



CR1.2:F31 1971

# **The Movement of Federal Facilities to the Suburbs**

**A Report of the Washington DC Advisory Committee  
to the United States Commission on Civil Rights - 1971**

Page 4

THE MOVEMENT OF FEDERAL FACILITIES TO THE SUBURBS

A Report by the  
Suburban Growth Committee  
of the  
United States Congress  
1971

CR1.2:  
F31  
No

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

To The

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Roy Littlejohn, CHAIRMAN

Rev. E. Franklin Jackson, VICE CHAIRMAN

Mrs. Juliet Munroe, SECRETARY

\*Eugene Davidson

Edward A. Hailes

Dr. Roy J. Jones

Mrs. Ruth Jordan

Mrs. Deborah L. Matory

Mrs. Nellie W. Mayers

George Mitchell

J. Larry Owens

Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

Lee A. Satterfield

\*Edward E. Saunders

\*Miss Jeanne Walton

Dr. Adolph Y. Wilburn

MARYLAND SUBCOMMITTEE

\*Rabbi Leon M. Adler  
Chevy Chase

Ann P. Brown  
Garrett Park

\*Richard L. Fairley  
Silver Spring

VIRGINIA SUBCOMMITTEE

J. Donald Anderson  
Alexandria

\*Wesley A. Pomeroy  
Falls Church

CR1.2:F31

\*No longer members of the Advisory Committee

CONTENTS

Preface . . . . . iii

Introduction. . . . . iv

Suburban Living for Black Families. . . . . 2

Employees' Concerns . . . . . 3

    Labor Department. . . . . 3

    Navy Department . . . . . 5

    Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. . . . . 7

Local Government Response . . . . . 10

    City of Rockville and Montgomery County . . . . . 11

    District of Columbia. . . . . 12

The Federal Response. . . . . 12

    Department of Housing and Urban Development . . . . . 12

    Department of Labor . . . . . 14

    Department of Health, Education, and Welfare . . . . . 14

    General Services Administration . . . . . 16

    Navy Department . . . . . 17

Conclusions . . . . . 20

Recommendations . . . . . 25

PREFACE

The United States Commission on Civil Rights

The United States Commission on Civil Rights is an independent agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957. By the terms of that act, as amended by the Civil Rights Acts of 1960 and 1964, the Commission is charged with the following duties: investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote; study of legal developments with respect to denials of the equal protection of the law; appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to denials of equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting denials of the equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

The State Advisory Committees

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as amended. The Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission upon matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission in matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference which the Commission may hold within the State.

This report was submitted to the United States Commission on Civil Rights by the District of Columbia Advisory Committee. The conclusions and recommendations are based upon the Advisory Committee's evaluation of information received at its all-day open meeting on May 14, 1970. This report has been received by the Commission and will be considered by it in making its reports and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

## INTRODUCTION

The District of Columbia Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights held a day-long public meeting on May 14, 1970 to gather information about the movement of Federal facilities from the District of Columbia to the suburbs, and the effects of these moves on minority employment, housing patterns, and the development and growth of the entire Washington Metropolitan Area.

The Federal Government is the largest single employer in the Washington Metropolitan Area and its actions affect almost every facet of the area's life. Ever since the move of the Atomic Energy Commission to Germantown, Maryland, in 1958, there has been a steady movement of Federal employment away from the central city into the Virginia and Maryland suburbs. From 1963 to 1968, at least 42 components of 18 agencies employing some 17,000 workers have moved out of the District. Another 12,000 were involved in the Navy Department move to Arlington, Virginia, 5,000 in the Public Health Service (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare--HEW) transfer to Rockville, Maryland in 1970, and 2,200 in the planned move of the U.S. Geological Survey to Reston, Virginia.

Jobs have been moving to the suburbs in most metropolitan areas in the United States since the late 1940's, but the situation in the Washington area is unique because of the number of low-income, moderate-income, and black, central city residents who are also employees of the Federal Government. While Federal jobs were moving out, much of the low-cost housing--and practically all the public housing--remained in the central city, putting the latter group of employees at a distinct



5

disadvantage in the competition for jobs near their homes.

Housing was not the only problem for black and low-income Federal employees who suddenly found their places of employment moved into the suburbs. Public transportation in the Washington area is either unavailable, costly, or inconvenient. (The Metro subway system may relieve some of this problem, but it is not expected to begin service to the suburbs until 1974.) Personal arrangements such as babysitting, after-work education programs, and children's schooling were often disrupted. While some employees at HEW were guaranteed jobs, many found job security, status, and personal satisfaction diminished when they were forced to take "dead-end" Federal jobs in the city, while the main business of their agencies moved to greener fields.

Finally, the economic impact of Federal relocations on the tax bases of all the jurisdictions involved was substantial: It was learned late in 1970 that Northern Virginia now contains more leased Federal office space (which brings in much needed tax revenues) than the District of Columbia. Many observers felt that the power of the Federal Government could have and should have been used more forcefully to rebuild the economic base of a Federal city still scarred by the civil disturbances of April 1968.

Housing remains the most immediate personal issue, however. Those concerned about the movement of Federal facilities to the suburbs--especially with regard to leased office space--saw this trend as an opportunity to use the power of the Federal dollar as a wedge to open the suburbs to low-income minority groups. In a report to the National Capital Planning

Commission (NCPC)\*, for instance, George Schermer, civil rights consultant, recommended that the role of NCPC be expanded to include control over the location of Federal leased space in the whole Washington Metropolitan region, just as it does for federally owned space now; and that special emphasis be placed on using agency relocations as a possible tool for opening the suburbs, especially new towns, to low-income and to minority groups.

A document of great importance is President Nixon's Executive Order No. 11512 of February 27, 1970, which said, in part, "The availability of low and moderate income housing . . . will be considered . . ." as a criterion for choosing a site for Federal installations. Prompted by the President's order and a suit by the Metropolitan Washington Planning and Housing Association to prevent the Navy Department move, the General Services Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development met with 21 other Federal agencies on March 20, 1970, to develop guidelines for the placement of Federal facilities. Yet these guidelines have not been issued; thus, their potential impact on policy regarding Federal agency relocations cannot be determined.

With these concerns in mind, the Advisory Committee undertook to explore this issue through a public meeting and by requesting information from a number of organizations in the Washington area. What follows is a summary of the statements offered at the public meeting, the Committee's conclusions and recommendations for consideration by the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and some of the documents received in connection with the Committee's investigation.

---

\*Policy Recommendations for the Location of Federal Work Facilities in the National Capital Region.



5

THE MOVEMENT OF FEDERAL FACILITIES TO THE SUBURBS

The purpose of the public meeting, convened by the District of Columbia Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, was to explore the implications of the movement of Federal facilities to the suburbs for both the District and its suburbs, for minority employment, for housing patterns, and for the development and growth of the entire metropolitan area.

At the outset, Gilbert Hahn, Chairman of the District of Columbia City Council, outlined the wishes of the D.C. governing body:

Naturally we prefer that these movements not take place at all in order to keep job opportunities in the city. The City Council is aware that the housing and transportation problems that inhibit the hiring of minority residents of the inner city have not yet been cured. Let us concede that there are overriding reasons sometimes for moving departments to the suburbs; but if this has to happen, let us resolve to make it possible for residents of the inner city to find equivalent housing near the new job locations or to make transportation to the jobs inexpensive and convenient.

To discuss the political, economic, and demographic aspects of the problem, a group of experts in these areas was invited to address the Committee.

Dr. Royce Hanson, President of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, speaking about the economic implications of agency moves, said that projections indicate that the District will have substantially more Federal jobs by the year 2000 than today, but Maryland and Virginia will gain such jobs at an even faster rate.

George Grier, Senior Associate of the Washington Center, offered some demographic data. The black population of the metropolitan area over the past century has remained at a fairly constant

proportion (about one-fourth), but recently has been concentrated in the central city; today, the District is now 71 percent black and the suburbs about 7 percent.

John Hechinger, President of the Hechinger Company and former Chairman of the D. C. City Council, characterized the District as "the pulse of one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the United States," and stated that the region derived its existence from the urban core. "The Federal Government must and can play a major role in the reversal of the urban sprawl by stopping the movement of Federal agencies to the suburbs," he said, and noted that there are large areas from 14th Street, N.W. toward the east that could be developed for use as Federal office space.

#### SUBURBAN LIVING FOR BLACK FAMILIES

A panel of citizens familiar with the problems involved in finding housing in the suburbs for low-income black families provided eloquent testimony which emphatically demonstrated the seriousness of the housing crisis in the Washington Metropolitan Area.

Charles Mahone, formerly with the People's Organization of Montgomery County (POMCO), and a 7-year resident of Rockville, described the availability of housing in the county as "almost nonexistent for the black people who work for the Federal Government because, by and large, those people who work for the Federal Government are the lower paid employees. The median housing in Montgomery County last year, the new construction, sold for about \$40,000 and anyone that earns \$15,000 or less cannot afford to buy a house today in Montgomery County. And I know very, very few black people

5

who earn \$15,000 a year." He said the county has a deficiency of some 5,000 low-cost units for its own residents, without adding the impact of bringing in people from the District.

Miss Leora Robinson, a resident of Fairfax County who served as a tester for Northern Virginia Fair Housing, said she found housing in Virginia equally scarce for both blacks and whites: "For the black testers and the white testers . . . there was no housing available. We tested apartments and there was nothing available. Everything was filled."

Blacks who move to the suburbs may find a hostile environment, according to Mrs. Doris Stanley, a resident of Montgomery County since August of 1964. She said the Federal Government should offer strong support to any of its black employees who choose to live in the suburbs. She emphasized that they will need "an awful lot of help. The suburbs are not open to them and are not welcoming them in; it is a fight."

#### EMPLOYEES' CONCERNS

The next group of participants at the open meeting were employees and union representatives from the Labor Department, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Navy Department, who provided information as to how workers--as individuals and in groups--reacted to and were affected by Federal agency relocations.

#### Labor Department

John Fodor, a member of the executive board of Local 12, American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), told about the circumstances surrounding the proposed move of the Labor Department's Manpower Administration to Virginia. The 2,500 employees involved

were notified in June 1968 that they would be moved that fall. The union then secured 1,200 signatures opposing the move.

Leroy Curtis, vice president of Local 12, described the experience of some employees who were moved from the District to Silver Spring, Maryland in 1959 and 1960. While some of the local merchants voluntarily opened their facilities to all, "others refused adamantly or opposed any forms of integration, adamantly . . . [until 1967], and only opened then as a result of a final court action, I think, when we filed ultimately with the Justice Department."

In order to avoid similar problems and to prevent the move, if possible, the union met with the Assistant Secretaries of the Department and the Solicitor of Labor, according to John Thurber, President of Local 12. At one such meeting, the following statement was made by an official of the Manpower Administration, according to Mr. Fodor:

Look, why are you people fighting this? You are for integration, aren't you? A move like this can't help but integrate the suburbs.

And in response, one of my black colleagues said, The job of integrating the suburbs is up to you. If we choose to spend our time that way, fine, but we are not going to do this as part of our job. We are D. C. residents. We are individuals, and we want to act according to our own persuasion. We don't want the burden of integrating the suburbs on top of an eight-hour day job.

After statements were obtained from more than 250 employees saying that the move would cause severe hardship and might alter

the racial composition of the labor force, the Manpower Administration move was cancelled. Mr. Fodor attributed the success of the employees' fight both to their diligence and to an enlightened management.

Navy Department

The relocation of 12,000 Navy employees to Virginia--a move that was completed in the fall of 1970--was outlined by Mrs. Bernice Scoville, then a configuration analyst with the Naval Ordnance Systems Command. The employees were informed of the move in March or April 1970, she said. About 8,000 of the employees were still located in the District of Columbia at the Main Navy-Munititons complex. Of these, about 3,000 to 4,000 were estimated to be in a low-grade; about half of them were black.

The personal problems of the employees involved in the move were many, and a full description of these problems was included in a suit brought against the Navy by the affected Navy Department workers and the Metropolitan Washington Planning and Housing Association. For instance, Mrs. Scoville explained that "my husband works at the National Institutes of Health and my son attends Woodrow Wilson High School and we sort of drop me at Navy, and drop my son at Woodrow Wilson and my husband goes on to NIH. And that's breaking up a very good transportation system." She also said that the move to Virginia would create problems "if one has to come into the District for a doctor, a lawyer, whatever . . . whereas, if you work at Main Navy, it is easy to run up town; if you've got to come across 14th Street bridge, we're talking about another thing."

Miss Joyce Williams, a GS-3 mail clerk at Naval Ships Systems Command (NSSC), expressed similar doubts about the move, noting that her bus fare would increase from approximately \$13 a month to \$30 a month. And, Levern Lacy, a file clerk at NSSC, said the move would disrupt his commuting system. He said he usually drove to work with his wife, who is also a Navy employee, but the move would cost them both additional commuting time; as a result, they would have to get another babysitter because of the hours. He said he was having trouble switching jobs because of the Government job freeze.

All three employees expressed dissatisfaction with the help they had received from the Navy Department. "We have gotten a route map telling us about accessible road maps from one point in Maryland, Washington, and Virginia, to the complexes in Virginia. We have been told what buses go where. We haven't been told what time they go there. We have been told things like what cafeterias will be available, like Hospitality House and some of the other places that on a GS-2, 3 or 7 salary one cannot afford to eat in," said Mrs. Scoville. Miss Williams said a task force had been set up to study carpools and a questionnaire had been distributed.

When asked what time employees wanted to report for work, 76 percent chose 7:30 a.m., but "we came up with the hours of 8 a.m.," said Mrs. Scoville. "So I don't think anybody is really hearing what we are saying." She also noted that while the Navy claimed that there were 2,800 housing units available in the area for low-income employees, an article in the Washington Post indicated that the number was probably only 128.

5

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Employees involved in the move of the Public Health Service to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Maryland, also participated in the open meeting. Roy Morgan, President of Local 41, AFGE, and a program analyst at the National Center for Health Statistics, said that all the PHS facilities were originally located downtown, but were now scattered all over the metropolitan area. The employees were first notified of the proposed consolidation from an architect's sketch of the Parklawn Building which appeared in the Washington Post, he said.

Miss Joy Schulterbrandt, a psychologist at the National Institute of Mental Health, said most of the employees there were apathetic about the move. She was concerned for two reasons: (1) a growing concern at the general pattern of moving away from the District, where the greatest number of black citizens is located, and (2) a pattern whereby employees are generally not advised or informed of the moves until after lease contracts have been signed, but it is generally understood that the concerns of white employees will be taken care of.

William Jenkins, an employee with the Public Health Service Commission and former vice president of Local 41, said the union filed suit against HEW to prevent the move, and conducted a survey which showed that "people were opposed to the move, particularly lower-grade employees and particularly black, lower-grade employees."

Mr. Morgan said that the union lost the suit because HEW "did things that mooted the suit." The Department designed a job guarantee program which was announced shortly after the suit was filed, he said.



He described it as follows: "The job guarantee plan was designed to alleviate the hardships of employees below a certain grade level . . . . The plan supposedly would find for an employee who would be hardshipped under certain conditions by the move, a comparable job in a location elsewhere in HEW, in an area downtown if that's where he had been working." The Department's official figures indicate that the majority of those who were placed under the job guarantee program stayed with the job that they were placed in, he said.

But in doing some cursory investigation of those who applied for help . . . we find that there is a significant number of people who were very much dissatisfied with the type of job that was comparable. In many cases, the jobs were comparable only in grade. Things other than their salary that determined the quality and status of the grade in Federal service, the work environment, type of program and what is generally called-- that fuzzy thing called "status", many felt that although . . . the job level, the grade level, the GS grade level was the same, that the jobs were the least desirable jobs that these agencies had not been able to fill, and here was an opportunity to fill them with people.

Mr. Morgan said he was also distressed by what he called the inadequate planning involved, and said that the Rockville city officials were informed of the move only 9 months before it was scheduled to take place.

Three HEW employees then offered their personal experiences. Mrs. Taloria Stevenson, an editor at the National Center for Health Statistics, said she was discriminated against when she tried to find a house in Maryland:

5

MRS. STEVENSON: I had been looking for a home prior to the move. And after it became almost inevitable that we would move, I decided I would look in the Rockville area for a place to stay. And I was reading the Sunday paper and I saw where they had some homes going up. And so I decided to go take a look.

I called out there first to see if this was really an open housing type development.

MR. ALEXANDER (Commission Staff counsel to the Committee):  
What were you told when you asked about that?

MRS. STEVENSON: I was told by the man that evidently I was not familiar with the law, that they were--they had to rent to anybody who qualified. And so I told him, I said, "Well, I would like to come out and look."

MR. ALEXANDER: What happened when you got there?

MRS. STEVENSON: Well, I went out. And . . . he took me to every place but the places that I had in mind . . .

MR. ALEXANDER: What type of neighborhoods did he show you houses in?

MRS. STEVENSON: Well they were predominantly--well, they were all-black neighborhoods. They were very poorly kept up, they were rundown places more than not.

MR. ALEXANDER: Did he ever show you the house that you had seen advertised in the paper?

MRS. STEVENSON: No, not really. We went back to the office and we discussed the places. And I asked him about the houses, and he told me he didn't think that I would be interested because of the price, and various other things. And I asked him about these various other things, I said, "Aren't there any black people in these developments?" And he told me there was no such thing as an integrated suburb.

He said, "You people have about ten years before they're ready for you."

Mrs. Stevenson said she subsequently bought a house in the District of Columbia for more than she would have paid for the house in Maryland.

Mrs. Lee Ethyl Robinson, a statistical assistant with NIMH, told the Commission that her commuting time would be increased from approximately 3 hours a day to 5 or 6 hours. She was then asked how much more it would cost her to commute to Rockville:

MRS. ROBINSON: Well, at present, since I'm right on the District line, I can get to work for sixty-four cents a day; which means a total of \$166.40 per year. The move to Parklawn would cost me a total of a dollar ninety-eight cents per day; which would make a total of \$514.80. Now this would be an increase of \$348.40, which is a percent increase of 209.4. . . .

Finally, Mrs. Doris Coram, a former editorial assistant for the National Center for Health Statistics, told the Committee that she had to quit her job and take another job at less pay because of the inconvenience caused by the move.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Officials from the Maryland suburbs and the District of Columbia expressed dissatisfaction with the way Federal agencies handled various moves. They were generally dismayed that they were not consulted sooner, and expressed a feeling of powerlessness in their relationship to the Federal forces involved.

5

City of Rockville and Montgomery County

Representatives of local governments from Maryland expressed dissatisfaction with the Federal Government's handling of agency movements from the District. Mrs. Rose Kramer, Councilwoman of Montgomery County, said the only issues put before the county council when the Parklawn move was announced, were traffic and transportation.

Matthew McCartin, senior councilman from Rockville, said that he learned about the move through the newspapers, and that "there was absolutely no consultation with the Federal Government . . . ." He continued, "There was no planning that I can find to take care of the tremendous transportation problems . . . . Not only do the people need bus transportation to get to the facility when you have 6,000 people there, obviously they need to get haircuts, they need to shop, they need to eat, and there is absolutely no internal bus circulation in Rockville worthy of the name . . . ."

On housing, Mr. McCartin said that 60 percent of the housing in his city is valued at \$25,000 or less, and in one area the average sales price was \$19,210, with a 17 percent sales turnover in a 2-year period. The city of Rockville has also built 140 units of publicly assisted housing, and Montgomery County has built 967 such units, he said.

Responding to charges made earlier that blacks were discriminated against in housing in Montgomery County, Mrs. Kramer noted that the county had one of the first public accommodations laws and fair housing laws in the area, and that both the county and the city of Rockville had human relations councils which investigated such

charges. "We have some racial discrimination, but we probably have far greater economic discrimination," she said.

#### District of Columbia

James Banks, Assistant to the Mayor for Housing, indicated some of the unique problems which the District confronts. The maintenance and revitalization of the city "as the Federal City and the National Capitol has to be of interest not only to us but also to the Federal Government," he said. Also, he noted, the District Government is not always consulted when agency moves are being planned. Finally, he pointed out the peculiar problem of leased Federal office space. He noted that while the National Capital Planning Commission has the power to review and approve plans for Federal construction in the region, it has no such power over leased space. "I would recommend that any move, whether it is to leased property or property to be owned by the Federal Government, be approved by the National Capital Planning Commission as a part of a total plan before the Federal department is authorized to proceed," he said.

#### THE FEDERAL RESPONSE

##### Department of Housing and Urban Development

The first in a series of Federal officials to testify at the meeting was Kenneth Holbert, Director of Housing Opportunity, Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Mr. Holbert stressed the importance of Title VIII of the 1968 Civil Rights Act, which states in part that "it is the policy of the United States

5

to provide within constitutional limitations for fair housing throughout the United States," and that to achieve this, Federal agencies must "administer their programs and activities relating to housing and urban development in a manner affirmatively to further the purpose of the Fair Housing Law."

"It is our belief," he continued, "that one of the major activities of Federal agencies in this regard, for those who are not directly concerned with the provisions of housing, is the location of their facilities in suburban areas." Further, he said, "It is our belief that when a Federal agency fails to use the leverage which its economic impact provides to improve housing opportunities for low-income and minority people in that community, it fails to carry out its responsibilities under Title VIII."

Since March 20, 1970, an interagency committee has been working on Federal guidelines on the relocation of Government facilities, he said. The criteria stress the availability or real prospect of low- and moderate-income housing truly open to all citizens, the adequacy of public facilities, and the adequacy of transportation systems. "If a community under consideration is deficient in one of these areas," he said, "provision is made for Federal and local cooperation to cure the problems." In addition, HUD is looking at all applications for Federal assistance from communities where relocation of Federal agencies is being considered, "and we propose to suggest to that Federal agency that they locate in the particular community that modifies or adjusts its zoning so that low- and moderate-income houses can be provided," Mr. Holbert said.

Department of Labor

Leo Wertz, Assistant Secretary for Administration, said that the Department of Labor's Manpower Administration considered vacating its downtown Washington headquarters because of problems with the lease and the desire to consolidate the department. Three factors prevented the move, however: (1) employee dissatisfaction; (2) cost; and (3) difficulty in making arrangements. Mr. Wertz said the Labor Department was committed to remaining downtown.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

In reference to the Parklawn move, Saul Rosoff, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Management, said that "the principle concern [for considering the move] was the spread of the agency in the various [19] locations."

Of the 600 employees who worked in the District, 115 to 120 were black, he said. In addition, about one-half of the people involved in the Parklawn move either lived in or worked in Maryland.

The Department supplied three kinds of assistance, Mr. Rosoff said:

- (1) Assisting employees who could make the move to Parklawn with counseling;
- (2) Assisting employees who could not make the move to find other employment; and
- (3) Working with the local community to relieve existing unemployment problems there.



5

In response to questioning, Mr. Rosoff said that about one-half the black employees made an application at one time or other for another job. Under the job guarantee program, 150 blacks were placed. One hundred-seven others were eligible and were in the process of having offers made and decided either to withdraw or to remain with their agency.

Stuart H. Clarke, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel and Training, said he felt the job guarantee and job swap programs should have been put into effect earlier. Some of the new considerations the Department would make before any site will now be approved include:

- (1) Involving the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer at the outset, and
- (2) Having the Selection Committee work with the Assistant Secretary for Administration.

A document that sheds light on HEW's considerations in the move is one prepared by I. K. Burgess of Health Services and Mental Health Administration dated June 20, 1969, entitled "Chronology of Events Leading to the Leasing of the Parklawn Building." Mr. Burgess writes that the decision to consolidate the Public Health Service was made by the Surgeon General, Dr. William Stewart, in the spring of 1966. When it proved impossible to buy or lease sufficient space within the District, the decision was made to formally request the necessary space in an area north of the National Institutes of Health, south of Rockville, and within a one-mile limit on either side of Rockville Pike. Five bids were received in November 1967, and the Parklawn Building was considered the best.

It is instructive to see the criteria on which the Parklawn Building was adjudged best, however. Mr. Burgess wrote, "Its general design and configuration was judged to be better than the others with competitive rental rates; it included the desirable parking accommodations, cafeteria facilities, and other service features; and, of equal importance, the annual rental rate /\$4.097 per square foot/ was the lowest of the five proposals." (Emphasis added.) Nowhere in the memo are employees' concerns mentioned.

#### General Services Administration

Arthur Sampson, Commissioner, Public Building Service, said two important events shaped the entire question of Federal site selection recently. They are the issuance of a directive by Mr. Kunzig, the GSA Administrator, which stated that in selecting sites for the housing of employees, GSA will avoid, wherever possible, locating employees where there was a lack of low- and moderate-income housing, or a lack of transportation which was accessible to that housing; and the issuance of President Nixon's Executive Order No. 11512. Mr. Sampson noted that while the Executive Order does not use the words "open occupancy" in reference to housing, "We are definitely looking for open housing."

Navy Department

Representing the Navy Department were John Walter, the Administrative Officer, and Thomas C. Embrey, Director of Space Management and Services in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense Administration. Their remarks may best be examined through the following lengthy quotation:

MR. ALEXANDER: This morning we heard from a number of Navy Department employees deeply concerned about losing their jobs, increased cost of transportation, inability to find housing in the suburbs. What steps, if any, is the Navy Department or the Defense Department taking to alleviate these problems?

MR. WALTER: I am not aware of anyone who is going to lose their /sic/ position.

MR. ALEXANDER: Well, people who feel that they cannot move to where the Government facility will be located, in effect feel that they will be losing their positions.

MR. WALTER: They'll be two and a half miles away from their present location.

I don't mean to be argumentative, but you asked for the facts; and this is what I'm trying to give you.

MR. ALEXANDER: Are there any plans similar to those presented by the /HEW/ representatives . . . for job guarantee programs?

MR. WALTER: I don't believe there will necessarily be a guarantee required. The jobs are there. There is no problem here.

. . . I know you're interested in housing. I can tell you we've met with Secretary Romney, who has created another task force . . . to go into Arlington County and find out what can be done immediately about low-cost housing.

There is a high-rise going up now in Hybla Valley, It's going to take some four or five hundred units, starting at ninety dollars a month. But it's not built . . . .

MR. ALEXANDER: . . . What rent did you mention?

MR. WALTER: Ninety to a hundred and fifty, something of this sort. It's high-rise low-cost housing. This is in the program worked up by HUD and Arlington County.

Right now, there's really no low-cost housing in Arlington County close by the Crystal City complex.

Following this exchange, it was estimated by Mr. Walter that there were 850 employees in GS grades 1-5, out of a total 12,000 involved in the move. In a letter written after the meeting, however, Mr. Walter gave the actual figures, including "the number of negro [sic] employees, by grade, in our departmental headquarters." The figures reveal that there were 4,393 employees in GS 1-5, and 1,645 (or 37.5 percent) were Negro. Moreover, while blacks comprise 15.8 percent of the total GS rated work force of 15,261, they comprise nearly 30 percent (29.9%) of the lowest grades (GS 1-7), and only a minute portion, 3.77 percent, of the upper grades (GS 8-18). The figures also show that while the median grade for all employees is GS 10, the median for black employees is GS 5.

The other major area of discussion with the Navy representatives concerned the evaluation of employee needs. Mr. Embrey stated that a survey of employees was conducted, but only after the decision to move. Mr. Walter explained that the Navy had arranged for

5

some 50 counselors to give out information on the move, but Dr. Roy Jones, A D. C. Advisory Committee member, questioned the adequacy of the Navy's method:

DR. JONES: But the fact is that all you do is make . . . the information available?

MR. WALTER: That's right.

DR. JONES: You don't go beyond that?

MR. WALTER: Not overly, no.

DR. JONES: And you don't feel --

MR. WALTER: The door is open for any employee to walk in to his Personnel Officer and say "Tell me more about this and how it fits me."

DR. JONES: You don't feel any need to go beyond that, I take it?

MR. WALTER: At the moment I haven't had any--you people say you've had contrary information this morning. I'm sorry; I haven't heard of it.

## CONCLUSIONS

Ordinarily, an Advisory Committee, after reviewing the information it has obtained, draws conclusions and develops recommendations to be submitted to the Commission and shared with the public.

However, in addition to this, at the closing session of the open meeting, a panel composed of James H. Harvey, Executive Director of the Housing Opportunities Council of Metropolitan Washington; Ralph Fertig, Executive Director of the Metropolitan Washington Planning and Housing Association; and James M. Scott, Executive Director of the Washington Suburban Institute who had observed the entire proceedings, shared their observations, conclusions, and recommendations with the Committee.

Mr. Harvey concluded, that from the remarks of the Federal officials, it is evident that low-grade and black employees are not considered when an agency contemplates relocation. "There is no . . . real concern for the low-grade employees, and specifically, no concern for the welfare of the low-grade black employees," Mr. Harvey charged. He added that the Federal Government is the worst offender in seeing that housing is provided for its low and moderate-income employees.

Title VIII of the 1968 Civil Rights Act requires all executive departments and agencies to carry out their programs in an affirmative manner consistent with the fair housing title. But, said Mr. Harvey, they do just the opposite by moving to the suburbs.

He pointed out that HEW developed elaborate transportation systems; "If just half of that effort was put into what we are going to do about housing, I think we would have had some progress," Mr. Harvey noted. He also charged that the agencies abandon all programs after the move has taken place.

Another observation made by Mr. Harvey was that employees were kept in the dark concerning moves. They learned about them from the newspapers or rumors. Finding out who is responsible is even more elusive. It is almost impossible, said Mr. Harvey, to pinpoint responsibility for an agency move--the White House, Congress, GSA, the agency itself--it constantly shifts.

Mr. Harvey commented on the hopelessness of the current situation interested private agencies are completely disregarded; the District government is powerless to protect its citizens affected by agency moves; where HUD has not provided the leadership; where agency housing officers do not know what they should do; and finally, where there is an absence of commitment to assist the lower grade black employee in government.

Mr. Fertig stated that the information presented at the meeting "made it perfectly clear . . . in a racially and economically polarized metropolitan area, that the government is the major force in building and sustaining that polarization . . . . Whether through indifference or intent, the Federal Government builds ghettos in the national capital area."



According to Mr. Fertig, a conscious use of the government's economic presence could reverse this trend and he urged the Federal Government:

1. **Not** to move its sites;
2. Not to provide subsidies to local governments or contract with any private firms unless they guarantee adequate housing for low- and moderate-income families proportionate to their numbers in the total metropolitan area;
3. To establish an office of national capital affairs consolidating all the Federal agencies involved in Federal agency location and site approval in the national capital region.

Mr. Fertig insisted that GSA could stop the moves to the suburbs but "GSA violated its own guidelines" by failing to survey affected employees needs, by not determining the number of low-income employees affected, by not studying transportation to find out if the new sites were accessible and by not analyzing housing.

Finally, Mr. Fertig called upon the Commission to take an active role in the then pending move of the Navy Department to Northern Virginia. He also urged the District government to refuse to grant permits for the demolition of housing unless adequate provision for relocation at equivalent rents is made.

James Scott, viewing the day from the perspective of a Northern Virginian concerned about the Federal government's role in dealing with institutional racism, expressed disappointment and pessimism. He pointed out that in Fairfax County, the proportion of black residents has gone down from 20 percent in 1920 to 10 percent in 1950 to 4 percent in 1970, because the local governments are not concerned about racial and economic integration or social goals, and neither is the Federal Government.

In fact, the Federal housing programs are clearly inadequate, he said, and "the Federal Housing Administration and the Veteran's Administration have consistently reinforced the patterns of segregation . . . nobody checks with the lender to see whether he makes loans to people who are seeking housing on a nondiscriminatory basis . . . . When the FHA acquires housing, it doesn't notify the local housing authority or local fair housing boards."

To reverse this trend of encouraging racial discrimination, Mr. Scott proposed that the Federal Government no longer provide grants to jurisdictions which refuse to provide housing for low-income families--"where the record shows that the community is a racist one."

Pointing out that the Federal Housing Administration recently refused--in the public interest--to insure housing near Dulles Airport because of the noise, Mr. Scott suggested that "it is just as much in the public interest for FHA to refuse to insure loans in the

suburban communities which do not take affirmative action on nondiscriminatory patterns and on the housing supply . . . ."

"I think perhaps that the Federal Government . . . should let local jurisdictions know that they will not stay in those communities where black people and poor people are continuously being planned and zoned out," Mr. Scott concluded.

The D. C. Advisory Committee concurs in these observations and notes that its brief investigation--the open meeting and the data it has examined--confirms the charge that while the Federal Government may profess concern with the lower income, black, inner-city employee, the practice of Federal agency moves to the suburbs contradicts those expressions.

There is no real opportunity for Federal employees to express their opinions on proposed moves and usually they are not informed until it is a fait accompli.

5

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations the District of Columbia Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights is about to offer have been put forward before in different settings and by different groups. Scores of civic, academic, political, religious, business and labor organizations have urged the Federal Government not to move installations until there is assurance of adequate housing for all economic and racial groups, transportation and community facilities.

Last year, the Commission itself put forward a series of recommendations as part of its study of "Federal Installations and Equal Housing Opportunity." The major recommendation of the Commission called for an executive order establishing a uniform site selection policy that would promote housing and employment opportunities for lower income and minority group employees and would also promote balanced economic development and help end racial and economic separation.

Soon after the report was issued, the President did sign an executive order concerning the planning, acquisition and management of Federal space. The order was a positive step in changing the unfortunate practices of past decades. However, the D. C. Advisory Committee believes that this executive order should be amended so that it would deal with the problems the Commission and this Committee have identified, particularly the availability of nonsegregated housing.

However, limiting its recommendations to the situation observed in the Washington Metropolitan area, the D. C. Advisory Committee recommends:

1. An immediate moratorium should be put into effect on the movement of all Federal installations and facilities to the Maryland and Virginia suburbs until the following steps have been taken:
  - a) The Federal Government should develop a clearly defined and uniformly enforced policy with regard to the movement of Federal facilities, which includes obtaining guarantees from the surrounding jurisdictions that adequate housing for low- and moderate-income employees and the transportation and community services that they would normally require, will be provided on a nondiscriminatory basis and at a reasonable cost.
  - b) When a move is contemplated, employees should be informed as soon as possible and the issue should be a mandatory subject for collective bargaining between the agency and its employee organization.

- c) Hearings must be held which will give all parties an opportunity either to oppose the move or to present testimony or evidence concerning the move, before it is approved.
2. The Federal Government should establish a centralized unit with representation from agencies with responsibility for locating facilities in the Washington Metropolitan area to coordinate all matters relating to agency movement.
  3. The District of Columbia should establish an office of Federal agency movement within the District government to deal with the issue of job site locations within the District and to establish working relationships with the Federal agencies employing its citizens and providing income to the city.
  4. The General Services Administration, which has the responsibility for acquiring space for many government agencies, should enforce more vigorously its own policies with respect to locating sites in areas with housing for low- and moderate-income employees.

## APPENDIX A

### SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEDERAL POLICY AND PRACTICE

Statement of Royce Hanson, President, Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies Before the Open Meeting of the D. C. Advisory Committee of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights

1. Before relocation of any Federal facility, a comprehensive survey should be made of employees' needs as to housing, transportation, and community facilities. The survey procedure should be standardized, and should be developed by a Federal task force in consultation with employee representatives, both black and white.
2. Prior to each relocation, the Federal Government should also survey the housing and other facilities of the community to which the move is going to be made. The adequacy of these facilities should be assessed, not just in terms of needs of the Federal employees expected to relocate there, but in terms of the combined impact of Federal relocation, secondary job generation expected to result from the Federal move, and normal growth. One of the most persistent problems of this region is the lack of Federal responsibility for the consequences and impact of its economic decisions.
3. The Federal Government should then work closely and continuously with local officials to assure that all needs are met adequately by the time of the move.
4. Specifically, the Federal Government should work with local officials to assure that there will be an adequate housing supply at all price levels to accommodate not only the expected influx of Federal employees, but also the needs of workers expected to be attracted by the secondary economic affects of the move in combination with continuing normal growth patterns. If this is not done, the results will be a localized housing shortage of a critical level, and housing prices will be forced up sharply to the disadvantage not only of Federal employees but of all residents of the area, both existing and future.
5. Federal officials should work closely with local officials to survey, and, where necessary, to improve transportation facilities, including the entire highway and street network, parking facilities, and bus and transit facilities. Specific attention should be paid to the transportation needs of workers who may prefer to remain in their present homes and commute to the new location, at least for a while. The impact of traffic generated by the new facility upon existing traffic patterns should also be evaluated to avoid localized traffic jams, damaging not merely to the employees but to the community.

6. Adequacy of supporting services, such as medical services, schools, day nurseries, etc. should also be surveyed, and Federal officials should make every effort in collaboration with local officials to assure that these needs are met.
7. It is of critical importance that the Federal Government should obtain assurance of the local authorities' capability to enforce fair housing regulations. Some localities now possess fair housing ordinances as comprehensive as the Federal law or more so. Under the terms of the Federal law, the Federal Government must defer to such local authorities in enforcement. But this provision can prove a mockery if, as in many cases, the local authority possesses a staff capability totally inadequate to the need.
8. Each Federal agency should establish an equal housing office, just as each now has an equal employment office.

This office should make it its business to see that unequal opportunities in housing do not lead to unequal employment opportunities.

9. It is quite unlikely that the present system of making government location decisions will be adequate to using the location power to enhance broader Federal objectives in the metropolitan area. Therefore, it is important that a reorganized Federal planning process for the national capital region be staffed and directed to see that these objectives are met when decisions to move or to build or lease new facilities are made. In short, no move should be permitted until a positive program of equal housing opportunity has been assured.



5

APPENDIX B

RECOMMENDATIONS WITH REGARD TO THE LOCATION OF  
FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS IN THE SUBURBS

Statement Submitted by Bruce J. Terris, Chairman, Democratic Central  
Committee to the D. C. Advisory Committee

First, a section should be established in the Office of the President with the responsibility of making decisions about the location of Federal installations. This section should provide for coordination with local governments so that the local governments are informed about proposed moves. An advisory or review committee shall be established to guarantee that citizens and especially employees have access to information and an opportunity to present their views in advance of decision.

Second, consideration should be given to the economic effect of the move on the community losing the installation as well as that gaining it before the move takes place.

Third, no move should take place until a specific finding is made that there is adequate low and moderate income housing for all employees in the area.

Fourth, if the move must be made even though there is a shortage of low and moderate income housing in the area, the Federal Government should acquire land and use it specifically for housing for employees who would be affected by the move.

APPENDIX C

THE POSITION OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY ON HOUSING IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Statement of Mrs. Ernest L. Heimann, President, Submitted to the  
D. C. Advisory Committee

Equal opportunity in housing can have meaning only when there is housing available to meet the needs of people in all income brackets. With the median price of a new home now over \$40,000 and virtually no new housing being built for under \$25,000, the family with a low or moderate income as defined in the various Federal housing programs is, for all practical purposes, foreclosed from settling in Montgomery County.

In some respects the problem of housing supply is more difficult to deal with than open housing. We feel that we are making some progress in gaining acceptance of the need for low and moderate income housing which is essential if we are to be a viable community. Unfortunately, we have not yet reached the point where people are no longer saying, "Okay, but don't put it in my neighborhood." One possible solution to this aspect of the problem is the position adopted by our members earlier this year making low and/or moderate income housing a requirement in certain zoning categories. The Montgomery County Council has taken a first step in directing the county attorney to pursue the feasibility of our proposal. At the same time, the League and Suburban Maryland Fair Housing are working with zoning attorney Robert Linowes on implementing legislation.

We understand that efforts are being made in some parts of the country to increase the supply of low and/or moderate income housing through use of or changes in the zoning power. As far as we know, however, no attempt has been made to use the particular approach which we have suggested. In any event, we realize that this would not solve the problem tomorrow. But we do feel it essential to have the principle established that developers be required to provide a variety of housing in terms of price.

Needless to say, however, groups like the League cannot solve a community's housing problems by themselves, nor can local governments, although they can certainly do more than they have been. The Federal Government has a vital role to play not only as a major employer in many areas, but also through the use of Federal funds which are being made

available to local communities for such programs as highways, schools, hospital construction, sewers, etc. In this sense the Federal Government has considerable leverage which it should be using to help make equality of opportunity a reality for all our citizens. And this leverage applies to more than just the housing field. It can be used to ensure equality of more than just the housing field. It can be used to ensure equality of opportunity in employment and education which are two other areas of great concern to the League and to which we are strongly committed.

APPENDIX D

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON

SUMMARY OUTLINE

A PROPOSAL TO ENSURE ADEQUATE AND NON-DISCRIMINATORY  
HOUSING WITH RESPECT TO FEDERAL AGENCY RELOCATIONS

I. EQUAL HOUSING OFFICE (EHO)

- A. Create and maintain an Equal Housing Office
- B. Equal Housing Office functions are to:
  - 1. Assist minority-group and low-income Federal agency employees obtain private or public housing close to job.
  - 2. Provide or arrange for legal assistance in cases of discrimination.
  - 3. Work with local real estate industry, local government and private fair housing groups to promote housing on equal basis for Federal employees.
- C. The placement of the Equal Housing Office in agency structure would be similar to that of the existing Equal Employment Opportunity Office

II. AGENCY PROCEDURE AT THE TIME IT REQUESTS SPACE

- A. Provide GSA with statistical data on employees: race, salary, place of residence by zip code
- B. Create an Advisory Committee
  - 1. Membership. To include low-income employees, HUD, GSA, and Director of Agency.
  - 2. Structure and organization. Meetings of the Advisory Committee shall be held monthly; Director of Agency shall relieve employees who are serving on the committee of their normal duties as the work of the committee requires; Committee shall remain in existence until at least one year after the move of the agency is complete; Director shall submit reports.
  - 3. Functions. Publicize its existence in a way that establish credibility with low-income and minority-group employees; survey of agency employees; work with Office of Personnel.

III. GSA PROCEDURE FOR INVESTIGATION OF POTENTIAL SITES

- A. Obtain market analysis, housing survey, zoning analysis
- B. Submit data to Advisory Committee for comment. Give agency's Advisory Committee 30 days to make comments before proceeding with lease or option on site.

- 5
- C. Agency Director consults with local officials whose localities are potential sites.

IV. ELIGIBILITY AND PREFERENCE CRITERIA

A. Eligibility criteria for sites

1. Adequate supply of decent and suitable housing within Area of Expected Residency (AOER) within price range of agency's employees.
2. Written assurance from HUD and Department of Justice that rights of all employees can and will be protected. Until and unless both assurances are received, such a site may not be considered eligible for a Federal installation under any circumstances.

B. Preference criteria for sites

1. In which housing is presently least restricted by race, color, etc.
2. From which have been received written assurances of non-discrimination policies from appropriate institutions responsible for development, construction, financing, sales and management of private housing.
3. Which have state and/or local fair housing laws and from which have been received written assurances that rights of Federal employees will be protected.
4. In which the location of the agency would increase economic diversity.

V. REMEDIES IF ADEQUATE HOUSING IS NOT AVAILABLE

Such sites may become eligible only if A or B, below, is met

- A. Written assurance is received from local government that it will take all steps necessary to produce the housing needed, and the local FHA Office has given written assurance that applications from local government and/or private developers in that area will receive priority processing and that funds are available.

- B. Written assurance is received from HUD that adequate funds are available to provide employees at GS-7 or comparable incomes and below a monthly housing allowance.

VI. REPORT OF GSA SITE RECOMMENDATION(S) TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND COMMITTEE COMMENTS

- A. At the same time GSA recommends a site or sites to the agency it shall provide to the Advisory Committee:
  - 1. Data on availability of housing for low-income employees.
  - 2. Copies of HUD and the Justice Department statement guaranteeing protection of rights of Federal employees.
  - 3. Preference criteria which were used in making recommendation(s).
  - 4. Statement where applicable of local governments and FHA Director relating to production of adequate housing and/or statement from Secretary of HUD relating to provision of housing allowance.
  - 5. List of sites which were excluded from recommended list, and the reason why.
- B. Advisory Committee shall have 60 days from receipt of information in which to comment and conduct second survey of employees during which time GSA may not take option or contract for building.

VII. POST-MOVE ENUMERATION OF MINORITY-GROUP EMPLOYMENT

- A. Director of the agency shall conduct an enumeration of minority-group employment no less frequently than each six months for a period of three years after the move of that agency is completed.
- B. Results of enumeration are provided to Advisory Committee, HUD, GSA, the Department of Justice, Civil Rights Commission, Civil Service Commission, and the Secretary of the department and to the monitoring agency (see VIII, A, below).

VIII. MONITORING OF FEDERAL AGENCY RELOCATION

- A. Monitoring to be performed by private agency under a 4-year contract to HUD to:
  - 1. Evaluate procedures and actions by GSA, HUD and other Federal government agencies with respect to agency moves.
  - 2. Evaluate Advisory Committee's role and function.

3. Analyze role played by local government with respect to Federal agency move to its jurisdiction.
4. Analyze the role of private organizations which may be involved in an agency move.
5. Gather statistical information on the number of low-income and minority-group employees of agencies before and after the location, relocation or expansion of an agency.
6. Report the difficulties encountered by low-income and minority-group employees as a result of a federal agency's location, relocation or expansion.
7. Recommend to GSA, HUD, and the Congress additional measures which need to be taken to ensure the purposes of these steps and procedures.

B. Monitoring Agency shall:

1. Conduct in-depth study of 12 major moves by Federal agencies.
2. Conduct less exhaustive study of 40 additional Federal agency moves.
3. Start monitoring as soon as possible after an agency requests space from GSA.
4. Submit quarterly and annual reports and a final major report. The reports shall be given to: HUD, the Department of Justice, Civil Rights Commission, GSA Administrator, Advisory Committee, Civil Service Commission, Directors and Secretaries of agencies studied.