

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Open Access Master's Theses

1980

AN ANALYSIS AND AN EVALUATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF COMMUNITIES AND DEVELOPMENT'S SECTION 8 PILOT MOBILITY PROGRAM

Jeanne Antionette Hall
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses>

Terms of Use

All rights reserved under copyright.

Recommended Citation

Hall, Jeanne Antionette, "AN ANALYSIS AND AN EVALUATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF COMMUNITIES AND DEVELOPMENT'S SECTION 8 PILOT MOBILITY PROGRAM" (1980). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 485.

<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/485>

This Thesis is brought to you by the University of Rhode Island. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu. For permission to reuse copyrighted content, contact the author directly.

AN ANALYSIS AND AN EVALUATION OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF COMMUNITIES
AND DEVELOPMENT'S SECTION 8
PILOT MOBILITY PROGRAM

BY

JEANNE ANTOINETTE HALL

A THESIS PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF
MASTER OF COMMUNITY PLANNING

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1980

MASTER OF COMMUNITY PLANNING THESIS PROJECT
OF
JEANNE ANTOINETTE HALL

Approved:

Dr Marcia Marber Feld

Thesis Project Advisor

Frank H. Fair Jr.

Director, Curriculum in Community Planning

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. THE ACTORS AND THE ISSUE.....11

 Introduction

 Background

 Section 8 Existing Housing Program

 The Gautreaux Case

 Other Mobility Programs

 The Actors

 Department of Housing and Urban Development

 Executive Office of Communities and Development

 Metropolitan Area Planning Council

 Local Housing Authorities

 Section 8 Administrators Association

 The Participants of the Section 8 Existing Housing Program

III. MASSACHUSETTS EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF COMMUNITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS'S SECTION 8 PILOT MOBILITY PROGRAM..29

IV. ATTITUDES TOWARD MOBILITY.....41

 Issues

 Summary

V. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....57

 Introduction

 Interviews and Analysis

 Conclusion

 Recommendations

.....

APPENDIX.....65

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....67

LIST OF TABLES AND EXHIBITS

Table

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 1. | Executive Office of Communities and Development Section 8 Minority Mobility Statewide..... | 30-33 |
| 2. | Executive Office of Communities and Development Section 8 Minority Mobility Boston..... | 34-35 |
| 3. | Cross Tabulation and Multivariate Analysis..... | 48-51 |
| 4. | Perceptions of Barriers..... | 53 |

Exhibit

| | | |
|------|--------------------------------|----|
| I. | Questionnaire Sample..... | 44 |
| II. | Questionnaire Totals..... | 45 |
| III. | Questionnaire Percentages..... | 46 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study has been completed to satisfy the requirements for the Degree of Master of Community Planning at the University of Rhode Island. Dr. Marcia Marker Feld, thesis research project advisor, consistently provided her guidance and assistance. The efforts of Dr. Feld and several other individuals who supported the activities of data gathering, literature review, and field investigations are greatly appreciated.

In particular, I would like to thank Alice Krapf, Director of the Bureau of Rental Assistance of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development; Mary-Ann Mates Morrison, also of EOCD; Wendy Plotkin of the Metropolitan Area Planning Council; Eleanor White of the Boston Area Office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and the many staff persons of local housing authorities throughout the greater Boston area.

Special thanks and appreciation are extended to Susan J. Lawson for manuscript edition and to my husband, Greg who has been steadfast in his support of this research, as well as my participation in graduate studies for the past two years.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to provide decent, safe and sanitary housing for American people, cities and towns, regions, states and the federal government have adopted programs which provide housing for low-income families. As early as 1937 with the passage of the United States Housing Act, it has been the federal government which has been the forerunner to initiate programs for housing.

In most instances, the provision of housing has been of two types. First, has been the provision of housing in a project environment. That is, a type of dwelling structure where a number of households reside in units owned by an agency, usually a housing authority. The dwelling units usually consist of congregate housing. Second, is the provision of housing units in privately owned homes or apartments. Here, a city, state or federal agency pays part of the rent directly to the landlord, with the remaining rent due paid by the tenant. In both types of housing, the subsidies received in rental cost by qualified households are based on a sliding scale relative to the income received by the eligible household.

In 1974, the United States Congress passed the Housing and Communities Development Act creating the Section 8 Existing Program. The Section 8 Program enables housing authorities to

offer opportunities of rental assistance to eligible households utilizing existing housing units. One goal identified by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is to enable participants of the Section 8 Existing Housing Program to locate suitable housing from a wide geographical area. By using the existing dwelling units the Section 8 Program allows for the following:

for rapid delivery of housing assistance at a relatively low cost, spatial deconcentration for lower-income families, maintenance and improvement of the existing housing stock, neighborhood preservation and avoidance of displacement in areas undergoing revitalization activities, and involvement of owners who have not previously participated in federally subsidized housing program.¹

The Section 8 Program permits eligible households to choose a dwelling unit which meets their individual needs.

The Section 8 Existing Program, funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, is administered by public housing authorities for use within an individual city or town. There are few agencies who administer the Program on a regional or a state-wide basis. The Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development (EOCD) became the first state to offer Section 8 housing on a state-wide level. In 1979 EOCD administered 1600 units. Other agencies which operate the Section 8 Program beyond municipal boundaries are Baltimore, Maryland; Rochester, New York; Cincinnati, Ohio;

1

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public Housing Agency Administrative Practices Handbook For The Section 8 Existing Housing Program, Pubn. No. 7420.7 (November 1979), p. 2-1.

2

Public housing authority (PHA) and local housing authority (LHA) are used interchangeably.

the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities, Minnesota; and the Leadership Council in Chicago, Illinois.

The use of Section 8 beyond municipal boundaries attains one of the goals of the program by enabling the participants of the program to locate suitable dwelling units in a wide geographical area. The opportunity to choose housing from a wide geographical area creates a mobility option. Such an option allows participants to search for housing in more than one community.

A regulation of the Section 8 Program, Part 882.103, states that public housing authorities (PHAs) are encouraged to promote greater choice of housing opportunities and those PHAs which provide households with the broadest geographical choice of units will be given preference by HUD in funding allocation.

To promote mobility among public housing authorities' clients, HUD has devoted a chapter on the subject in the Public Housing Agency Administrative Practices Handbook for the Section 8 Existing Housing Program. Five mechanisms are identified which would enable participants of the Section 8 Program to seek housing in the largest possible area. They are:

1. Administrative arrangements among public housing authorities
2. Exchange of certificates
3. Centralized application and referral center

4. Elimination of residency requirements and preferences and referral to other public housing authorities
5. State, regional and multi-jurisdictional public housing authorities³

Administrative arrangements among local housing authorities may create opportunities for certificate holders to seek assistance outside the jurisdiction that granted them the certificates. A local housing authority may contract to run the Section 8 Existing Program in a neighboring community where the program is not operating, thus enlarging the geographical area for participants to locate suitable housing.

Some local housing authorities (LHAs) presently use an exchange of certificates. If two or more LHAs agree to an exchange of certificates, families could reside in an area better suited to their needs thus eliminating the usual requirements of applying to the other housing authority. In addition to conserving time for the certificate holder, this exchange becomes a cost effective mechanism for the housing authorities because the client has already been briefed by the original housing authority about the Section 8 Program and less administrative time is necessitated.

If an applicant wishes to have the widest choice in using a Section 8 certificate, the applicant must go to each community he/she may wish to reside in, and apply for a

³Department of Housing and Urban Development, Handbook, pp. 7-4,5.; Certificates are the legal documents which allow Section 8 participants to locate housing. This document is valid for sixty days.

Section 8 certificate. A centralized application and referral center however, would allow an applicant in one visit to choose the community(s) he/she may want to live.

Local housing authorities could agree to eliminate residency requirements by making applicants and other local housing authorities aware of housing opportunities in a geographical area. Applicants obtaining such outreach could be referred to certain housing authorities so their needs could be met.

The establishment of a state, regional or multi-jurisdictional housing authority creates housing opportunities which can ignore the boundaries of local housing authorities. By encompassing a wide geographical area, applicants are given a large region in which to choose housing, usually with a central location where they can apply for such housing.

The State of Massachusetts through the Executive Office of Communities and Development's Section 8 Program provides the participants of their program a choice of mobility not possible to the participants of local housing authorities within the state. The households of the Section 8 Program under the jurisdiction of the local housing authority are not only limited to locating a dwelling unit within the communities' borders, but other factors may enter the mobility choice. Potential or actual participants of local housing authorities' Section 8 Existing Program encounter a low vacancy rate and/or high rental costs in some communities in Massachusetts. The

participants of EOCD's Section 8 Program may reside in any city or town in the Commonwealth providing the dwelling unit meets all the requirements of the program. By enabling clients to choose housing in several communities, factors which may deny housing in one town may be possible in another.

In an effort to address the mobility of low-income households and minority households, Governor Edward J. King of Massachusetts issued a major policy statement on housing concerns in the State in March, 1980. Part of the policy statement was devoted to mobility and choice. Citing the limited housing choices of the poor and the elderly, the Governor encouraged cities and towns to identify barriers to free housing access which may exist in their communities and work to remove them. The Governor recommended that actions be taken to encourage mobility and promote fair housing requirements including the expansion of the Section 8 Program on a regional rather than a local basis.⁴ By such expansion, maximum choice of housing would be available to program participants.

Governor King in this policy statement announced support of a new program of the Executive Office of Communities and Development (EOCD) to increase mobility for low-income and minority participants of the Section 8 Existing Program within the State of Massachusetts. This new program, the "Pilot Mobility Program" is a demonstration project targeted

⁴Commonwealth of Massachusetts, *Housing Massachusetts: Meeting the Needs of the 1980's; The Governor's Housing Program*, (March 1980) p.31.

to encourage mobility of the participants of the Section 8 Program guided by EOCD.

The EOCD Pilot Mobility Program is an attempt to provide housing choice to low-income and minority households, on a state-wide level. By providing avenues for greater mobility the Department is striving to fulfill the goal identified by the Department of Housing and Urban Development: to enable participants of the Section 8 Existing Program to locate suitable housing from a wide geographical area.

In order to provide participants of this Section 8 Existing Program an option of mobility the Department must identify the barriers to mobility and obtain a profile of the characteristics of households likely to move. The Department must be knowledgeable of other types of mobility programs or actions which may foster mobility. The Department must also assess its capability to establish and administer a pilot mobility program.

Agencies participating in the EOCD Pilot Mobility Program are: the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Executive Office of Communities and Development in Massachusetts, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, the local housing authorities in Massachusetts, other organized groups with actual or proposed mobility programs, and finally, perhaps most importantly, the actual and potential participants of the Section 8 Existing Housing Program in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

To institute this pilot program, EOCD's Bureau of Rental

Assistance⁵ has relied upon its past experience of operating the state-wide Section 8 Program and is attempting to coordinate with a small group of local housing authorities. The Bureau is also working with the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, the regional planning council for the greater Boston area, in an effort to analyze the reasons why people may or may not move under the Section 8 Existing Program.

The issue and goal is clear--to provide mobility for low-income and minority households of the Section 8 Program, so that these participants may have the widest geographical area from which to choose their place of residence.

It is the purpose of this study to examine the Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development's Pilot Mobility Program in the greater Boston area. In this examination, the agencies involved in the pilot program must be reviewed, the program described, and characteristics identified of the participants. However, program evaluation of the Pilot Mobility Program is not possible at this time since the program has not yet been funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The program was to be in existence in February 1980. It is currently expected that the program will be in operation by the beginning of the Fiscal Year 1980.

⁵ The Bureau of Rental Assistance administers the state-wide Section 8 Existing Program, the State 707 Program, and the Moderate Rehabilitation Program.

SUMMARY

The Section 8 Existing Housing Program was created in 1974 with the passage of the Housing and Communities Development Act. This program allows public housing authorities to offer rental subsidies to eligible households. Participants of the program locate housing in existing or newly constructed residential structures.

One of the goals of the Section 8 Program is to enable participants to locate suitable dwelling units in a wide geographical area. Yet, there are few public housing agencies which enable clients of the program to actually search for housing beyond a city or town's boundaries.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, in an attempt to foster mobility of Section 8 participants, has identified five mechanisms which local housing authorities may follow to provide mobility. They are: administrative arrangements among PHAs, exchange of certificates, centralized application and referral center, elimination of residency requirements and preferences and referral to other public housing authorities, and state, regional and multi-jurisdictional public housing authorities.

The State of Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development offers the Section 8 Existing Housing Program on a state-wide basis. Here, participants of EOCD's program may reside in any city or town within the Commonwealth.

EOCD has announced a new program, the Section 8 Pilot

Mobility Program, which is a demonstration project targeted to encourage mobility of the participants of local housing authorities' Section 8 Program guided by EOCD. It is the purpose of this study to examine the EOCD Section 8 Pilot Mobility Program by reviewing who is involved in the pilot program and the program itself. Also to be examined is an identification of the characteristics of Section 8 participants who may move, and an analysis of the administration of the program.

CHAPTER II

THE ACTORS AND THE ISSUE

INTRODUCTION

In order to examine the issue of mobility of the Section 8 certificate holders in the greater Boston area, those groups who influence mobility and the role they exercise in the mobility issue shall be identified. Background information on the topic will be provided including the Section 8 Existing Program and a case review of an early mobility program.

The central point of mobility suggested by HUD is to provide housing opportunities in suburban locations or in non-impacted areas¹ for Section 8 certificate holders. Concurrently, the mobility of Section 8 certificates provides an opportunity for freedom to choose a dwelling unit from a wide geographical area, which is currently under local housing authorities administration.

Households will move if they perceive the new housing, neighborhoods and other amenities to be better than their present living environment. The costs to move would have to be negated by the perceived benefits.

¹A non-impacted areas are those areas with a substantially lower proportion income residents than the surrounding area.

The agencies and people involved in the mobility issue within the greater Boston area are: the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, local housing authorities, the Section 8 Administrators Association, and finally the participants of the Section 8 Existing Housing Program.

BACKGROUND

Section 8 Existing Housing Program

Section 8 originally was incorporated as a Public Law within the Housing Act of 1937. The purpose of that Section was to aid "lower-income families in obtaining a decent place to live" and to promote economically mixed housing through the use of assistance payments.² To provide housing assistance, the Act established the vehicle whereby local housing authorities could exist as an autonomous public body within a city or town.

In 1974, the Housing and Communities Development Act revised and consolidated the provisions of the 1937 Act into the Section 8 Existing Program now used in many localities throughout the country.

Under this program, local housing authorities and other agencies receive funding from the Department of Housing and

²U.S. Code, Congressional and Administrative News
"Legal History of Acts, 1974 Housing and Community Development Act of 1974." (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co.) 1974, p. 4277.

Urban Development to subsidize housing units for low-income households in the form of rental assistance. Those households which comply with the local housing authorities' and HUD's eligibility criteria, and are accepted into the program pay no more than 25 percent of their income on housing costs. These rental subsidies require the participants to demonstrate initiative and responsibility by locating a suitable dwelling unit. Eligible participants are given a certificate, valid for sixty days, which enables the participant to locate a dwelling unit within the Fair Market Rent³ designated by the local housing authority and HUD. In the Section 8 Existing Program, the clients must indicate responsibility by locating a dwelling unit without the LHA's assistance, selling themselves as a tenant, selling the Section 8 Program to a prospective landlord, have the unit inspected by a Section 8 Program representative, and follow the rules and regulations of the Section 8 Program. The landlord must agree in the form of a contract to participate in such a housing program. This contract includes a lease for the Section 8 tenant which is valid for one year. Additionally, the unit must meet all local health codes.

By utilizing privately owned existing and newly constructed housing units, Section 8 certificate holders enjoy

³Fair Market Rent (FMR) is that rent which certificate holders must meet when locating a housing unit. The rent is based on the number of bedrooms required by the family and includes a utility allowance for heat and other utility costs.

a wider range of housing opportunities than a tenant entering a housing project. The Section 8 tenant, at a minimum, is able to survey an entire city or town for a suitable dwelling unit, whereas a tenant accepted into a housing project cannot choose the area he/she may wish to reside. Thus, a Section 8 certificate holder has freedom to locate housing provided the requirements of the program are followed.

Local housing authorities are required to notify and recruit prospective clients of Section 8 of such a program, attract prospective landlords to the program, and assist households in the search process.⁴ LHAs also inspect units and secure a satisfactory lease among all parties, and make subsidy payments to participating landlords. The success of the program lies in the abilities and motivations of local agencies to undertake these functions. HUD provides financial incentives for local housing agencies and enters into contractual arrangements with agencies through an Annual Contributions Contract (ACC), as a means of securing local agency participation. An administrative fee is received by an LHA from HUD for the management of a Section 8 certificate. When a certificate is issued by an LHA a preliminary fee of \$275 is obtained. After the preliminary fee is received, an on-going fee of 8.5 percent of the Existing Fair Market Rent of a two-bedroom unit is allocated to the agency. With HUD dealing directly with housing agencies, who in turn enter

⁴The local housing authority may not search for housing for the tenants but may make available information to guide the tenant's housing search.

into a contracts with households and landlords, it is an attempt by HUD to streamline administration and improve its efficiency.⁵

The Gautreaux Case

The Gautreaux Case was one of the earliest attempts to offer regional mobility to Section 8 certificate holders in Chicago. The case evolved from many years in court and became an agreement between the plaintiffs in the case and the Department of Housing and Urban Development

In 1966, Dorothy Gautreaux and other tenants in and applicants for public housing in the City of Chicago brought suit against the Chicago Housing Authority and the Department of Housing and Urban Development charging that these agencies had employed racially discriminatory policies in the administration of the Chicago low rent public housing program. After ten years of court rulings the United States Supreme Court in 1976 ruled in favor of the plaintiffs. As a result of that court case, known as the "Gautreaux Case" the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) and HUD agreed to a demonstration program whereby the Section 8 participants of the CHA would be given an opportunity to reside in the Chicago metropolitan area.

In 1969 the U.S. District Court found that the CHA had violated the rights of public housing tenants since first,

⁵Evaluation of Section 8 Existing Housing Program
(Cambridge, Ma: Urban Systems Research and Engineering)
1978, p.1.

it had adopted a procedure under which the aldermen of the City could preclear proposed public housing sites in their wards and veto them if considered politically hazardous. Second, its tenant assignment procedures, in effect, placed residents in projects on the basis of their race.⁶

In that same year, the District Court divided the City into two wards: the Limited Public Housing Area, where further development of public housing was to be avoided, and the General Public Housing Area, where public housing programs were to be expanded.⁷ The General Public Housing Area was that area which was also predominately white.

The City at that time viewed that court remedy as "ill-conceived and would do more harm than good."⁸ The City felt that a majority of the black citizens of Chicago would prefer to remain in black neighborhoods and that the effect of the court had been to deny desperately needed housing in the black community.⁹

The court, seven years before the case was settled in the U.S. Supreme Court, stated that the city's solution to

⁶Hagman, Donald, Public Planning and Control of Urban Land Development (St, Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co.) 1973, p. 852

⁷U.S. Dept. of HOusing and Urban Development, The Gautreaux Demonstration: An Evaluation of Its Impact on Participating Households (18 October 1979) p. 23.

⁸Hagman, p. 855

⁹Ibid.

its site selection problem lay not within the City of Chicago but beyond its municipal boundaries into the metropolitan region. Yet, no concrete plan of the City approached that suggestion.

By 1971, the Court of Appeals ruled that the Department of Housing and Urban Development had also violated the rights of public housing tenants and applicants.¹⁰ In 1973 the plaintiffs submitted to the District Court a proposal which would order metropolitan-wide relief. The plaintiffs relied upon the Detroit desegregation suit, Milliken V. Bradley. The Court dismissed the proposal because "the equitable factors which prevented metropolitan relief in Milliken v. Bradley are simply not present here."¹¹

The Court of Appeals reversed the lower court decision, and in April 1976, the U. S. Supreme Court upheld that Court of Appeals ruling, finding that metropolitan-wide relief, in principle, is permissive.¹²

In June 1976 HUD and CHA agreed to voluntarily undertake a demonstration program designed to assist Gautreaux Class¹³ families to find housing in suburban or other non-minority impacted areas of the Chicago region. The effort would utilize the Section 8 Existing Housing Program to promote racial and economic dispersion throughout the Chicago area by enabling

¹⁰Gautreaux, p. 855.

¹¹Ibid, pp. 25-26.

¹²Ibid, p. 27.

¹³43,000 families are referred to as the "Gautreaux Class", those families who were effected positively by the court case.

inner-city residents an opportunity to locate in the suburban or non-impacted areas.

The Leadership Council, a non-profit agency in Chicago, was given the opportunity to administer this metropolitan program using Section 8 certificates. Four hundred certificates were made available by HUD for the first year of operation. In the second year, 470 certificates were made available.¹⁴ The Council initially had to establish procedures which would enable people to move throughout the Chicago area. 43,000 families were identified by the Leadership Council as the Gautreaux Class.

A relatively low vacancy rate in non-impacted areas and the scarcity of large bedroom units (more than two bedrooms), forced the Leadership Council to limit the program to those families who required two-bedroom units or less, thus the eligible population was cut in half. Notices were sent to eligible families; eventually 168 were placed during the first year.¹⁵ The total number of Section 8 families who have moved to suburban locations or to non-impacted areas since the program began is 455 families.¹⁶

The Gautreaux demonstration has necessitated special services for clients which are not usually administered under

¹⁴Gautreaux, p. i.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid, p. 3.

the Section 8 Program. More effort was required to locate housing owners willing to participate in the program, and counseling was provided to families about their ability to move. To complete such services, the administrative fee received by the Council from HUD to operate the program exceeds \$1,000 for each family.¹⁷

A primary goal of the Gautreaux demonstration was to encourage the Gautreaux Class families of the Section 8 Existing Housing Program to move into the suburban areas of Chicago or into areas of low concentration of minorities within the City. "in 90 percent of the cases, this goal was achieved."¹⁸ Participants moved into neighborhoods designated by the U.S. District Court in 1969 as General Public Housing Areas.

Other Mobility Programs

The Leadership Council in Chicago is the only non-profit agency administering the Section 8 certificates on a regional basis. It is also the only agency operating a mobility program as a result of a court case.

There are three municipalities in which local housing authorities administer the Section 8 Existing Program beyond

¹⁷The Section 8 cost per family is based on a one time start-up fee of \$275 and an on-going subsidy of 8 and ½ percent of the Fair Market Rent for a two-bedroom unit.

¹⁸Gautreaux, p. 89.

their city limits. They are: Baltimore, Maryland; Rochester, New York; and Cincinnati, Ohio. In Baltimore, 147 families now reside outside the central city in Baltimore County; in Rochester 213 certificate holders have moved to five counties; and in Cincinnati, a total of fifty families have chosen to move to the county.¹⁹

In Minnesota, the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities has the cooperation of over fifty suburban housing authorities who operate without regard to municipal boundaries. Approximately 550 families have relocated from the central city to the suburban region.²⁰

THE ACTORS

The Department of Housing and Urban Development

In January 1979 Secretary of Housing, Patricia Harris acted upon the recommendations of the Assisted Mobility Task Force. The following changes were made in the Section 8 Existing Housing Program:

1. As a condition of participation in the Section 8 Program, each public housing authority operating within a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) must establish a program that provides for metropolitan-wide applicability of the Section 8 Existing Certificates.

¹⁹Robert Embrey, Jr. Memorandum on Recommended Demonstration Program to Promote Deconcentration, 27 August 1979, Housing and Urban Development, p. 4.

²⁰The Housing Advocates, Inc., Regional Housing Mobility Programs, A Guidebook for the Promotion of Housing Opportunities (Cleveland, Ohio, 1979) p. ii.

2. As a condition of participation in the Section 8 Existing Program, each PHA operating within an SMSA must combine with other PHAs within the metropolitan area to develop a metropolitan-wide information resources exchange that will operate as an information clearinghouse to participating households of housing opportunities throughout the metropolitan area.
3. The designation of \$2 million in Fiscal Year 1979 and an amount greater than \$2 million in Fiscal Year 1980 from the Secretary's Discretionary Fund specifically designated to provide grants for the development of effective metropolitan-wide information clearinghouses in several metropolitan areas and to encourage innovative approaches towards providing outreach and personalized assistance to Section 8 Existing participants who wish to move to non-impacted areas. 21

Robert Embry, Jr., Undersecretary of HUD's Division of Community Planning and Development in a memorandum in August of 1979 further promoted the use of Section 8 Existing Program funds to promote deconcentration of participants of the program. Both Secretary Harris and Mr. Embry were stressing mechanisms which follow the regulations of Section 8 including "that public housing authorities are encouraged to promote greater choice of housing opportunities."²²

The most recent handbook governing the Section 8 Existing

²¹ Andrew Wiseman, Executive Assistant to the Secretary, Memorandum on New Policy to Encourage Greater Mobility in the Assisted Housing Program, 17 January 1979, Housing and Urban Development, pp. 1-2.

²² HUD regulations 24 C.F.R. Section 882.103

Program, issued in November 1979, devoted a chapter on mobility not present in previous handbooks. Although vague, the chapter clearly suggest that PHAs must consider the mobility of Section 8 certificate holders in a metropolitan context. No penalties are cited for refusal to participate in a metropolitan effort, but additional units may be allocated to PHAs participating in mobility efforts.

The Executive Office of Communities and Development

The Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development (EOCD) is a state-wide housing agency responsible for providing decent, safe and sanitary housing at an affordable cost to low-income individuals and families. As an eligible public housing agency, the Department is able to administer the Section 8 Existing Housing Assistance Payments Program (HAP Program) on a state-wide basis. The Department has structured their HAP Program to ensure that each participant has absolute freedom to select a suitable Section 8 unit in any city or town within the state.

Currently, EOCD administers over 1600 subsidized units throughout the state. A unique feature of the administration of these units is a division of geographical jurisdiction. In the greater Boston area, which forms the boundaries for the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, the State Section 8 Program is administered by EOCD. Outside this region, the state subcontracts to seven non-profit agencies to administer the program in different regions. (See Appendix 1)

EOCD's Section 8 Existing Housing Program is unique compared to those housing authorities who administer their own programs. Local housing authorities administer their programs within their city or town borders, with rare interjurisdictional actions. Each LHA conducts its own briefings²³ for certificate holders, develops its own utility allowance, and inspects units within the city or town.

The Section 8 Existing Program of EOCD is administered on a state-wide basis, including the use of EOCD certificates in communities where a local housing authority administers a Section 8 Program. The major difference between the EOCD and local housing authorities' Section 8 Program is that a certificate holder from EOCD may choose anywhere in the Commonwealth in which to reside, whereas, a participant in a local housing authority's Section 8 Program must reside within that community.

The dichotomy which exists between the two ways of operating the Section 8 Program in Massachusetts, is cited in the following example. Mrs. Smith currently resides in the City of Boston as a tenant receiving no rental subsidies. She is a potential candidate for Section 8 rental assistance because of income earned and the size of her family. Mrs. Smith has no locational preference in which to reside. She simply would like to find suitable housing in a neighborhood she feels would meet her desires. If Mrs. Smith wants to consider

²³Briefings are meetings whereby those applicants who are initially accepted into the program are briefed on the Section 8 Program, their income verified and a certificate issued.

moving to the Cities of Quincy, Cambridge or the Towns of Watertown or Newton; she must file an application for a Section 8 certificate in each of these towns. There is no limit to the number of cities or towns Mrs. Smith may register, but once she has obtained a certificate from one town, she must find housing within that locality which issued the certificate.

Alternatively, Mrs. Smith may apply for a Section 8 certificate administered by the Executive Office of Communities and Development. If accepted into this program, Mrs. Smith can search for living quarters in all of the above cities and towns, and choose one community which qualifies for her needs in housing.²⁴

Repeated efforts for subsidization is not an easy task for potential participants. The EOCD Section 8 Program provides a 'one-stop' application center and a wide community choice of living for an applicant.

Although EOCD's Section 8 Existing Program provides the most mobility at the present time to potential and actual participants of the program, the Department administers only 1600 units of housing. EOCD has initiated a new program, "The Pilot Mobility Program" as a way to involve some local housing authorities to offer regional mobility to Section 8

²⁴Mrs. Smith may apply not only to various local housing authorities for a Section 8 certificate, but also to the EOCD program. She may opt for the program or community which first becomes available or the town in which she most likely will move.

certificate holders as well as to acquire additional units for the program. This pilot will enable the clients of selected LHAs an option of mobility on a state-wide basis. The Pilot Mobility Program will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

The Metropolitan Area Planning Council

The Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) is the regional planning council for the greater Boston area. The MAPC region is comprised of 101 communities surrounding the City of Boston. Of these communities ninety-two have local housing authorities and forty-five have the Section 8 Existing Housing Program.²⁵

MAPC has obtained a \$100,000 grant from HUD to research the mobility issue in the greater Boston region. The grant does not provide any tenants with Section 8 certificates for the greater Boston area. MAPC's intent is to identify prospective movers and non-movers within the Section 8 Program and perhaps provide them with referrals, counseling, and general information.

At the present time, the regional planning council is attempting to identify the characteristics of certificate holders who may wish to relocate out of their present neighborhood. MAPC is, with the cooperation of EOCD identifying

²⁵The Metropolitan Area Planning Council, Regional Housing Mobility Program (September 1979) pp. 1-2.

these characteristics through the use of a questionnaire to be administered to EOCD Section 8 clients. An analysis of this questionnaire will be presented in a later chapter.

Local Housing Authorities

As stated in a previously noted HUD memorandum and in the Handbook guiding the Section 8 Existing Program LHAs must consider mobility by participating in a regional type of effort enabling certificate holders to choose a dwelling unit from a large geographical area.

A selected group of LHAs will be participating in EOCD's Pilot Mobility Program. Another group of housing authorities will join together under the auspices of a new program to offer mobility. There is limited exchange of certificates between authorities, and if it is done it is apt to be conducted informally.

Section 8 Administrators Association

The Section 8 Administrators Association is an organized group of housing authorities in Massachusetts who administer the Section 8 Existing Program on a local basis. Reacting to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's current focal point the provision of a broader housing opportunity for potential and actual participants of the Section 8 Program, the Association had submitted a draft proposal for a pilot mobility program to HUD.

With the initial support of thirty-two communities (see Appendix 2), the plan provides that mobility certificates

issued to participating communities could be used in any other community participating in the program. The housing authority for the community in which an applicant locates an apartment will administer that Section 8 certificate as long as it remains within that community. The plan cites that, "The housing authority which administers any units under this mobility program will invoice the housing authority which originally issues the certificate for all costs in connection with the administration of said unit, or in the alternative, an annual adjustment will be made to the Annual Contributions Contract."²⁶

The Participants of the Section 8 Existing Program

Actual and potential certificate holders of the Section 8 Program do not have a formal plan of mobility in the greater Boston area. The only mobility program conceived by tenants has been the Gautreaux demonstration.

The proposed programs by the Executive Office of Communities and Development, the Section 8 Administrators Association and to a limited extent, the informal use of exchange of certificates, do not involve participation of tenants in the development of the programs.

It is one of the purposes of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to enable the clients of the Section 8 Program to have the option, if they wish, to move to another

²⁶Camille Holmes, President, Section 8 Administrators Association to Marvin Siflinger, Area Manager, HUD, 21 December 1979.

area, particularly if it is to a suburban community or a non-impacted area. By providing the vehicles to choose housing from a wide geographical region, the individual household chooses where he/she prefers to reside.

CHAPTER III
MASSACHUSETTS EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF COMMUNITIES
AND DEVELOPMENT'S SECTION 8
PILOT MOBILITY PROGRAM

The Department of Housing and Urban Development encourages local housing authorities

to promote and facilitate the area-wide mobility afforded families receiving Section 8 housing assistance. Despite such opportunities, however, only about one-half of all certificate holders nationwide use their certificates to obtain a different unit from the pre-Section 8 residence and only about one-third obtain a different unit in a different neighborhood.¹

The Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development administers the Section 8 Existing Program on a state-wide basis. The Department directly administers the program in the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, the greater Boston area, and subcontracts to seven non-profit agencies throughout the remainder of the state. In the greater Boston area EOCD administers 20 percent of the Section 8 certificates.

Participants of the EOCD Section 8 Program, especially minorities, have the opportunity for maximum mobility. Tables 1 and 2 portray those Section 8 certificate holders who have moved from one town, moved to one town or remained

¹Gautreaux, p. 32.

TABLE 1
 EOCD SECTION 8 MINORITY MOBILITY
 STATEWIDE

DECEMBER, 1979

| TOWN | FROM TOWN | |] TO TOWN | | STAY TOWN | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|----|------|-----|-------|
| | MINORITY | WHITE | MINORITY | WHITE | MINORITY | WHITE | | | | |
| ABINGTON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| ACTON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| AMESBURY | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.2% |
| ANDOVER | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| ASHBURNHAM | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| ASHLAND | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% |
| AVON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BARNSTABLE | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BELLINGHAM | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BELMONT | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 0.4% |
| BERLIN | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BERNARDSTON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BEVERLY | 1 | 0.1% | 7 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BILLERICA | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.2% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BOSTON | 19 | 1.2% | 39 | 2.5% | 14 | 0.9% | 17 | 1.1% | 417 | 26.2% |
| BOXBOROUGH | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BOXFORD | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BRAINTREE | 1 | 0.1% | 3 | 0.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 0.3% | 3 | 0.2% |
| BREWSTER | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BRIDGEWATER | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BROCKTON | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 0.3% | 4 | 0.3% | 3 | 0.2% | 9 | 0.6% |
| BROOKLINE | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% |
| BUCKLAND | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| CAMBRIDGE | 4 | 0.3% | 2 | 0.1% | 8 | 0.5% | 5 | 0.3% | 4 | 0.3% |
| CANTON | 1 | 0.1% | 4 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| CARVER | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| CHELMSFORD | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| CHELSEA | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 3 | 0.2% | 7 | 0.4% | 8 | 0.5% |
| DALTON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| DANVERS | 0 | 0.0% | 13 | 0.8% | 1 | 0.1% | 8 | 0.5% | 1 | 0.1% |
| DEDHAM | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| DENNIS | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |

TABLE 1 (Cont'd)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|------|---|------|---|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| E. LONGMEADOW | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| ESSEX | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% |
| EVERETT | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% |
| FALMOUTH | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| FOXBOROUGH | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 0.4% |
| FRAMINGHAM | 1 | 0.1% | 7 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 0.3% | 15 | 0.9% | 41 | 2.6% |
| FRANKLIN | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| GARDNER | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| GILL | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| GROVELAND | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| HAMILTON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| HARDWICK | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| HINGHAM | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% |
| HOLBROOK | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| HOLLISTON | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| HUDSON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| HULL | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% |
| KINGSTON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| LAWRENCE | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 0.4% |
| LUNENBURG | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| LYNN | 2 | 0.1% | 3 | 0.2% | 1 | 0.1% | 10 | 0.6% | 21 | 1.3% | 78 | 4.9% |
| MALDEN | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 12 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 11 | 0.7% |
| MANSFIELD | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| MARBLEHEAD | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MARION | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MARLBOROUGH | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 2 | 0.1% | 23 | 1.4% |
| MARSHFIELD | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MATTAPOISETT | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MAYNARD | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MEDFORD | 4 | 0.3% | 2 | 0.1% | 2 | 0.1% | 4 | 0.3% | 3 | 0.2% | 8 | 0.5% |
| MEDWAY | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MELROSE | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% |
| MENSON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MIDDLEBOROUGH | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| MIDDLEFIELD | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MIDDLETON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| MILFORD | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| MILLIS | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| MILTON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| N. ANDOVER | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% |

Table 1 (Cont'd)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|------|---|------|---|------|----|------|---|------|----|------|
| N. READING | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| NAHANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| NATICK | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.2% |
| NEEDHAM | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| NEW MARLBOROUGH | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| NEWTON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| NORFOLK | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| NORTON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| NORWELL | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| NORWOOD | 2 | 0.1% | 7 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 6 | 0.4% | 1 | 0.1% | 33 | 2.1% |
| PEABODY | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 0.4% |
| PEPPERELL | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| PLAINVILLE | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| PLYMOUTH | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| PLYMPTON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| QUINCY | 1 | 0.1% | 7 | 0.4% | 1 | 0.1% | 10 | 0.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 20 | 1.3% |
| RANDOLPH | 2 | 0.1% | 6 | 0.4% | 3 | 0.2% | 7 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 26 | 1.6% |
| READING | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 0.4% |
| REVERE | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 44 | 2.8% |
| ROCKLAND | 1 | 0.1% | 4 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| ROWLEY | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| SALEM | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | 5 | 0.3% | 1 | 0.1% | 7 | 0.4% |
| SAUGUS | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% |
| SHARON | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.2% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% |
| SOMERVILLE | 1 | 0.1% | 5 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 0.3% | 1 | 0.1% | 15 | 0.9% |
| SOUTH HADLEY | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| SPRINGFIELD | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| STONEHAM | 0 | 0.0% | 9 | 0.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | 23 | 1.4% |
| STOUGHTON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 3 | 0.2% | 6 | 0.4% | 1 | 0.1% | 11 | 0.7% |
| SUDBURY | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| SWAMPSCOTT | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.2% |
| TAUNTON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| TEWKSBURY | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| WAKEFIELD | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% |
| WALPOLE | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 0.3% | 1 | 0.1% | 4 | 0.3% | 1 | 0.1% | 7 | 0.4% |
| WALTHAM | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| WASHINGTON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| WATERTOWN | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| WELLESLEY | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| WESTFORD | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |

TABLE 1 (Cont'd)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----|------|-----|-------|---|----|------|-----|-------|---|-----|-------|-----|-------|---|
| WESTWOOD | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |] |
| WEYMOUTH | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 0.3% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 0.4% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 12 | 0.8% |] |
| WHITMAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.1% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |] |
| WINCHESTER | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |] |
| WINTHROP | 0 | 0.0% | 9 | 0.6% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |] | 1 | 0.1% | 53 | 3.3% |] |
| WOEBURN | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |] |
| WORCESTER | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |] |
| WRENTHAM | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |] | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |] |
| TOTALS | 48 | 2.6% | 228 | 17.4% |] | 48 | 3.5% | 228 | 14.8% |] | 494 | 36.3% | 821 | 49.1% |] |

TOTAL RECORDS 1591

SOURCE: Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities
and Development

TABLE 2

EOCD SECTION 8 MINORITY MOBILITY
BOSTON

DECEMBER, 1979

| TOWN | FROM BOSTON TO NON-BOSTON | | FROM NON-BOSTON TO BOSTON | | FROM BOSTON TO BOSTON | |
|-------------|---------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|
| | MINORITY | WHITE | MINORITY | WHITE | MINORITY | WHITE |
| ABINGTON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| ASHLAND | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BARNSTABLE | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| BERLIN | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BOSTON | | | | | 417 | 58.8% |
| BOXBOROUGH | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BRAINTREE | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BRIDGEWATER | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| BROCKTON | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | 2 | 0.3% |
| BROOKLINE | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% |
| CAMBRIDGE | 7 | 1.0% | 3 | 0.4% | 4 | 0.6% |
| CARVER | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| CHELSEA | 2 | 0.3% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| DANVERS | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| DEDHAM | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| DENNIS | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| FRAMINGHAM | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| FRANKLIN | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| GARDNER | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| LYNN | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MALDEN | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MANSFIELD | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MARTON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| MARLBOROUGH | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MAYNARD | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MEDFORD | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MELROSE | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MILTON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| NEEDHAM | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% |
| NEWTON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| NORWOOD | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.3% | 1 | 0.1% |
| PLYMPTON | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| QUINCY | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 0.4% | 1 | 0.1% |

TABLE 2 (Cont'd)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|-----|-------|--|
| RANDOLPH | 2 | 0.3% | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | 2 | 0.3% | | | |
| REVERE | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| ROCKLAND | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| SALEM | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| SOMERVILLE | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | | | |
| SOUTH HADLEY | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| STOUGHTON | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| TAUNTON | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | | | |
| WAKEFIELD | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| WALPOLE | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | | | |
| WATERTOWN | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | | | |
| WESTWOOD | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | | | |
| WINTHROP | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.1% | | | |
| TOTAL | 19 | 2.7% | 39 | 5.5% | 14 | 2.0% | 17 | 2.4% | 417 | 58.8% | |
| TOTAL SAMPLE | | 709 | | | | | | | | | |

TOTAL RECORDS 1591

SOURCE: Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities
and Development

in the same town. Of those certificate holders participating in the EOCD Section 8 Program, most have selected to remain in the same community they resided in prior to obtaining a Section 8 certificate. Over 80 percent of EOCD participants remain within the same town and 20 percent move from their town.

As a public housing agency with state-wide authority, the Executive Office of Communities and Development has developed a pilot mobility program whereby local housing authorities in the state have had an option to join with EOCD to provide their participants of Section 8 with an option of mobility. At this time there are six communities in the greater Boston area who will be participating in the pilot program. They are: Cambridge, Watertown, Littleton, Stoughton, Marlbor and Norwood. The Boston Area Office of Housing and Urban Development expects that 1100 to 1400 certificates will be made available for this pilot program.

The objective of this pilot mobility program is to provide certificate holders the opportunity to select suitable housing in any city or town within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.² By issuing an EOCD certificate to those participants selected by the LHAs, those clients will not only have the ability to reside anywhere within the community which

²Draft, Executive Office of Communities and Development: Pilot Mibility Program Administrative Plan (14 December 1979) p. 2.

selects the participants but can also choose to reside anywhere within the state.

The operation of the program will be as follows:

1. EOCD will enter into an Annual Contributions Contract, ACC, (see page 14) with participating local housing authorities in order to comply with HUD regulations
2. Local housing authorities will continue to provide outreach to the communities where they have jurisdiction, secure applicants to the Section 8 Program. All public notices of the Section 8 Program will state that selected applicants will be able to use their certificate in any city or town within the Commonwealth.
3. EOCD will brief all applicants of the Section 8 Program who will be participating in the EOCD pilot program. Along with LHAs assistance, EOCD will verify clients' income. Special moving sessions will be offered to participants who feel they would like and/or need additional assistance in locating suitable housing.³
4. EOCD will lease-up a unit for the participants including the inspection of units.

³Draft, p. 7.

5. When a tenant locates a housing unit within a community participating in the pilot program, that community will undertake administration of that unit. Otherwise, EOCD will administer the unit.
6. EOCD will be responsible to notify all tenants of a renewal of lease and review of income. Tenants who wish to relocate will be asked to attend a special moving session and will be issued a new certificate,⁴ then procedures four and five will be repeated. If the tenant remains in a participating community, then the LHA shall notify EOCD.

EOCD has ~~not~~ begun this program because allocation of funds has not been distributed. The Department expects that by May or June of 1980 the program will begin.

Since the program is not operating, all segments of the pilot have not been finalized. There is no Annual Contributions Contract, no date for briefings, and no administrative fee signed between EOCD and participating communities.

Local housing authorities and EOCD will divide administration responsibilities of the program. The administrative fee received by any PHA for the management of a Section 8 certificate is \$275 as a preliminary fee and an on-going fee of 8.5 percent of the Existing Fair Market Rent of a two-bedroom unit. EOCD has proposed an administrative fee split with

⁴Draft, p. 9.

participating LHAs in the pilot program of the Department receiving \$200 of the preliminary fee and 3 percent of the on-going 8.5 percent of the FMR of a two-bedroom unit.

A second pilot mobility plan has been proposed by the Section 8 Administrators Association. With the initial support of thirty-two communities (See Appendix 2), the plan is composed of an exchange of certificates among participating LHAs. The exchange of certificates will allow for local autonomy. The use of a clearinghouse agency has been considered. This agency would be aware of the number of mobility certificates from the participating communities and would streamline administrative services. As in the case of EOCD's pilot mobility program, the Section 8 Administrators Association's mobility program has not been funded.

The administrative fee of the Association is different than EOCD. The Association has split the fee between the issuing authority and the host authority. The issuing authority is that LHA which issues a certificate to a Section 8 applicant. The issuing authority provides outreach to Section 8 applicants and conducts briefings. The issuing authority will receive the \$275 preliminary fee and 1.5 percent of the 8.5 percent from the on-going FMR for a two-bedroom unit. The host authority will inspect the unit and prepare the lease for the tenant and landlord. The host authority will receive 7 percent on-going administrative fee.

The mobility offered to participants under the Section 8 Administrators Association's plan is limited. Those clients

wishing to relocate may only do so in those communities where the local housing authority is participating in their mobility program.

The two programs of mobility in the greater Boston area are pilot demonstrations. Once evaluated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development after Fiscal Year 1980, these pilot programs may or may not be continued.

SUMMARY

The Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development has developed a pilot mobility program whereby six local housing authorities in Massachusetts have joined with EOCD to provide the participants of LHAs Section 8 Program with an option of mobility. The objective of this pilot mobility program is to provide certificate holders the opportunity to select suitable housing in any city or town within the Commonwealth. EOCD will be responsible for the major part of administration of the pilot program.

Another pilot mobility program is proposed in Massachusetts by the Section 8 Administrators Association. Their program would use an exchange of certificates among thirty-two participating communities. Since only the mobility certificates could be used in participating communities, the certificate holder is limited in mobility options.

CHAPTER IV
ATTITUDES TOWARDS MOBILITY

The characteristics of Section 8 certificate holders who have the potential to move from their present neighborhoods are unknown. In an effort to study those characteristics, the author worked with the Metropolitan Area Planning Council to develop a questionnaire which was to be administered to new EOCD Section 8 certificate holders.

Assumptions as to why people move were made in order to construct a questionnaire on mobility. Although people move for a variety of reasons, a set pattern develops among all types of movers when searching for new living quarters. Kevin McCarthy in a study, Housing Search and Mobility, identifies a paradigm of search behavior which potential movers follow when searching for a new residence. According to McCarthy, movers of all incomes and ethnic groups tend to pursue the same pattern no matter where they seek housing. That pattern consists of what point in time households will conduct an active housing search, what procedures they will use, and how those procedures may influence the kinds of moves they make. A common element in all types of households in their search for new dwelling units is that households "weigh the perceived benefits of moving against the perceived

costs and move only when it seems advantageous to do so."¹

The strategy searchers pursue is influenced by three factors: 1) satisfaction with current housing, 2) the characteristics of the household, and 3) the familiarity with the housing market.²

The study conducted by McCarthy searches for differences in housing search behavior among varying income groups.

Most renters, regardless of income, appear to favor a low-cost search strategy when they are looking for housing. They spend an average of only two weeks searching, examine three or four alternatives, and rely mostly on friends and newspapers.³

The study does conclude that low-income households and minorities are more likely to encounter discrimination during their housing search.

A questionnaire was designed to obtain information about people's propensity to move, what they specifically considered when seeking a new dwelling (i.e. schools, nearby shopping, low crime areas) whether they would need public transportation, their willingness to move, and reasons for not considering moving away from their present residence or neighborhood.

After several revisions, the questionnaire received approval from EOCB's Bureau of Rental Assistance for administration of the survey to new Section 8 certificate holders

¹McCarthy, Kevin, Housing Search and Mobility (The Rand Corporation) September 1979, p. 4.

²Ibid, p. 6.

³Ibid.

during their briefing sessions in March 1980. (See Exhibit I)

The survey was administered to 123 clients who attended the briefings. The briefings were held at four locations: Boston, Revere, Framingham and Stoneham. There was no attempt to obtain a random sample of the population group. At the close of the briefing session, the survey was administered on an informal basis while the clients were having their income verified by the Section 8 Program representative who had conducted the briefing session.

Although response to the survey was optional, most participants who attended the briefings answered the questions. Of those responding, 71 percent checked might like and would like very much to move to a different city or town. The results of the survey are shown in Exhibits II and III.

The survey has been successful in initially identifying potential movers to suburban locations and non-impacted areas. Presently, EOCD is releasing demographic information necessary to continue analysis through cross-tabulations and multivariate regression analysis. Demographic data to be released in aggregate form are ethnicity and race, income, age, sex, size of family, and the number of bedrooms needed by the certificate holders. Since this study has not been completed, its findings cannot be incorporated into this analysis. The demographic information will not be released until mid-May.

There are four questions suggested by MAPC which would utilize cross-tabulation of demographic information and the

**EXHIBIT II
TOTALS**

To the Section 8 Recipient: The following QUESTIONNAIRE is designed to help the Executive Office of Communities and Development assist you in using your Section 8 certificate. Your answers will help us!

1. DO YOU HAVE A CAR? 49 Yes 71 No 3 NA 2. DO YOU HAVE A TELEPHONE? 4 NA 106 Yes 13 No
3. HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN YOUR PRESENT APARTMENT OR HOUSE? Years Months
- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <u>14</u> 6 months or less | <u>35</u> 2-5 years |
| <u>8</u> 7-12 months | <u>31</u> 5-10 years |
| <u>21</u> 1-2 years | <u>14</u> 10 years or more |

There are many reasons why people decide to move. Please read each of the reasons below and put an "X" under the category that describes how important this reason was in moving to YOUR PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD.

| | <u>Not Important</u> | <u>Somewhat Important</u> | <u>Very Important</u> | <u>Don't Know</u> | <u>NA</u> |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| 4. SIZE OF APARTMENT | <u>13</u> | <u>25</u> | <u>79</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>5</u> |
| 5. CONDITION OF APARTMENT | <u>14</u> | <u>20</u> | <u>82</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>5</u> |
| 6. GOOD SCHOOLS | <u>29</u> | <u>12</u> | <u>68</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>9</u> |
| 7. LESS CRIME | <u>22</u> | <u>15</u> | <u>77</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>6</u> |
| 8. CLOSE TO SHOPPING | <u>23</u> | <u>35</u> | <u>59</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>5</u> |
| 9. CLOSE TO JOB | <u>52</u> | <u>24</u> | <u>26</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>16</u> |
| 10. FRIENDS AND RELATIVES NEARBY | <u>47</u> | <u>34</u> | <u>35</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>6</u> |
| 11. NEARBY PARKS AND RECREATION | <u>41</u> | <u>45</u> | <u>29</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>6</u> |
| 12. a. PEOPLE OF DIFFERENT RACES LIVING IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD | <u>55</u> | <u>32</u> | <u>23</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>6</u> |
| 12. b. Cost of Apartment | <u>8</u> | <u>11</u> | <u>65</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>38</u> |

Now that you have your Section 8 certificate, you will be making a number of decisions about staying in your present apartment or moving elsewhere. Below are listed a number of different locations of where you could live with your certificate. Please read each location and indicate HOW MUCH YOU THINK YOU WOULD LIKE IT.

| | <u>WOULD NOT LIKE</u> | <u>MIGHT LIKE</u> | <u>WOULD LIKE VERY MUCH</u> | <u>NA</u> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| 13. STAY IN PRESENT APARTMENT | <u>61</u> | <u>20</u> | <u>40</u> | <u>2</u> |
| 14. STAY IN PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD | <u>35</u> | <u>30</u> | <u>54</u> | <u>4</u> |
| 15. MOVE TO DIFFERENT NEIGHBORHOOD | <u>34</u> | <u>34</u> | <u>46</u> | <u>9</u> |
| 16. MOVE TO DIFFERENT CITY OR TOWN | <u>47</u> | <u>35</u> | <u>36</u> | <u>5</u> |

If you have indicated that you WOULD NOT LIKE TO MOVE TO A DIFFERENT NEIGHBORHOOD OR CITY OR TOWN, please put a check next to the reasons below that you have considered in making this decision.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 17. <u>57</u> I like my present neighborhood. | 21. <u>25</u> Too far from friends and relative |
| 18. <u>26</u> Unfamiliar with other neighborhoods and cities or towns. | 22. <u>25</u> Children would have to change schools. |
| 19. <u>12</u> Too difficult to get to work. | 23. <u>5</u> People living in other areas would have different interests. |
| 20. <u>18</u> Too difficult to get to shopping and stores | 24. <u>7</u> I might be discriminated against. |
| | 25. <u>9</u> Other |

END OF SURVEY

Thank you for your help.

EXHIBIT III
PERCENTAGES

To the Section 8 Recipient: The following QUESTIONNAIRE is designed to help the Executive Office of Communities and Development assist you in using your Section 8 certificate. Your answers will help us!

1. DO YOU HAVE A CAR? 39.84% Yes 2.44% NA 57.72% No
2. DO YOU HAVE A TELEPHONE? 86.18% Yes 3.25% NA 10.57% No
3. HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN YOUR PRESENT APARTMENT OR HOUSE? Years Months
- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u>11.38%</u> 6 months or less | <u>24.46%</u> 2-5 years |
| <u>6.50</u> 7-12 months | <u>25.20</u> 5-10 years |
| <u>17.07</u> 1-2 years | <u>11.38</u> 10 years or more |

There are many reasons why people decide to move. Please read each of the reasons below and put an "X" under the category that describes how important this reason was in moving to YOUR PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD.

| | Not Important | Somewhat Important | Very Important | Don't Know | NA |
|---|---------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|-------|
| 4. SIZE OF APARTMENT | 10.57% | 20.32% | 64.23% | .83% | 4.06% |
| 5. CONDITION OF APARTMENT | 11.38 | 16.26 | 66.66 | 1.63 | 4.06 |
| 6. GOOD SCHOOLS | 25.20 | 9.76 | 55.28 | 4.06 | 7.32 |
| 7. LESS CRIME | 17.89 | 12.20 | 62.60 | 2.44 | 4.88 |
| 8. CLOSE TO SHOPPING | 18.70 | 28.46 | 47.97 | .81 | 4.06 |
| 9. CLOSE TO JOB | 42.28 | 19.51 | 11.14 | 4.06 | 13.01 |
| 10. FRIENDS AND RELATIVES NEARBY | 38.21 | 27.64 | 28.46 | .82 | 4.88 |
| 11. NEARBY PARKS AND RECREATION | 33.33 | 36.58 | 23.58 | 1.62 | 4.88 |
| 12. a. PEOPLE OF DIFFERENT RACES LIVING IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD | 44.72 | 26.01 | 18.70 | 5.69 | 4.88 |
| 12. b. Cost of Apartment | 6.50 | 8.94 | 52.84 | .81 | 30.89 |

Now that you have your Section 8 certificate, you will be making a number of decisions about staying in your present apartment or moving elsewhere. Below are listed a number of different locations of where you could live with your certificate. Please read each location and indicate HOW MUCH YOU THINK YOU WOULD LIKE IT.

| | WOULD NOT LIKE | MIGHT LIKE | WOULD LIKE VERY MUCH | NA |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------|----------------------|-------|
| 13. STAY IN PRESENT APARTMENT | 49.59% | 16.26% | 32.52% | 1.63% |
| 14. STAY IN PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD | 28.46 | 24.39 | 43.90 | 3.25 |
| 15. MOVE TO DIFFERENT NEIGHBORHOOD | 27.64 | 27.64 | 37.40 | 7.32 |
| 16. MOVE TO DIFFERENT CITY OR TOWN | 38.21 | 28.46 | 29.27 | 4.06 |

If you have indicated that you WOULD NOT LIKE TO MOVE TO A DIFFERENT NEIGHBORHOOD OR CITY OR TOWN, please put a check next to the reasons below that you have considered in making this decision.

17. 46.34% I like my present neighborhood.
18. 21.39 Unfamiliar with other neighborhoods and cities or towns.
19. 9.76 Too difficult to get to work.
20. 14.63 Too difficult to get to shopping and stores
21. 20.32% Too far from friends and relative
22. 20.32 Children would have to change schools.
23. 4.06 People living in other areas would have different interests.
24. 4.88 I might be discriminated against.
25. 7.32 Other

END OF SURVEY

Thank you for your help.

data collected from the questionnaires. To understand the attitudes of new EOCB Section 8 certificate holders towards mobility the questions will be described below as well as the results to be obtained from the questions, and the cross-tabulations which will be done in the analysis.

Question 1: What proportion of Existing Section 8 certificate holders would like to move away from their present neighborhood? The results would determine the potential pool of users of mobility programs. These results will be derived from the survey questionnaire by analyzing numbers 13 through 16, identifying the movers and nonmovers of the 123 respondents. The separation of these two groups will permit further analysis to continue.

Question 2: Does the housing mobility preference vary for different demographic groups of the Existing Section 8 certificate holders? The analysis of this question would provide a predictive model for future potential users of housing mobility services. The analysis can be exemplified by Table 3.

Question 3: What are the reasons that nonmovers state for their preference to remain in their present neighborhood? By examining questions 17 through 25 on the questionnaire, a determination of the certificate holders'

TABLE 3
 Cross Tabulation and Multivariate Analysis

| | Current Residence | Race | Family Composition | | | Possession of Car | Income | Tenure |
|------------|----------------------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| | | | Age of Head | Sex of Head | # of Minors | | | |
| | 1 = Core City ^a | 1 = White | ≤ 62 | M | 0 | 1 = Yes | 1 = Lower | 1 = ≤ 2 Years |
| | 2 = Suburba | 2 = Non-White | ≥ 62 | F | 1 or More | 2 = No | 2 = Very Low | 2 = ≥ 2 Years |
| Movers | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Movers | | | | | | | | |

^aDefinitions will be established after demographic data becomes available, in order to identify the most appropriate combination of communities.

TABLE 3 (Cont'd)

Housing Choice Preference (xCurrent Residential Location)
 xAge, Possession of Car, Number of Minors and Income

| | <u>Age of Head</u> | | | <u>Possession of Car</u> | | |
|------------|-------------------------|-----------|--------|--------------------------|----------|--------|
| | 62 | 62 | Totals | Yes | No | Totals |
| Movers | | | | | | |
| City | | | | | | |
| Suburb | | | | | | |
| Non-Movers | | | | | | |
| City | | | | | | |
| Suburb | | | | | | |
| Totals | | | | | | |
| | <u>Number of Minors</u> | | | <u>Income</u> | | |
| | 0 | 1 or More | | Lower | Very Low | |
| Movers | | | | | | |
| City | | | | | | |
| Suburb | | | | | | |
| Non-Movers | | | | | | |
| City | | | | | | |
| Suburb | | | | | | |
| Totals | | | | | | |
| | <u>Race</u> | | | | | |
| | White | Non-White | Totals | | | |
| Movers | | | | | | |
| City | | | | | | |
| Suburb | | | | | | |
| Non-Movers | | | | | | |
| City | | | | | | |
| Suburb | | | | | | |

* Will be established after demographic data becomes available, in order to identify the most appropriate combination of communities.

TABLE 3 (Cont'd)

Housing Choice Preference (x Race) x Income and Number of Minors

| Race | Income | | Total |
|--------------------------------|----------|-----|-------|
| | Very Low | Low | |
| <u>Movers</u> Non-White | | | |
| White | | | |
| <u>Non-Movers</u> Non-White | | | |
| White | | | |
| Totals | | | |

| Race | Number of Minors | | Total |
|--------------------------------|------------------|---|-------|
| | 1 or more | 0 | |
| <u>Movers</u> Non-White | | | |
| White | | | |
| <u>Non-Movers</u> Non-White | | | |
| White | | | |
| Total | | | |

For Housing Choice Preference x Race x Location, see B1(e).
 For Housing Choice Preference x Race x Age, see B3(c).

Housing Choice Preference (x Age) x Income, Length of Tenure and Race

| Age of Head | Income | | Total |
|----------------------------|----------|-----|-------|
| | Very Low | Low | |
| Movers ≥ 62 < 62 | | | |
| Non-Movers ≥ 62 < 62 | | | |
| Totals | | | |

51
TABLE 3 (Cont'd)

| Age of Head | Tenure | | Total |
|-------------|---------|---------|-------|
| | 2 Years | 2 Years | |
| Movers | | | |
| ≥ 62 | | | |
| < 62 | | | |
| Non-Movers | | | |
| ≥ 62 | | | |
| < 62 | | | |
| Total | | | |

| Age of Head | Race | | Total |
|-------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| | Non-White | White | |
| Movers | | | |
| ≥ 62 | | | |
| < 62 | | | |
| Non-Movers | | | |
| ≥ 62 | | | |
| < 62 | | | |
| Total | | | |

For Housing Choice Preference (x Age) x Location, see Table B1(a).

Housing Choice Preference (x Sex) x Number of Minors

SEX OF HEAD

| Sex of Head | Number of Minors | | Total |
|-------------------|------------------|---|-------|
| | 1 or More | 0 | |
| <u>Movers</u> | | | |
| Female HOH | | | |
| Male HOH | | | |
| <u>Non-Movers</u> | | | |
| Female HOH | | | |
| Male HOH | | | |
| Total | | | |

preferences to stay in their present neighborhood can be identified if it is of personal preference or of perceived barriers. Table 4 exemplifies the analysis of the question.

Question 4: Do different groups of nonmovers vary in their reasons for not wishing to move from their present neighborhoods? This will indicate the groups most likely to choose perceived barriers as reasons for staying in their present neighborhood. By referring to Table 4, a division of nonmovers into subgroups by the different variables can be accomplished.

ISSUES

Since an evaluation of the EOCD Pilot Mobility Program was not possible as the program has not begun, the author considered an attitudinal survey on Section 8 certificate holders' views on mobility. During initial research into the process of developing such a survey, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council was starting the development of a similar survey to be administered to EOCD's Section 8 certificate holders. The author joined the team developing the questionnaire for the purpose of using the survey results for this study and also for representing the interest of EOCD.

The development of the questionnaire required repeated refinement. The survey has to be designed for maximum comprehension so that those individuals completing it would provide the necessary information. The survey required construction so that the information could be obtained with a minimum of time. The initial survey of four pages in length was compressed to one page.

When the final questionnaire was approved by both MAPC and EOCD, little time remained before the survey was to be administered during the March briefings. Thus, no test sampling was conducted to evaluate the understanding and the length of time needed to complete the survey. As a result, questions 4 through 12 were omitted from analysis. Those surveyed found the directions confusing and responded differently for various situations.

An issue which arose after the questionnaires were administered concerned the use of the names of those surveyed. When the questionnaire was administered, those attending the briefing were asked to sign their names to the sheet they answered. This item was not on the questionnaire approved by EOCD. Thus, the privacy rights of the individual were later questioned, since the individuals did not sign a disclaimer. This dilemma has not been solved. EOCD has taken back the original surveys, has cut off the names, and placed an identification number on each sheet which only EOCD can match with a name. If MAPC wishes to follow-up any of these clients at a future date, it must obtain a disclaimer in writing from

the client prior to continuing. Otherwise, MAPC can deal only with aggregate numbers.

Finally, there was no plan or research design completed by MAPC which included a statement of the purpose of the attitudinal questionnaire. There was a broad goal stated: to understand Section 8 certificate holders' attitudes towards mobility, but nowhere were objectives and activities of such a questionnaire stated. The lack of an initial research design or plan diminished MAPC's ability to establish analysis and follow-up of the questionnaire.

These issues can be refined through the development of a new questionnaire by MAPC for Fiscal Year 1980. The survey explained in this study could then be referred to as a test questionnaire on mobility.

SUMMARY

In order to understand the attitudes of Section 8 certificate holders' views on mobility, a questionnaire was developed to be administered to 123 clients of EOCB's Section 8 Program.

If those responding to the survey, 71 percent noted that they might like and would like very much to move to a different city or town. The results of the survey are shown in Exhibits II and III. Through further demographic analysis, cross-tabulations and multivariate analysis will be conducted.

Since several issues arose during the development of the questionnaire, the administration of it and the analysis, a

new survey for Fiscal Year 1980 will most likely be considered by MAPC to understand certificate holders' propensity to move.

CHAPTER V
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

With the stated goal of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to enable participants of the Section 8 Existing Housing Program to locate suitable dwelling units in a wide geographical area, the Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development has developed a pilot mobility program to ensure that local housing authorities' clients in Massachusetts have that option of housing choice.

The pilot mobility program will include six local housing authorities participating in the greater Boston area. They include Cambridge, Littleton, Marlboro, Norwood, Stoughton, and Watertown.

Informal conversations with representatives from EOCD, MAPC, and local housing authorities indicated that LHAs have varying perceptions of the EOCD pilot mobility program, the Section 8 Administrators Association's pilot mobility program, or HUD's recommended mechanisms to insure mobility. (See pages 3 and 4)

INTERVIEWS AND ANALYSIS

Selected local housing authorities were informally interviewed to survey the agencies' attitudes about the issue of mobility , the Section 8 Administrators Association's

and EOC'D's pilot mobility programs. Local housing authorities were selected from the greater Boston area in three categories: those who will participate in the EOC'D pilot mobility program; those who will participate in the Section 8 Administrators Association pilot mobility program; and those not participating in either pilot mobility program, but do or will continue to offer the Section 8 Existing Program on a local basis. Cities and towns interviewed were the Cities of Boston, Cambridge and Quincy, and the Towns of Concord, Littleton and Watertown.

Among all six communities, the provision of a wide range of housing opportunities to clients of the Section 8 Program is of the highest importance. Mobility of Section 8 certificates enables that provision to become a reality. The local housing authorities agreed that mobility of certificates not only fulfills the regulations of HUD but also offers low-income and minority households the ability to live wherever they wish. Yet, how this mobility is to be achieved has not been agreed upon.

Two organizational strategies have been identified. One is that local housing authorities are autonomous public bodies and should remain so even if participating in a mobility program. The second, would require local housing authorities to be accountable to the Executive Office of Communities and Development. Often, both strategies are intertwined.

During the informal interviews, the Section 8 Administrators Association and the individual LHAs both indicated

that LHAs should remain autonomous and be exclusive administrators of the Section 8 Existing Housing Program. Clearly, the authorities do not want to deal with another bureaucracy (EOCD) in the administration of the Section 8 Program. LHAs must report often to the Area Office of HUD and they indicate that EOCD would place additional regulations upon the agencies. In retrospect, New England and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in particular, is characterized by a government of cities and towns governed individually and without much inter-jurisdictional cooperation. The counties within the state have not and do not foster regional activities.

The perceptions of local housing authorities of EOCD vary individually, but can often be described as a 'them-us' type of attitude. The gulf between local agencies and state agencies is compounded by thoughts that EOCD, as one housing employee said, "Is inefficient and understaffed." This same agency implied that they (the LHA) are able to offer quick and personalized services to clients whereas EOCD cannot. Yet, another agency, with a small staff, welcomes EOCD's pilot mobility program because it will bolster the support services now available from the LHA.

Since the 'them-us' attitude is held by a number of local housing authorities, some agencies never studied the EOCD pilot mobility program as a way to provide mobility for their Section 8 tenants.

In addition to the two organizational strategies, the issue of the split administrative fee between EOCD and

participating LHAs in that pilot program or the issuing and host authority in the Section 8 Administrators Association pilot has been a volatile one among many agencies. The administrative fee provides the funding necessary for staffing within the housing authorities. An agency for one certificate receives \$275 preliminary fee and an ongoing administrative fee of 8.5 percent of a two-bedroom unit of the Fair Market Rent. When the EOCD pilot mobility program was announced, for example, many local housing authorities exclaimed that the Department was taking away money they felt should be theirs. EOCD has proposed that it receive \$200 of the preliminary fee and 3 percent of the 8.5 percent of the ongoing administrative fee. Yet, by an explanation of what EOCD will be offering as part of the mobility program LHAs may understand the split administrative fee. The Department will be conducting all the briefings for the participants involved in the pilot mobility program, enter into an Annual Contributions Contract, write the leases for the participants of the program and be held responsible for notification of clients for their renewal of lease.

Though the split of the administrative fee is a dilemma posed by many agencies, some voice differing viewpoints. Watertown Housing Authority's staff person states that "the administrative fee has nothing to do with the concept of mobility." The staff views the pilot mobility program as a pilot which will most likely have some problems as would most demonstration programs. The purpose for Watertown's

participation in EOCD's pilot program is to provide housing opportunities at a much larger level for its Section 8 clients as close to Watertown or as far away as they wish.

The authorities interviewed who are participating in the EOCD pilot program isolated a number of reasons why they joined the pilot program. The pilot program would enable them to offer a Section 8 certificate which can be used to locate an apartment anywhere within the state. Other reasons mentioned were: the low vacancy rates in many cities and towns, Fair Market Rents which are too low compared to the cost of rental housing in a community, housing stock which does not provide apartment dwellings, and lack of support services. The EOCD pilot mobility program cannot address all of these issues, but it can provide other avenues where more dwellings are available for tenants at reasonable cost with more support services. The pilot program will open doors for many clients if they wish to move to another location.

CONCLUSION

The data obtained from the Metropolitan Area Planning Council's questionnaire on Section 8 clients' perceptions of mobility will provide an initial identification of those households willing to move to a different neighborhood or town. With this information LHAs as well as EOCD can tailor their outreach to those clients who may want to move.

The survey may also serve to identify what services clients will need to enable them to move. Examples are:

information about various cities and towns including what services are available, transportation to visit potential communities and briefing sessions on how to locate suitable housing.

EOCD's capability for administration of the pilot program rests upon its past experience with the Section 8 Existing Program and its present staff. Since the Department has been offering state-wide certificates of the Section 8 Program, the pilot will be an extension of those duties. EOCD will continue to brief participants and inspect units. The ability of EOCD to function effectively with participating local housing authorities lies in the cooperative nature of the pilot program

By working cooperatively with the local housing authorities, nonparticipating agencies may be drawn into such an effort. Ultimately, a partnership between the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, EOCD, and local housing authorities may be formed to offer mobility on a region-wide or statewide level where previously no such option was possible.

EOCD must attempt to deliver to local agencies services which can meet their needs through support services, staff and leadership. With HUD's mandate of mobility for local housing authorities and Governor Edward King's support of EOCD's pilot mobility program, local agencies may find it rewarding to join the pilot demonstration.

EOCD must prove that its pilot program is a viable mechanism to provide mobility because not only will the program

be evaluated on its own merits but also it will be compared and contrasted to the Section 8 Administrators Association's pilot mobility program.

The examination of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development's Section 8 Pilot Mobility Program has been faced with limited options for analysis. Since the program as of this date is not operational, a program analysis of the pilot program has not been possible. However, the author jointly worked on an attitudinal questionnaire on clients' propensity to mobility. Yet, this has not produced any data usable for this study. However, the foundations upon which EOCD's pilot mobility program have been examined, particularly the Gautreaux Demonstration in the metropolitan Chicago area.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Several recommendations are suggested for further study and analysis. It is recommended that program evaluation begin as soon as the pilot program becomes operational. The advantages of conducting such analysis will include immediate feedback to the administrators of the pilot on whether the goals of the program are being met and which activities shall be continued, stopped or changed. Since the Metropolitan Area Planning Council will be conducting more extensive surveying on the attitudes of mobility, it is suggested that once data is available, EOCD gear their program towards the clients of Section 8 who are most likely to move. By surveying, EOCD

with the cooperation of MAPC may be able to offer those services which may not be immediately offered in the pilot.

From surveying techniques or through other mechanisms, factors which discriminate lower-income and minority households from moving to a non-impacted area or suburb should be identified. Strategies should then be developed to eliminate these barriers of mobility.

It is suggested that not only should there be a careful review of the EOCD pilot program but also of the Section 8 Administrators Association's program. By comparing the two programs, their differences may be analyzed and changes recommended.

The option of mobility can perhaps allow people the freedom to reside where they want not possible under local housing authorities' Section 8 Programs. Whether this mobility occurs in the suburbs or in the central cities, the choice should be available. EOCD's pilot mobility program is the beginning of a regionalized approach to meet the needs of the clients of the Section 8 Existing Housing Program.

APPENDIX 1

NON-PROFIT SUBCONTRACTORS OF
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF COMMUNITIES AND DEVELOPMENT
SECTION 8 EXISTING PROGRAM

Berkshire Housing Services, Inc.
86 North Street
Pittsfield, Ma.
Jurisdiction: Northern Berkshire County

Cape Housing Assistance Corporation
77 Winter Street
Hyannis, Ma.
Jurisdiction: Barnstable, Dukes, Nantucket
Counties

Community Teamwork, Inc.
167 Dutton Street
Lowell, Ma.
Jurisdiction: Northern Essex, Northern
Middlesex Counties

Construct, Inc.
P.O. Box 582
Great Barrington, Ma.
Jurisdiction: Southern Berkshire County

Housing Allowance Program, Inc.
135 State Street
Springfield, Ma.
Jurisdiction: Hampden, Hampshire Counties

Rural Housing Improvement, Inc.
14 Walnut Street
Winchendon, Ma.
Jurisdiction: Worcester, part Norfolk, part
Middlesex Counties

South Shore Housing Development Corp.
169 Summer Street
Kingston, Ma.
Jurisdiction: Plymouth, Bristol Counties.

APPENDIX 2

SECTION 8 ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION

PILOT MOBILITY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Boston
Brookline
Wellesley
Newton
Milford
Waltham
Braintree
Fall River
New Bedford
Taunton
Dedham
Pembroke
Medford
Somerville
Framingham
Woburn
Lexington

Salem
Peabody
Danvers
Lynn
Saugus
Melrose
Wakefield
Needham
North Reading
Burlington
Falmouth
Plymouth
Dennis
Quincy
Weymouth

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Ann. Concord Housing Authority, Massachusetts.
Interview. 21 March 1980.
- Christ, Ann. Littleton Housing Authority, Massachusetts.
Interview. 21 March 1980.
- Connolly, Thomas Jr. Massachusetts Association of Housing
and Redevelopment Authorities. Interview. 20 March 1980.
- Embry, Robert C. Jr. Memorandum on Recommended Demonstration
Program to Promote Deconcentration. U.S. Depart-
ment of Housing and Urban Development. 27 August 1979.
- "First PHA Section 8 Existing Handbook Stresses Housing
Quality, Outreach." Current Developments. (24 Decem-
ber 1979): 639.
- Graziano, Paul. Watertown Housing Authority, Massachusetts.
Interview. 26 March 1980.
- Holmes, Camile. Letter to Marvin Siflinger, Area Manager,
Department of Housing and Urban Development. Section 8
Administrators Association. 21 December 1979.
- Housing Advocates, Inc. Regional Housing Mobility Program:
A Guidebook for the Promotion of Housing Opportunities.
(Cleveland, Ohio) 1979.
- Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs. "Section 8
Existing HAPP State-wide Equal Opportunity Housing
Policies and Procedures."
- Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs. "Section 8
Existing Housing Assistance Payments Program State-
wide Administrative Plan, Policies and Procedures."
(1 September 1978).
- Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development.
Draft, Pilot Mobility Program Administrative Plan.
(14 December 1979).
- Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development.
Housing Massachusetts: Meeting the Needs of the 1980's
the Governor's Housing Program. (March 1980).

- Massachusetts Executive Office of Communities and Development. "Transfer of Certificate Holders Between DCA and the Subcontractors." (1 September 1978).
- Massachusetts. Section 8 Handbook. January 1980.
- May, Kenneth. City of Marlboro Department of Community Development. Interview. 4 April 1980.
- McCarthy, Kevin. Housing Search and Mobility. Santa Monica, Ca.: The Rand Corporation. (September 1979).
- Metropolitan Area Planning Council. Regional Housing Mobility Program. (Boston, Ma: MAPC) September 1979.
- Nelson, Andrew. Cambridge Housing Authority, Massachusetts. Interview. 2 April 1980.
- "New Regulations to Promote Mobility of Low-income Residents Considered by HUD." Current Developments. (7 September 1979): 109-110.
- O'Brien, Clement. Quincy Housing Authority, Massachusetts. Interview. 2 April 1980.
- Solomon, Rod. Boston Housing Authority. Interview. 20 March 1980.
- U.S. Code Congressional and Administrative News. "Legislative History of Act." (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Company) 1974.
- U.S. Code Congressional and Administrative News. "1974 Housing and Community Development Act of 1974." (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co.) 1974.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Office of Policy Development. The Gautreaux Housing Demonstration: An Evaluation of Its Impact on Participating Households. (18 October 1979).
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Public Housing Agency Administrative Practices Handbook For the Section 8 Existing Housing Program. Pubn. No. 7420.7 (November 1979).
- Urban Systems Research and Engineering. "Executive Summary." In Research and Evaluation Regarding the Section 8 Housing Assistance Program: Sector A. Cambridge, Ma: Urban Systems Research and Engineering. (January 1977).

Wiseman, Andrew. Memorandum on New Policy to Encourage Greater Mobility in the Assisted Housing Programs. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 17 January 1979.

White, Eleanor. Boston Area Office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Interview. 22 March 1980.