

1977

## Planning Implications to High Vacancy Rates in Public Housing

Russell J. Archibald  
*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

Archibald, Russell J., "Planning Implications to High Vacancy Rates in Public Housing" (1977). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 1378.  
<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/1378>

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](mailto:digitalcommons-group@uri.edu). For permission to reuse copyrighted content, contact the author directly.

PLANNING IMPLICATIONS TO HIGH  
VACANCY RATES IN PUBLIC HOUSING

BY

RUSSELL J. ARCHIBALD

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

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1977

MASTER OF COMMUNITY PLANNING

OF

RUSSELL J. ARCHIBALD

Approved:

Thesis Committee

Major Professor

Charles E. Downe

Stacy B. Wood

Albert J. Lott

A. A. Michel

Dean of the Graduate School

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1977

## Abstract

Today there is a great demand for low-rent public housing in Providence, Rhode Island, yet many families that can avail themselves of public housing are unwilling to do so. The causes of this situation are investigated.

A summary of the background and framework of public housing from the beginning is studied. Important features of the Wagner-Steagall Act and other legislation which followed were investigated because of the effect which they had on the character of the housing program.

Several questions were established and tested to find out the level of dissatisfaction with the social and physical aspects of life in public housing. The questions were tested by a survey of residents in several public housing projects.

In general, the results of all avenues of investigation showed a deep-rooted disfunctional nature of several policies and programs. An overview of the aspects of life pointed to many irritating aspects which to some degree affected project living.

The study assisted in providing solutions to areas of both social and design problems. These should aid planners in their endeavors in the future.

### Acknowledgment

The author wishes to express his gratitude to:  
his major professor Charles Downe for his guidance, advice, and criticism during development of this thesis;  
Pat Smith and Penny Lopez for their assistance in interviewing residents;  
the managers and administrators of the Providence Housing Authority; and  
members of the Tenant Association for their input into problem areas of public housing.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Chapter I - Introduction

- A. Objective, Justification
- B. Questions that were Investigated by Study

### Chapter II - Background

- A. Overview of the Background of Public Housing
- B. Background History of Public Housing
- C. Framework of Public Housing

### Chapter III - Statistical Overview

- A. Conditions and Trends

### Chapter IV - Methodology

- A. Study Design
- B. Data Collection - Interviewing

### Chapter V - Analysis of Data

- A. Implications from Public Housing Investigated
- B. Characteristics of Respondents
- C. Checking Questions
- D. Summary

### Chapter VI - Conclusions and Recommendations

### Appendix

#### Questionnaire

#### Tables - Responses to Questionnaire

#### Bibliography

A. Objective

The objective is to study the causes of high vacancy rates in three public housing projects in Providence, Rhode Island. With the outlay of large sums of Federal money for construction and rehabilitation of public housing units, the high vacancy rates in public housing projects and the demand for low-cost housing being what it is, efforts must be made to uncover the causes of this paradoxical situation. After interviews of tenants, security personnel, and public housing administrators a collection of causes will be made to focus on those factors that would aid in combating these problems of high vacancy rates.

## Justification

A situation exists in the United States where a Federal Housing program that was started some years ago does not now fulfill the needs for which it was intended. If we are to continue following the guidelines of that program, new policies must be enacted for the areas in which the program is failing. Today, if the decision was reached that public housing programs were to be abandoned, there would still exist a major resource consisting of hundreds of thousands of housing units whose ultimate fate will still have to be decided. Also at this time the reasons why the program is now failing can serve as one of the guidelines for programs which will succeed the present.

If for no other reason vacancy rates are visible symbols of the lack of acceptance of the public housing program in its present form. Through the collection of statistics and interviews of people related to public housing I hope to expose the magnitude of the problem. My objective is to present facts and opinions concerning the causes of the dysfunctional nature of the program which leads to high vacancy rates.



## B. Questions That Were Investigated by Study

- I. Are families living in public housing more sensitive to the stigma of project life and do they consider themselves socially inferior? Are they identified as being in the lowest income groups and social status?
- II. Are certain elements of life irritating to those who live in public housing? Do the dangers associated with many projects create an atmosphere incompatible to a suitable living environment?
- III. In areas of high child density do special problems arise especially gang behavior and vandalism?
- IV. Have racial tensions increased in public housing over the last decade due to the large numbers of Blacks presently moving in?
- V. Has management policies of the housing authority created stressful environments in public housing?
- VI. Has the dense nature of the physical environment along with unpleasant aspects of the housing design itself created insufficient landscaping, and outdoor recreational areas?

## A. Overview of the Background of Public Housing

Back in the 1930's liberal congressmen pushed through legislation setting up programs to federally fund public housing. Since those years our federal government has played an expanding role in meeting the needs of the low income family. The first public housing law was written by Ernest Bohn in 1937. In the same year congress passed the Housing Act of 1937-the initial step to bring a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling to every American family.

Public housing was plagued with difficulties from its inception. It came a reality more or less as a compromise between social reformers who saw it as a tool to wipe out slums, and those who saw it as a vehicle for no more than a much-needed infusion of capital into the economy.

From the beginning public housing was a joint effort of the three levels of government-local, state, and federal. Forseeing the need for a strong central control resulted in the setting up of a Federal housing authority whose only function was to assist municipal governments to develop and operate low rent public housing by giving long-term, low-interest loans. The federal government also provided cash contributions to keep rentals at a level that low-income families could afford. At this point the concept of graded rents by family income and size was adopted. The design at the inception of public housing was to give living quarters to those caught in temporary financial straits not as subsidized housing for those without income, the unemployed, or the poor who depended on charity.

The 1937 Act also put emphasis on urban non-poor families and resulted in projects which were designed with one or two bedroom units. As a result every provision had far reaching effects.

In the 1950's the concept of housing changed drastically. Instead of an emphasis on the social aspects of families, the concept developed of just housing people, just providing rooms.

So started a process in which projects began housing people with the most problems but who got the least help in solving them. The projects became warehouses for welfare recipients, the children were stigmatized with the identity of "project kids"- a image of nothing but young hoodlums. There were more and more vacancies as non-welfare families moved out; in order to fill the vacancies, more and more welfare families were brought in. As a result project managers became less and less able to handle their new clientele and responded by becoming more paternalistic and restrictive.

## BACKGROUND HISTORY OF PUBLIC HOUSING

B.

Federal public housing policy, as we know it today, was enacted when the Wagner-Steagall Act<sup>1</sup> was signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937.<sup>2</sup> The purpose of this Act<sup>3</sup> included seven basic principles. They were to establish:

1. the first permanent federal agency in behalf of low rent subsidized housing;
2. the principle of federal loans to local housing authorities to finance projects by issuing bonds in order to lend the authorities 90 percent of the cost of approved projects.
3. the principle of removing one slum dwelling for every new public housing unit built;<sup>5</sup>
4. the principle of charging rent in relation to income of the tenant, and of using the tenant's income as a basis for eligibility of occupancy;

<sup>1</sup> United States Housing Act of 1937 (Public Law 412, 75th Congress; Stat. 888; 42 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.).

<sup>2</sup> National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, 25th Anniversary Issue: United States Housing Act of 1937, Journal of Housing, Oct. 1962, NAHRO, Washington, D. C.

<sup>3</sup> For a brief description of the forerunners of this Act, see Fisher, Robert Moore, 20 Years of Public Housing, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1959.

<sup>4</sup> When used in this Act--"low-rent housing" means decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings within the financial reach of families of low income, and developed and administered to promote serviceability, efficiency, economy, and stability, and embraces all necessary appurtenances thereto.

<sup>5</sup> The Wagner-Steagall Act was careful to avoid oversupply of housing by stating that no housing units were to be built without destroying "dwellings...substantially equal in number to the number of newly constructed dwellings provided by the project." 50 Stat. 891 (1937) as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1410(a).

5. the principle of annual federal subsidies to make up the difference between what a low-income tenant pays in rent and what it costs to provide the dwelling unit;
6. the policy of local tax exemption as a means of subsidizing low-income families; and
7. the principle of local responsibility for planning, building and managing the public housing.

The decentralized structure for developing and administering the public housing program was determined by a federal district court case<sup>6</sup> in 1935 that held that the federal government had no power under the Constitution to clear land and build public housing. However, there was nothing illegal about (Federal funding) but leaving motive force, title to property, and condemnation rights to the states. The Act provided a formula for the use of public money to underwrite a local program.

Political appeal of the Wagner-Steagall Act was enhanced by the backing of the American Association of University Women, the AFL-CIO, the American Association of Social Workers, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, and the American Legion.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Friedman, Lawrence M., "Public Housing and the Poor: An Overview," California Law Review, Vol. 54 (1966, P. 647.

<sup>7</sup> Fisher, Robert Moore, Twenty Years of Public Housing, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1959.

Public housing was not without its opponents who consisted mainly of real estate and business groups, builders, suppliers and mortgage lenders. The National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Home Builders, the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, the United States Savings and Loan League, and the National Apartment Owners Association were lobbying against the low-cost public housing bill. This was a group primarily concerned that there would be an oversupply of housing. From a philosophical point of view, there was opposition to "socialized" housing and the government being in the real estate business. A factor favorable for the passage of the Act was its potential for creating jobs and housing for a relatively new type of "poor people." In 1937 the country had already suffered through seven years of a severe depression. The pool of poor people had grown in numbers by the unemployment of those who were formerly middle class or better. These problem poor were members of a temporarily submerged middle class. Public housing for these people was politically attractive because of their large number and their potential at the polls. It was also able to prime the pump by supplying jobs for construction workers and others.

8,9

The passage of the Wagner-Steagall Act was quickly followed by a flurry of attempts to attach amendments to it.

8

The 1937 Act was proposed by its sponsors, Senator Robert F. Wagner, Sr. (New York) and Congressman Harry B. Steagall (Alabama) as a means of relieving unemployment and helping state and local agencies eliminate substandard housing." Fisher, Robert Moore, Twenty Years of Public Housing, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1959.

9

Section 1412 (b) of the Act states, "As soon as practicable the Authority shall sell its federal projects or divest itself of their management through leased." Section 1412 (c), "The Authority may sell a Federal project only to a public housing agency (or\* to a nonprofit body for use as low-rent housing).

Two years after the Act was passed, World War II broke out and progress in public housing was interrupted. Private building was halted and housing efforts were revised to provide shelter for the defense workers. A tremendous housing shortage developed and employment escalated.

The end of World War II brought concern about a possible depression. One way to avoid a depression was to inaugurate a high level of construction. The government responded by doing whatever was necessary to bolster the construction industry with new private housing programs. The major beneficiaries of the new housing programs were the veterans and the middle class generally. Aided by special mortgage arrangements and tax breaks, they were able to own individual homes in the suburbs. It became possible for them to get away from the cities' problems and undesirable neighbors. Public housing was left boxed in the cities while the inexpensive land on the fringes of the metropolitan areas was de facto taken up by developments for the middle class. The formerly "submerged middle class" with their full employment and better wages could no longer remain as tenants in public housing because their earnings were above the maximum allowable. When the public housing units were vacated, they were inherited mainly 10 by a new type of tenant--the permanent poor and the new urban immigrants. This change in the type of public housing tenant has continued until the present time. It is not unusual in many cities to have approximately one-half of the tenants on public assistance. With so many of the clientele deriving their income from welfare checks, the projects changed from their original conception.

The sentiment of the country was beginning to run against public

housing. This feeling and the shortages of building materials during 1946-1948 resulted in fewer than 2000 units being built in 1947-1948. There were approximately 170,000 units of public housing built and occupied prior to 1949.<sup>11</sup>

Public opinion reversed itself in the election of 1948 and, as a result, the 81st Congress in 1949 passed a major housing act whose objective was " the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

One of the programs in this act was to provide low-rent public housing for the poor. President Truman signed the Act and authorization was given to build over 800,000 public housing units by 1955. To this date that goal has not quite been reached, although the population and the number needing low-cost housing has increased. The act included five new elements:<sup>12</sup>

1. the authorization for the construction of 810,000 units of public housing over a six year period;
2. the establishment of a new form of subsidy for the clearance of slums, with the land to be used for "redevelopment" by either public or private housing;
3. the changed method of limiting costs on public housing construction from the former per unit cost limitation to a per room cost limitation;

<sup>11</sup>  
See, generally, Building the American City, House Document No. 91-34, pp. 108-33, 91st Congress, First Session.

<sup>12</sup>  
National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials Journal of Housing, October 1962; 25th Anniversary Issue: United States Housing Act of 1937..



4. the removal of restrictions on the disposition of remaining war veterans housing;
5. the authorization for local authority bonds and notes as a replacement for federal loans to underwrite public housing costs.

The Act of 1949 also made at least three amendments to the basic law of 1937.<sup>13</sup>

1. It deleted the requirement that projects receiving Federal annual contributions must also be given a local cash or tax subsidy of at least 20 percent of the Federal contributions. Inserted in its place was a provision that the local projects were to be tax exempt, but that a payment in lieu of taxes of not more than 10 percent of annual shelter rents could be made for each project;
2. It required, as a condition of Federal loans or annual contributions, "... that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper limits of admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise unaided by public subsidy is providing (through new construction and available existing structures) a substantial supply of decent, safe and sanitary housing...."
3. First priority would be given to those low-income families eligible for public housing who were "...displaced by any low-rent housing project or by any public slum clearance or redevelopment project..."

By the end of the first year, only 10,000 units were in construction and of these 3,000 were more than two or three months past ground breaking.

The private

13

Building the American City, Housing Document No. 91-34, 91st Congress, 1st Session, p.110.

interests that could not prevent the legislation from being passed took to an offensive to hamper the program. In an intensive campaign they attempted to blacken the name of the program by equating it with socialism and by scaring voters. According to them, public housing in their communities would be the equivalent of taking money out of their own pockets to pay the rent of "shiftless families".

The war in Korea saw a slackening of housing starts with Congress cutting back on the annual authorization of 135,000 units. In 1951-52 it was cut back to 50,000 and then to 35,000 for the next two years.

When the Eisenhower Administration was inaugurated, public housing was in a hostile atmosphere.<sup>14</sup> President Eisenhower stated that the merits of continuation of the program should be evaluated and in the meantime it would be well to "mark time".

In September of 1953, he appointed a 21-man advisory committee to study the entire national housing program and to make recommendations on how or if it was to continue.<sup>15</sup> In December 1953 the advisory committee's report was submitted. It recommended:

1. continuation of public housing;
2. expansions in the urban renewal program;
3. improvements in public housing such as use of existing buildings rehabilitated if necessary;
4. use of scattered sites for new dwellings;

4

Next President-- Where He Stands on Public Housing," Architectural Forum, June 1952. There were only 10,000 units finished in 1951 and in the three years 1952-54 inclusive, 161,000 units were completed.

The number of new starts slowed down to:

16,244 in 1954

8,568 in 1955

4,916 in 1956

HUD Statistical Yearbook 1967, p. 244  
table HAA3.

15

50th Anniversary Issue: United States Housing Act of 1932,  
Journal of Housing, October, 1962

5. designs conforming to local patterns; and
6. more attention to the low-income aged.

The result of the Committee's report was the Housing Act of 1954, which had the positive feature of bringing federal aid to neighborhood conservation in the fight against the slum. There was a provision in the Act which authorized 35,000 units limited to those communities where a slum clearance and redevelopment or urban renewal project was under way. The community had to certify that the housing was needed to relocate families affected by the project.

Public housing continued to have a difficult time in Congress at each session. In 1956 there was the redefinition of "low-income family" to include single elderly persons and the raising of the cost limitation per room in housing for the elderly. There was no major public housing legislation during the 1957-58 period. In 1959 Eisenhower signed a housing bill which he had previously vetoed twice that year. Business leaders, home builders and congressmen on both sides of the political fence criticized the vetoes because it not only destroyed public housing but carried urban renewal and the FHA program along with it. An important policy of the 1959 legislation was the greater autonomy it gave to the local housing authorities. <sup>16</sup> A basic issue which had troubled public housing was the question of who was to be the decision maker--the government furnishing the funds or the community that builds the houses?

No important housing legislation was enacted by Congress in

16

It is the policy to vest in the local public housing agencies the maximum amount of responsibility in the administration of the low-rent housing program, including responsibility for the establishment of rents and eligibility requirements (subject to the approval of the authority) with due consideration of accomplishing the objective of this act while effecting economies."

Eisenhower's last year as President. After the 1960 elections the new President, John F. Kennedy, had a substantial majority in both House and Senate. Mayors of the big cities, housing commissioners, city planners, and civic groups concerned with housing began lobbying for passage of housing legislation which was much broader in scope than what had been enacted to date. An idea of what was to happen was given in a speech in which President Kennedy said, "An equal challenge is the tremendous urban growth that lies ahead. Within 15 years our population will rise to 235 million and by the year 2000 to 300 million people. Most of this increase will occur in and around urban areas. We must begin now to lay the foundations for livable, efficient, and attractive communities of the future."<sup>17</sup> As a result, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on

Banking and Currency began hearings on a number of bills to amend the federal housing laws. The Housing Act of 1961, which resulted from these hearings, had an easy time getting through both houses of Congress.

It provided among other things:

1. authorization to spend the balance of the money appropriated in 1949. This meant that about 100,000 new units of public housing could be built;
2. a 5 million dollar authorization to test out new ideas on low-rent housing;
3. authorization to local housing officials to determine admission policies;
4. authorization to permit over-income families to retain their tenancy (provided they could not find private housing and if they paid an equitable rental);

17

A Nation's Housing, "Message of the President of the United States, March 9, 1961, Hearings on Housing Legislation of 1961. 87th Congress, 1st Session, p.7.

5. combination in a single bill for housing, mass transportation and open-space land provisions;
6. authorization of the increase of urban renewal grants from two billion dollars to four billion dollars; and
7. permission to include commercial facilities.

Furthermore, the bill indicated the strength of the historical movement to involve the government into greater participation in urban development.

After the assassination of President Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, in a speech at the University of Michigan made it clear that the 'Great Society' was an urban society. "It will be the task of your generation to make the American city a place where future generations will come not only to live but to live the good life." <sup>18</sup> At the time he made the speech, there were about 35,000,000 Americans living in poverty. <sup>19</sup> President Johnson's first year in office saw the passage of measures which were interrelated in their effect on cities. They covered equal economic opportunities for all people regardless of color, civil rights, mass transportation, and the Housing Act of 1964. <sup>20</sup> The Housing Act authorized an additional \$750,000,000 for urban renewal. The Transportation Act authorized \$375,000,000 for a three-year period to aid urban mass transportation systems. The Housing Act shifted emphasis from large-scale reconstruction of slum areas to rehabilitation of the existing housing. The use of urban renewal funds was permitted to enforce health codes in renewal areas providing the localities

<sup>18</sup> President's Talk at Michigan University, "Washington Post, May 23, 1964, p.6.

<sup>19</sup> Council of Economic Advisers, Annual Report, Washington, 1964, p.55.

<sup>20</sup> Public Law 88-560, September, 1964..

involved increased their own expenditures in order to qualify for a grant. Cities that failed to enact satisfactory codes by 1976 could not qualify for federal funds. The law provided low interest, twenty-year loans to finance the repairs or modernization required to meet the health codes. This was intended to produce less destruction of the social fabric of the urban area by calling for more attention to the human problems of slum clearance and housing. For those who fought the Act, there was the provision that no demolition project could be approved until it was determined by the Housing Administration that rehabilitation was not possible.

President Johnson, with his large majority in both Houses of Congress, pushed for more amendments to the Housing Act. In his Housing Act of 1965 he proposed rent supplements to bridge the gap between 25 percent of a poor family's income for rental of housing and the rent it would pay on the private market for it. By 1969 the program was to furnish enough housing to accommodate 375,000 families and remove them from the waiting lists for public housing. Some of the controversial issues involved in public housing would be avoided and it would give low-income families the opportunity to move into the suburbs. The politicians representing the suburban communities saw it as a "plot" to break the "white noose" around the cities and even to allow Negroes into their neighborhoods.

The President's attempt to get financial backing for the creating of new cities was defeated by the mayors of the large cities who were afraid that they would lose more of their middle class residents. The

21  
Scott, American City Planning, University of California Press, 1969, p. 612..

cities won \$675,000,000 for urban renewal in 1966 and \$750,000,000 for 1967 and 1968. Money for code enforcement in deteriorating areas and for demolishing dilapidated housing was provided by the Act. Among other provisions were the programs for direct loans for non-profit housing for the elderly and for leasing 10,000 units annually from private owners and used for low-income families.

In this message to Congress on January 26, 1966, President Johnson made some unusual suggestions for meeting housing and urban development problems. They were the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966<sup>22</sup> and the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

The "model cities" program is the term the president preferred to use for the provisions for restoring quality to run-down neighborhoods. "Redevelopment" had a poor connotation for many people. An adequate model neighborhood program was to include a number of features designed to improve life in urban housing project. It would among other things:

1. reduce crime and delinquency;
2. provide access between home and job;
3. expand the housing program; and
4. cut down dependency on welfare.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 set a 10-year timetable for attaining the goal of a decent home and environment for every American. Congress set the goal of replacing 6,000,000 substandard housing units, rehabilitating others to increase the supply to about 26,000,000 housing units. This Act differed from the others with a

program of home ownership for families with an annual income between \$3,000 and \$7,000. The program was further broadened to include job training. Concerns situated in the immediate area were to be given preference in any contracts awarded by the government. It was no longer a question of just providing shelter but it was social action aimed at moving the underprivileged up the economic scale. The Act of 1966 required developers to get their funds from private sources; the new Act authorized the developers to issue bonds which were guaranteed by the government. Every planning agency receiving federal funds would be required to develop greater social commitments because housing needs and land use were tied to jobs, transportation, training, rent supplements and possible home ownership. The Act recognized that economic, social and environmental planning must be combined to tackle the problems of the underprivileged. There was an election coming up so liberals and conservatives alike voted for the bill.

The Housing Act of 1969 increased the public housing annual contributions for 1969 and 1970 by 95 million dollars and also increased room allowances given in the 1937 Act.<sup>23</sup> The Act further stated that the maximum rent a tenant pays (25 percent of his income) "shall not apply in any case...so that limiting the rent of any tenant...will result in a reduction in the amount of welfare assistance..."<sup>24</sup>

It provided prompt notification to a tenant determined to be ineligible for admission to a project and an opportunity for an informal hearing on such determination. Sec. 404 of the Housing and Urban Act of 1968

<sup>23</sup> Public Law 91-152, December 24, 1969, Sec. 212 (b)

<sup>24</sup> Ibid. Sec. 213 (b)



was amended to read as follows:

...the Secretary shall (1) require...feasible opportunities for training and employment (arising in connection with the planning... of any project assisted under any such program) be given to lower income persons residing in the area of such project." 25

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-609) after much debate and a presidential veto of the original appropriations bill was finally signed by President Nixon on December 31, 1970. The annual contributions available for operating and maintenance expenses were increased from 75 million dollars to 150 million dollars.

The number of services to the tenants were increased to include: 26

1. tenant counseling on family budgets;
2. care and upkeep of property;
3. physical security of residents;
4. counseling on health, education, welfare, and employment; and
5. mandatory participation in the running of the low-rent housing projects by tenants.

A feature of the Housing Act of 1937 was its obvious effort to create jobs, and to avoid conflict with the private housing industry. The Housing Act of 1949 was a landmark in that it was the first to authorize action on a large enough scale to make even a modest impact on the shortage of housing. It offered great promise for tackling the authorization for the construction of 810,000 units in 10 years. As

25

82 Stat 476, 12 U.S.C. 170. d.

26

Amended Provisions on Public Housing of Housing and Urban Development of 1970, Journal of Housing, January, 1971, p.20.

of December 31, 1969, more than three decades later, there were only 784,930 units built.<sup>27</sup> Congress was passing the Acts but it was the appropriations Committees that restricted the program through riders on the appropriations.<sup>28</sup> Over the past 30 years many of the statutory restrictions and administrative policies have been liberalized. Social policies, transportation and urban problems, as well as housing, have been added to the Federal program. It has become possible for private developers and sponsors to contribute their talents for innovation and design.

To summarize, there have been 37 different Federal housing programs developed to serve three broad income groups as follows:

1. families below the Federal poverty line;
2. families above the poverty line but who would otherwise have to pay more than 20 to 25 percent of their gross incomes for standard housing (moderate income); and
3. families able to pay the economic costs for standard housing under Federal mortgage insurance or guarantee programs (FHA or VA).

The President's Committee on Urban Housing made a recommendation that six to eight million subsidized dwellings be built by 1978 for the families of the first two groups. It was from this report that the Congress took their estimates of required housing in the 1968 Act. To date, the Government housing subsidy programs have been inadequate to meet the goals that Congress itself voted because of statutory and administrative restrictions.

27  
Statistical Yearbook 1969, LRPB Table 8, p. 197 Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands Excluded. All Programs included..

28  
Of the fiscal year 1971 funds for low-rent public housing (\$942 million) dollars have already been frozen. U.S. News and World Report, April 19, 1971, p.42.

"Low rent public housing has not followed the normal pattern for reform movements in modern countries. Every social experiment starts off as an abstract idea, frequently in an atmosphere of violent theoretical debate. But after it has been tried out for a while, one of two things usually happens. Either it dies out, an acknowledged failure, or it takes and is accepted as an integral part of the ordinary scheme of things....But public housing...still drags along in a kind of limbo, continuously controversial, not dead but never more than half alive." 29

29  
Sherine Bauer, "The Dreary Deadlock of Public Housing",  
Architectural Forum, May 1957..

Framework Of Public Housing

C.

Public housing constitutes a resource that approximates 1.2 percent of the total housing supply in the United States.

The framework of the public housing is based on the phrase "a decent home and a SUITABLE living environment for every American."<sup>30</sup> Public housing is a method of achieving a decent home through subsidized low-rent housing for people who would otherwise be unable to find suitable housing at a price which they could afford. This program is one of the welfare efforts advanced by the Federal Government for local community participation. Under the existing legislation,<sup>31</sup> 1,538 local communities through their housing authorities own and operate public housing projects. The local communities make their own decisions whether they want public housing and what its scale should be. The only requirement is for them to have a "workable program." Both public and private housing are built under Federal control and the local regulations where they are constructed and are similar in this respect. Where government financing is involved, there are certain Federal regulations that must be followed. However, whenever private finances are involved, the bankers and other investors supply their own rules. In any given locality rules and regulations may be the same for both classes of housing and may be planned by the same group of architects, engineers, and contractors.

Public housing may consist of any known type from high-rise to

<sup>30</sup> [redacted] as, Paul H. Chairman, Building the American City, 91st Congress 1st Session, House Document 91-34, Washington, D.C.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid. p. 112.

row housing as long as the prescribed rules and regulations are followed. The lack of compatibility of the character of a project with its neighbors is not inherent in the rules of the Federal program. Opposition to public housing by important conservative groups has influenced the disposition of the program. Their fear of having public housing equal to what the neighboring taxpayers have affects the projects. It is sometimes the fear of the local authorities "that it be criticized by influential sections of the public" and the congressional admonition that public housing "...shall not be of elaborate design of material..."<sup>32</sup> that governs the final resultant.

Admission to and continued occupancy in low rent public housing were established for those families whose maximum incomes were below certain levels set by local housing authorities. The inhabitants of public housing are in the lowest segment of the financial scale.

Since 1956 the number of black families living in public housing had increased from 43.6 percent<sup>33</sup> to 51 percent<sup>34</sup> in 1969. Taking into account the larger average size of black families and add to it other nonwhites, the total nonwhite public housing accounts for about 55 percent of the families and approximately 60 percent of the people. In recent years approximately one-half of the public housing starts have been specifically for the elderly. "If 62 years is taken as a dividing line, they formed 30 percent of the total (people in public

32

p. 128.

33

Ibid. p. 114.

34

U.S. Statistical Yearbook 1969, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., 1969, p. 205.

housing) in 1966." These statistics are merely of a quantitative nature and do not attempt to imply a qualitative judgment.

In many of the projects there are so many 'problem' families that the residents of a project and its contiguous areas are fearful of their property and lives. In Providence, Rhode Island, two examples of this type of situation occurred recently which illustrates the conditions existing in many cities throughout the country. The incident is not typical of all projects but it occurs often enough to be a factor associated with the vacancy phenomenon in public housing.

The Chad Brown Housing Project in Providence has become such a social jungle that a family can be terrorized into permanent flight by a gang of teenagers. A white family of five persons had to be evacuated after their lives were threatened and their home besieged by a crowd of black youths. Cause for the incident was the family's sixteen year old daughter who dared to identify the youths who allegedly raped her after she was assaulted and left unconscious. According to newspaper accounts, <sup>36</sup> a group estimated at fifty blacks surrounded the family's row house apartment hurling rocks, smashing all windows, and finally breaking down the door. The family- a mother, her daughter, two teenage sons, and an aunt in her eighties-were moved to a new address. While the police were trying to disperse them, the gang set

35

As, Paul H. Chairman, Building the American City, 91st Congress 1st Session, House Document 91-34, Washington, D.C.

36

"Pruitt-Kgoe R.I.," The Providence Evening Bulletin, editorial, February 18, 1971

fire to the family's car.

A dangerous situation had grown in the neighborhood with a breakdown of law and order, letting the assailants escape without accounting for their actions. "The wrong family was forced out of Chad Brown." The families that should have been held accountable are the families of the youngsters involved in the assault on five terrorized tenants. Those that cannot bring themselves to live in peace with their neighbors ought to be forced to leave the project for the peace the neighbors have a right to expect.

According to the housing authority's director in Providence, there is "no policy to evict persons found responsible for assaults or other serious offenses against other residents."

Racial incidents were prevalent at the project. Less than a month later, renewed problems occurred in the same project over different circumstances. A rampage began after police attempted to arrest a youth wanted on a family court order. Police said they spotted him and chased him into an apartment. When he was removed, a cursing crowd attempted to free the sixteen year old from custody. "It seems to be a chain reaction. As soon as somebody is apprehended all hell breaks loose." One of the members of the group (identified later as a twenty-four year old man) told the others to scatter. The area quieted down, but soon after the police left reports were received of attacks on other tenants inside their homes. Four elderly white women, "three of the victims are over seventy-five years old and one an eighty-nine

37

38

"Rape Suspect's Sister is Charged in Attack on Alleged Victim's Apartment," The Providence Journal, February 18, 1971

39

Director of the Providence Housing Authority, as quoted by the Providence Evening Bulletin, April 15, 1971.

year old",<sup>40</sup> were attacked. The inability of the races to live with each other has been one of the characteristics making this an undesirable project. This is reflected in its high vacancy ratio.

"Police, four of whom were assaulted in attempting to quiet the disturbance, said the assaults were definitely racial in character.

"The victims," they said, "are all whites, the assailants black."<sup>41</sup>

"I am a nervous wreck," said one Chad Brown resident. "I haven't slept all night. I'm afraid to leave my home, and I'm afraid to stay...I heard them kicking in her door. She was a poor old soul... the nicest person, doesn't bother anyone."<sup>42</sup> It was disclosed that it was common practice for some residents to send their children away for the night whenever trouble broke out. A neighbor said that when she went to the victim's apartment the telephone was off the hook, and the telephone book was opened to a page with the police number. "The rescue squad had come and gone before the police got there. They took twenty minutes to get here."<sup>43</sup>

The public housing act called for the principle of "equivalent elimination." Participating communities had to remove a number of substandard housing units from its existing housing supply by demolition, condemnation, and rehabilitation equal to the proposed number of new housing units. When a project was proposed, those residents who were

<sup>40</sup> [redacted] Community Scored, "The Providence Evening Bulletin,  
April 15, 1971.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> "Afraid to Leave...and Stay," The Providence Evening Bulletin,  
April 15, 1971, and subsequent tenant interviews.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.



able to cope with their situation, moved away leaving the helpless,  
"problem families or the pathological poor"<sup>44</sup> who would be unable to  
find private housing. Many of the housing projects began to accu-  
mulate more and more tenants of this kind, with the result that a  
project became an institution for this group of people. The remaining  
self-respecting tenants gradually moved away.

Approximately 400,000 housing units were demolished under urban  
renewal but only 20,000 public housing units replaced them. This is  
about five percent of those removed from the market and two and one-half  
percent of the approximately 800,000 units built by 1969.<sup>45</sup> Although  
it was originally intended that public housing should acquire the  
renewal sites, it often was apparent that the area was close to downtown  
and was valuable for factories, luxury apartments and other uses.

Most cities wanted this land for the return of the middle and high in-  
come families from the suburbs, clean industry and a revitalized down-  
town. Rarely a welcome neighbor, the projects could not get into the  
'better' areas. Influential neighborhoods managed to keep them out  
and they could not go into the suburbs because the authorities had no  
jurisdiction there. The reluctance to use scarce land, neighborhood  
hostility, and the pressure for more housing left the authorities  
with little choice. As a result, high-rise, high-density projects were  
built on marginal vacant land near factories, junkyards, railroad  
yards, tank farms and similar areas regardless of the effect on the

44

as, Paul H. Chairman, Building the American City, 91st  
Congress, 1st Session, House Document 91-54, Washington, D.C.  
December 1968.

45

Ibid. p. 125.

project environment.

Efforts to find housing sites outside the cities' ghettos have been rebuked by the suburbs. Referenda have been consistently voted down when attempts have been made to establish housing authorities to plan for a project. Legal attempts to force the suburbs to accept the projects came to an end when the Supreme Court ruled five to three on April 22, 1971 that the states may allow community residents to reject public housing projects in their communities. The decision approved a 1950 amendment to the California constitution that requires endorsement by a majority of the voters before housing projects need be constructed. Justice Black said that the provision did not aim at a racial minority and insures that all people of the community will have a voice in the decision. "Provisions for referenda demonstrate devotion to democracy, not to bias, discrimination, or prejudice," Black wrote.<sup>47</sup>

The Public Housing Act of 1949 stipulated that the projects must be operated by local authorities.<sup>48</sup> They usually consist of a five-man board with certain legal and discretionary powers. Appointments made by the local mayor or some local governing body usually are for four or five year terms. The members generally draw no salary but receive compensation for expenses. They make the policy, hire the staff, assume fiscal responsibility, and provide the leadership for the program and the community. The job is a part-time endeavor by men and women who

46

[redacted], Herbert, "The Failure of Urban Renewal: A Critique and Some Proposals," Urban Renewal: People, Policies, and Planning, Bullish and Hauskencht, editors.

47

"Court Backs Voter on Housing." Providence Evening Bulletin, April 26, 1971, p. 1.

48

Ibid. p. 19.

generally lack professional housing or sociological training. A recent survey<sup>49</sup> showed that 67 percent of the respondents spent an average of two hours or less per week on housing authority business; only 5 percent reported that they put in an average of ten hours or more. The rationale behind the appointment of part-time laymen representing the "best of the community" is to keep the program "out of politics." However, there is a considerable amount of "power struggle" to gain control of the programs, appoint managers, name architects and engineers and to influence the selection of sites.<sup>50</sup>

The authority members and their clientele are at opposite ends of the social and financial scale so that a lack of sympathy exists on the part of one and frustration on the other. In the past, tenants have been asking for participation in running their projects. The latest government directives make this mandatory, but in a recent survey of housing authorities, 56 percent said "no", 21 percent were not sure and 23 percent voted "yes" to the idea of tenant participation.<sup>51</sup> "It is suggested that the housing authority system currently acts as a barrier to expanded and improved housing programs for the poor."<sup>52</sup>

The appointment of the right manager to actually run a project is probably one of the most critical acts to influence the success or failure of the project. Management styles can vary greatly because

49  
Hartman, C.W. and Carr, G. Housing Authorities Reconsidered, A.I.P. January, 1969 p. 15.

50  
Are Public Housing Directors Retiring or Being Fired?  
Journal of Housing, February 1971, p.86.

51  
Hartman, C.W. and Carr, G. Housing Authorities Reconsidered, A.I.P. Journal, January, 1969 p. 17.

52  
Ibid. p. 17.

project managers have considerable leeway in administrative matters. Their projects are relatively autonomous and differ from one another in tenant constituency. One can be a huge high-rise ghetto with a high percentage of "problem families", another could be row housing with a mixture of elderly and the "submerged" middle class. The manager to run each project should be selected according to a match between his talent and the project but too often the job goes to a political appointee. In Providence, for instance, "The housing authority, like other agencies, has consistently been disrupted by staff recruited on the basis of political favoritism or by castoffs from the city austerity programs or the like. The result of this kind of politics has been a severe neglect of the tenants, badly undermined programs, and finally, apathy and anger among the voters." <sup>53</sup> Many managers have grown up in the program from its beginning and have adapted to changing conditions. The training and qualifications for managers have never been formalized. Tenant "mix" can produce an impossible situation for a manager if it contains too many problem families mixed in with the elderly and deserving poor. Incompatibility of the tenants tends to drive out the more stable groups and can create a situation where terror and vandalism result in a project which then becomes largely vacant. Most authorities agree that a certain amount of discipline is required to create an orderly environment, free of terror.

53

are Public Housing Directors Retiring or Being Fired?"  
Journal of Housing, February, 1971 p. 88.

In New York City the attitude of management toward the eligibility of a prospective tenant is outlined in a set of rules. <sup>54</sup> A tenant considered ineligible if he/she has any of the following:

1. history of recent serious crime activity.. includes cases in which a member of the family who is expected to reside in the household was or is engaged in ...provided that involvement in such activities shall not be a ground for ineligibility if it occurred more than five years ago;
2. pattern of violent behavior;
3. confirmed drug addiction .. in cases where the confirmed addict is undergoing follow-up treatment by a professional agency after discharge from an institution, the applicant shall not be considered ineligible;
4. rape or sexual deviation .. exception is permitted in the case of an individual under 16 years of age when involved in the offense;
5. grossly insanitary or hazardous housekeeping;
6. record of serious disturbance of neighbors, destruction of property or other disruptive or dangerous behavior.

The New York City Housing Authority issues an information pamphlet to prospective tenants which answers the following questions

(along with others):

Are authority tenants subject to more regulations than tenants in private housing?

Why does the authority have its own police force?

What community facilities does the authority provide?

Does the authority encourage tenant programs?

The New York City Housing Authority evidently is making an effort to sell its program. HUD has issued a number of guides for managers to help them follow the latest procedures for running a project. A typical guide would be a grievance procedure directive issued by HUD.<sup>55</sup> It states the purpose, background, and requirements for hearing a tenant's complaints, gives instructions on the administrative expenses involved and also prints a model grievance procedure.

Through such a procedure tenant complaints over the years are finally resulting in the elimination of many injustices suffered by them.

Housing authorities finance their projects by borrowing money through tax-exempt bonds. With the proceeds they acquire sites, prepare them and then erect the low-cost housing. The properties are owned by the local communities and are tax-exempt. The local housing authorities enter into a contract with the Federal Government which agrees to make annual contributions for a stated period of time to pay for interest and amortization of the bonds. Rents which the low-income tenants pay go only to meet all management,

55

operation and maintenance costs. Tenants are required to pay not more than 25 percent of their income for rent and 10 percent of that is turned over to the local community in lieu of taxes.

A rent strike could be very disruptive to the management and maintenance of a project when it cuts off the source of funds for these functions because most authorities have small reserves.

The money which a community should be receiving in lieu of taxes and on which it depends for paying various municipal services is also curtailed by a strike.

## Chapter III - Statistical Overview

### A. Conditions and Trends

Based on the criteria that substandard housing units be removed, crowding in standard units be reduced and the standard vacancy ratio be increased to 5 percent, the housing need at the beginning of 1950 was estimated at nearly 21 million units.<sup>56</sup> Of the existing housing inventory 17 million units were classified as substandard, another 3 million households in standard units were classified as overcrowded, and the vacancy rate requirement was set at an additional million.

From 1950 to 1960 the average rate of increase of the housing inventory was 1,230,000 units<sup>57</sup> and from 1960 to 1970 it was 1,030,000 or a total increase of approximately 22,500,000 units in twenty years. The number of families increased by 10,000,000 in the decade 1950-1960 and by approximately 8,000,000 families in twenty years.<sup>58</sup> The net results of overcrowding is not known, but Kristoff estimated the crowded households in standard units to be 2,682,000

56

Kristoff, Frank, Urban Housing Needs Through The 1980's: An Analysis and Projection. The National Commission on Urban Problems, Research Report #10, Washington, D.C. 1968, p.9.

57

1970 Census of Housing, U.S. Department of Commerce/Bureau of Census, Washington, D.C., February 1971

58

Statistical Yearbook 1969, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, GS, Table 14, p.327, Washington, D.C., 1969.



in 1950 and increased to 3,957,000 in 1960. According to these statistics, inroads into the 21 million housing unit shortage of 1950 has been minimal.

Recently two important commissions have called for drastically increasing the housing supply at all levels of the market. In 1968 the Douglas Commission in Recommendation Number 1-- "Housing Goals" stated:

"The Commission believes that to meet America's housing needs we must build at least 2.0 to 2.25 million housing units a year. Of these at least 500,000 units a year, exclusive of housing for the elderly, should house the poor and moderate-income families who at present costs and incomes cannot afford to rent or buy decent, safe and sanitary housing."

60

In the same year the Kaiser Commission in its major conclusions called for:

"A 10-year goal of 26 million more new and rehabilitated housing units, including at least 6 million for lower-income families. Attainment of this goal should eliminate the blight of substandard housing from the face of the nation's cities and should provide every American family with an affordable, decent home."

61

The massive efforts called for by these reports have not

59

Kristoff, Frank, Urban Housing Needs Through The 1980's: An Analysis and Projection. The National Commission on Urban Problems, Research Report #10, Washington, D.C., 1968.

60

Douglas, Paul H., Chairman, Building the American City, 91st Congress 1st Session, House Document No. 91-34, Washington, D.C., December 1968, p.180.

61

Kaiser, Edgar F., Chairman, A Decent Home, U.S. President's Committee on Urban Housing, Washington, D.C., December 1968, p.3.

materialized while the need for more dwelling units has increased.

If the housing starts of 1.8 million for 1971 are reached, it will still be 800,000 units below the 2.6 million annual rate which the Kaiser Commission recommends.

The scale of low-rent public housing compared to the total housing in the United States is relatively small. With less than 800,000 public housing units in a national total of 68 million dwellings, it constitutes about 1.2 percent of the housing market. There were 5,047,000 families below the poverty line<sup>62</sup> and 14,500,000 families with an annual income of less than \$5,000.<sup>63</sup> Approximately 51 percent of this group tended to concentrate in the central cities.<sup>64</sup>

The housing shortage is most critical for the low income families. "About 7.8 million American families--1 in every 8--can not now afford to pay the market price for standard housing that would cost no more than 20 percent of their total incomes."<sup>65</sup>

The normal vacancy rate for privately rented apartments is

<sup>62</sup> Douglas, Paul H., Chairman, Building The American City, 91st Congress 1st Session, House Document No. 91-34, Washington, D.C., December 1969, p. 44.

<sup>63</sup> HUD Statistical Yearbook 1969, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., 1969, derived from Tables GS 16, 28, 32.

<sup>64</sup> Douglas, Paul H., Chairman, Building The American City, 91st Congress 1st Session, House Document No. 91-34, Washington, D.C., December 1969, p.50.

<sup>65</sup> Kaiser, Edgar F., Chairmen, A Decent Home, U.S. President's Committee on Urban Housing, Washington, D.C., December 1969, p.7.

66  
5 percent. A vacancy rate of this percentage is required to afford some maneuverability and choice to tenants.

66  
Douglas, Paul H., Chairman, Building The American City, 91st Congress 1st Session, House Document No. 91-34, Washington, D.C.

## Chapter IV - Methodology

### A. Study Design

The study design is both descriptive and analytical. The initial step was to compile background material on public housing in order to look at the underlying principles and objectives for which its policies were formed.

The statistics are used to determine the degree of the problem. Existing conditions and trends were derived from government publications, interviews, research articles and literature on public housing. Three housing projects in Providence were used for the purpose of documenting general characteristics and attitude of residents in the present program.

Questions were drawn concerning the disfunctional aspects of the housing program. The questions were tested by interviews to check their viability.

## B. Data Collection - Interviewing

### The Sample

The 5 percent sample was directed toward those living at the Roger Williams, Chad Brown and Admiral Terrace Housing Projects. An informal interview was held with a number of persons who had moved from these three housing projects in 1971 and 1972. Their addresses were obtained from the Providence Tenants Association.

A 5 percent sample of the total 1334 families was chosen. This meant that every twentieth family living at the housing projects would be interviewed. It was expected that the large number of vacancies would appear in the 5 percent sample in the same ratio as they would in the total 1334 units. A small number was not at home on the return visits made to all 'no answer' units. If the interview could not be completed, then the next higher numbered unit was contacted. This pattern was continued until slightly over 5 percent of the units were complete.

### The Interview

The technique used in the study is the survey method. A personal interview by a person skilled in interviewing procedures using a questionnaire was the means of obtaining the information. The interview required about 30 minutes to conduct. Interviewing was conducted during the early evening hours, weekends and also during the daytime hours. The head of household or one of the two parents of the household was the only acceptable respondents.

### Questionnaire

A copy of the questionnaire used for the survey is in the Appendix. The questionnaire was composed of 48 questions.

The following is a list of questions taken from the survey that were relevant to the six questions raised in the study.

Question I

Are families living in public housing more sensitive to the stigma of project life and do they consider themselves socially inferior? Are they identified as being in the lowest income groups and social status?

Number in household?

Did your parents ever live in public housing?

How do you feel about living in Chad Brown Housing Project?

Proud  
Ashamed  
Don't mind  
Don't know

Do you feel that there is racial tension in your project?

Yes No Don't know

Does the tension bother you?

A lot  
A little  
Not at all  
Don't know

Do you feel crime is a problem in your housing project?

When you think of yourself living in Chad Brown, are you

Happy  
Depressed  
Nervous  
Angry  
Tense

Do you feel that most of the people in the projects are law abiding or criminal?

Does it bother you to see so many vacant apartments?

Yes No Don't care

Question II

Are certain elements of life irritating to those who live in public housing? Do the dangers associated with many projects create an atmosphere incompatible to a suitable living environment?

What do you dislike about your project?

In general, how would you describe the people who live in your project:

Are clean	Dirty	Don't know
Quarrel often	Don't quarrel	
Don't know	Drink often	
Don't drink	Don't know	
Are friendly	Are not friendly	
Don't know		

Do you feel crime is a problem in your housing project?

What is the biggest crime problem?

Drugs	Breaking & Entering
Assault	Handbag theft
Robbery	Vandalism
Other	

Have you ever been personally attacked in the project area?

Yes	No
Has a friend?	
Yes	No
Has a relative?	
Yes	No

Where in the housing project do the crimes typically take place?

Do you think that the Housing Authority is doing enough to protect you?

Does it bother you to see so many vacant apartments?

Yes	No	Don't care
-----	----	------------

Question III

In areas of high child density do special problems arise especially gang behavior and vandalism?

Number in household?

Do you feel that most of the people in the project are law abiding or criminal?

Do you feel crime is a problem in your housing project?

What is the biggest crime problem?

Drugs	Breaking & Entering
Assault	Handbag theft
Robbery	Vandalism
Other	

Where in the housing project do the crimes typically take place?

Question IV

Have racial tensions increased in public housing over the last decade due to the large numbers of Blacks presently moving in?

Color?

Do you feel that there is racial tension in your project?

Yes No Don't know

Does the tension bother you?

A lot  
A little  
Not at all  
Don't know

Do you fear that your project will become an all Black housing project?

Yes No Don't care



Question V

Has management policies of the housing authority created stressful environments in public housing?

What do you dislike about your project?

Have you ever complained to the housing office?

Did management act on your complaint?

Yes

No

Yes, but it took a week

Yes, but it took a month

Yes, after you contacted a community person

Was your complaint about

Maintenance

Noisy children

Noisy adults

Filth

Vandalism

Roaches and rats

Need for a larger apartment

Do you think that the Housing Authority is doing enough to protect you?

Have you been informed of the new Housing Security Officers?

Do you feel that the Security Officers should be armed?

Do you think the force should be expanded?

All around the country tenants have been hassled by management.

Have you had hard times with the administration?

Paying rent      Yes      No

Eligibility      Yes      No

Other (Explain)

If you were to change management procedures. What would be the first change that you would make?

Question V Con'td

Do you feel that management treats some families in the project better than others?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain.

How do you feel about the checking of income by the management?

Question VI

Has the dense nature of the physical environment along with unpleasant aspects of the housing design itself created insufficient landscaping, and outdoor recreational areas?

Does it bother you to see so many vacant apartments?

Yes

No

Don't care

Do you feel the project area is too dense?

Do you feel the walkways in the project area are adequately lighted?

Would you like to see more recreational areas in the project surroundings?

Does your project provide a stable social atmosphere to raise children?

Does the design of your apartment give you adequate view of your project landscape?

Looking at the design of your apartment in reference to the building you live, do you feel the construction of the walls allows you maximum privacy?

## Chapter V - Analysis of Data

### A. Implications from Public Housing Investigation

The average tenant moving into public housing gains advantages, such as low rent, heat, adequate space, and all plumbing facilities. The private housing which many of these people can afford may not have all the facilities offered by public housing. Even so their preference when given the choice runs most often to private housing. However, the level of subsidization of the public housing projects should make them the more desirable option.

A paradoxical situation in low-rent public housing exists because ostensibly it should be desirable, yet there is much antipathy toward the program. A number of elements in the program do not perform their intended function.

A series of questions concerning the disfunctional nature of public housing is stated. They were drawn from researched literature, statistical analysis, historical background of the program, and interviews with public housing authorities. Each question was then tested for its viability by additional research in the literature of housing authorities, statistics, and interviews held with tenants and former tenants in the projects.

## B. Characteristics of Respondents

### Description of Households:

#### Female Head of Household with Children:

Female head of households with children constituted the largest percentage of the total sample (67%).

In this group 42% of those sampled were between 18 and 30 years of age while the majority (73%) is under 40 years of age.

The majority of the women are divorced or separated (73%). The remainder are single or widowed. Within these households (82%) are either unemployed or on welfare. Of those surveyed the majority (82%) of the group is black.

#### Male Household Head with Children:

The male head of household comprises 24% of those surveyed. In this group 65% of the males are employed. Racially, 85% of this group was black, and 65% were over the age of 30.

#### Elderly and Those without Children:

Those people 65 years of age or older and those persons having no children comprise 8% of the total sample. All of those surveyed ranged in age from 40 years of age and older. The reason for grouping these two household types together is because they are few in number and they tend to have the same views in the survey.

In this group none of the people were employed. Two of the six surveyed are white. In this group the majority of the people were on social security or company pensions.

## Relationship of Life Style to Length of Time Lived in Public Housing

In female headed households 50% of those interviewed have lived in public housing under 5 years, and 50% have lived in projects for more than 5 years.

In elderly households and those households with no children 100% or all of the families interviewed have lived in public housing for more than 5 years.

Among male heads of households 66% have lived in public housing over 5 years and 33% have lived here under 5 years.

When looking at the total results of the survey 69% of those who responded to questions of this survey have lived in public housing for more than 5 years and 31% have lived there under 5 years.

C. Checking Questions

Question: I

Families in a housing project are identified as being in the lowest income group and social status. Many eligible low-income families do not wish to be associated with them. The implication that public housing fails to meet the desires and demands of many of the people it is intended to serve is stated by Catherine Bauer, one of the drafters of the 1937 Housing Act. She writes in "The Dreary Deadlock of Public Housing"<sup>67</sup> that only a small percentage of the people eligible for occupancy actually apply for the low-rent dwellings. "And of those who do, most appear to be desperate for shelter of any kind: minority families about to be thrown on the street by clearance operations, problem families sent by welfare agencies, and so on."

Forced relocation by urban renewal activity afforded an opportunity to investigate housing preferences made by the displaced low-income residents. Chester Hartman, in a study<sup>68</sup> of 500 families relocated from Boston's West End, revealed "that the overwhelming majority refused to consider the possibility of living in a housing project for reasons consistent with their preference for the residential patterns and life styles prevalent in their former neighborhood."<sup>69</sup>

67

█, Catherine, "The Dreary Deadlock of Public Housing," Architectural Forum, May 1957.

68

Hartman, Chester, "The Limitations of Public Housing," American Institute of Planners Journal, November, 1963.

69

Ibid.

An extremely negative attitude towards the image of public housing was held by those families displaced. About one-third of the families specifically mentioned the social undesirability of housing projects. They attached importance to the social aspects of housing status as well as sociability features which were more important than the financial and physical advantages offered by public housing.

In private housing a mixture of low and modest income groups makes it practically impossible to focus attention on the poor and, in this way, most escape the stigma attached to the lowest income group. "In Providence, as well as nationally, the trend has been for public projects to house an increasing proportion of the extremely disadvantaged families with very low incomes, single parent families with many children, who are welfare recipients, and have chronic and multiple problems."

This kind of selectivity results in widespread behavior problems, as well as the stigma of projects <sup>70</sup> as places where only the "riff-raff live." Their presence in large numbers differentiates a housing project from an average residential neighborhood. The way public housing is structured, it fails to blend in with rest of the community.

Ms. Smith, an unwed mother of three and a part-time house worker, had recently been displaced when the structure in which she was living was condemned and razed. Because of her low income, Aid to Dependent Children and the money she earned from housework, she was encouraged by her case worker to move into the Roger Williams Housing Project. She resisted all attempts to be relocated in the project. She rejected

70

---

Ibid. p. 286.

the project. "I wouldn't let my sons go over there to play, never mind me going. The place is full of pushers, hustlers and junkies. Nice people don't live there." She found a flat over a paint shop and while living there she had to contend with drafty rooms heated with a space heater, traffic noises, no running hot water and peeling paint. In comparison the project was a fireproof building and had central heating and hot water. Her rent would have been the same because welfare would have paid the rent in either case.

Mr. and Mrs. Doe and their three children were project tenants for four years. He was incapacitated by a car accident a few years ago and could not work. He claimed that he tried to get out and into any half-way decent flat from the day he moved into the project. No one would rent to him because he was now a project tenant. "When they (the prospective landlord) found out where we lived our goose was cooked. They wouldn't rent us the flat. We were lucky to get out because my cousin knew about a family moving out of a tenement in his block. He got it for us before they even moved out." They talked about their loneliness while in the project. Their former friends did not visit them and they had a feeling of being ostracized because they were "project people." "There was a bad smell about the neighbors. We couldn't take it."

Mrs. Jones, a mother of five children, expressed delight with her apartment when she was interviewed. All the physical conveniences were fine and she was happy to be in the project, except for a few things. She did not care for most of her neighbors. They were too noisy, although her own television



set was adding to it. Her main concern was her children, aged three to fourteen. She did not care to have them associating with "all them bastards in the yard. They don't respect anybody." If she could get out of the project, she would like to go into the suburbs away from the noise and where people have "respect" for each other.

When looking at the data from the question concerning household characteristics you find 71% of the households are headed by females and 29% are headed by males. When looking at the marital status of the tenants interviewed, you find 67% have unstable relationships (divorced or having children out of wedlock) and only 33% of the tenants were married.

In the area of employment 70% of those surveyed were unemployed or on welfare and only 30% were currently working.

In response to questions on whether the parents of the tenants lived in public housing before them, more than half replied yes (59%).

A large number of the residents interviewed felt ashamed about living in public housing (65%) in comparison to the residents (35%) who do not mind living in public housing.

The majority of the sample residents if given the choice would prefer living with mixed income levels (92%) in comparison to those who would not (8%).

When asked about the character of the residents in public housing, the heads of the household stated that 67% had criminal inclinations and only 33% were law-abiding.

The response to the question as to how they perceive themselves

living in public housing, it was found that 26% were depressed, 32% were nervous, 27% were angry, and 15% were tense.

The questions that families living public housing are more sensitive to the stigma of project life, that they consider themselves socially inferior, and that they are identified as being in the lowest income group as well as social status received qualified support. It was supported by close to two-thirds of the tenants perceiving themselves troubled by different aspects of project life.

Question: II

According to the Housing Act, people were to be given "A decent home and a suitable living environment." This has not been provided for when we observed the dangers associated with many housing projects and where the atmosphere is incompatible to a suitable living environment. People living in low-income housing are subjected to physical assaults in their home, i.e. rape, stonings from hostile gangs outside their apartments, and destruction of their property. Private property, such as bicycles or baby carriages, cannot be left unguarded for just a few minutes without having them stolen. The verbal abuse some of the tenants have to take from the managers and some of their neighbors is seldom matched in other neighborhoods. The teenagers in the project form gangs that fight with each other and terrorize the project. Services to the tenants are nonexistent, except for the delivery of mail. Even the mailboxes are broken into and vandalized. Besides the above broken glass is scattered all over the grounds as well as other dangerous debris which makes the surrounding area a dangerous place for children to play.

"Housing as an element of material culture has as its prime purpose the provision of shelter, which is protection from potentially damaging or unpleasant trauma. The most primitive level of evaluation of housing, therefore, has to do with the question of how adequately it shelters the individuals who abide in it from threats in their environment."<sup>71</sup>

71

Water, Lee, "Fear and the House as Haven in the Lower Class,"  
American Institute of Planners Journal, January, 1966, p.23.

Joe, a university student majoring in sociology, spent a summer living in the Roger Williams Housing Project in Providence. He stated that the project tenants have a set of moral values that offended us, but suited them. The men do not want to work like "whitey" does for two dollars or so an hour. Because there is a desire for a better standard of living a person becomes a hustler, or a drug pusher, or becomes involved in some other illegal activity to increase living standards. After Joe's radio was stolen from his apartment, he discovered that there was an underground network of thieves from who he could buy back his radio. He went out of his way to befriend them so that he could get information and they returned his radio. They used the vacant apartments for "storing the stuff" and for other illicit purposes. An interesting racket described by Joe was the solicitation of "whitey" into the project with the promise of a girl. They would bring the victim to an apartment and shortly after they arrived an irate husband would appear on the scene. "Whitey" would then be shaken down for all he had in money and valuables. The police would practically never go into the project for fear of being stoned and being charged with police brutality. If you wanted to hide out, the project was the place to go.

It was shown that dangers existing in many housing projects affect their livable qualities to such an extent that they no longer afford safe shelter for tenants. The examples of violence, crime, and verbal abuse suffered by the tenants confirm this question.

A large percentage of residents (50%) when asked what they disliked about living in public housing said the numerous breaking and enterings in apartments, the second largest complaint (23%) was the uncleanliness

and roaches, followed by the constant assaults (12%), and finally 15% felt that problems with management was the most upsetting aspect of project living.

When residents were asked to describe the people who live around them, the majority of the answers placed residents in a category of being dirty (48%), quarrelsome (77%), heavy drinkers (82%), but quite friendly (53%).

A high percentage of residents (92%) regard crime as being a problem in their housing project. Being more specific the residents classified the largest crime problem as breaking and entering (46%), followed by vandalism with (18%), assaults (15%), handbag thefts (12%), and drug use at (7%) being the least problem. The heads of the household in the sample also pointed out that the majority of the crimes in public housing take place on the dragstrip (47%), in the hallways of the buildings (32%), and in the apartments themselves (21%).

Tenants regarded their neighbors as being criminal in nature (67%), while a small percentage (33%), were law-abiding citizens.

Almost 83% of the sample residents thought the housing authority was not doing enough to protect them in the area of project security. When directly asked if it bothered them (tenant's questioned) to see so many vacant apartments, 70% said yes, 17% said no, and 13% did not care one way or the other.

Personal relationships were considered to be more negative in every aspect. A high percentage of the tenants complained about security, criminal acts taking place, and the uncleanliness of their surroundings. Although the tenants knew crime was a problem, they still were very concerned about the large number of vacant apartments.

The question that certain elements of life are irritating to

those who live in public housing and the dangers associated many projects  
creates an atmosphere incompatible with a suitable living environment  
received qualified support.

Question: III

In areas where there is a high populace of children numerous problems arise especially gang behavior and vandalism.

In looking at the data collected on children residing in public housing it showed that (79%) of the total number of tenants were children (224). There were 86 adults. This density of children causes numerous problems ranging from friction with neighbors to vandalism and community-noticed crime. In a number of the interviews tenants placed much of the trouble caused in the projects on youths 10 to 15 years of age. The most numerous complaints were related to destruction of property and gang behavior.

In Leonard Freedmans' book "Public Housing" he reported that when large numbers of teenagers are brought together in a small area, the result is an intense concentration of gang behavior. He suggested that public housing actually increased crime and delinquency. The concentration of the poor in projects made more visible the social disorganization which had previously been dispersed through a number of slum neighborhoods. And the existing project makes a more viable target for the opposition.

In reviewing the information given by the tenants in the sample it was found that almost (77%) of the families had between 3 and 9 members. Six (6) of the heads of household in the sample had no children. Two-thirds of the tenants were living in unstable family units (not married with children) and the survey showed poor guidance in terms of raising children in a socially acceptable manner.

The survey pointed out that much of the felling of whether residents were law abiding (33%) or criminal (67%) was cast toward the children.

Those interviewed placed much of the handbag thefts, vandalism

and breaking and entering on juveniles. Many residents (92%) think a large percentage of the crime problems could be directly related to young offenders.

The heads of the households regarded the dragstrip and hallways of the project as havens for youths to get into trouble.

The hypothesis that in high child density areas numerous problems arise specifically gang behavior and vandalism was supported. Although residents had trouble giving direct percentages of how much crime and delinquency is accounted for by children, they believe it was an ever increasing problem.



Question: IV

Because of the large number of blacks now moving into public housing, racial tensions have increased over the last decade.

In order to understand the racial problems in public housing, you must first know the background of public housing. First and foremost, public housing was setup for the working-class whites and post war veterans. From the start of public housing until the latter part of the fifties this held true. In the sixties large numbers of blacks were being relocated because of urban renewal. Blacks found themselves moving into housing which was primarily inhabited by large numbers of working-class whites. Because intergration was so sudden, combined with the new trend of black awareness and black power in the sixties interracial tensions surfaced.

One of the theories relating to the problem is the "Black Power" Theory. Today there are 21 million blacks in America with more than 2/3 of them classified as low income. Of the 24.5 million persons living in urban places classified as low income, blacks represent almost 60%. Therefore, it is reasonable to associate blacks with the low income category. For this reason we will examine and give consideration income category. to the prevalent theory of black power. At one end of the spectrum are the black separatists whose visionary goals imply the foundation of a new, independent black nation carved out of North America. Realizing the incongruity of such a goal with the present United States political divisions has led to other models of separatism. One of the most promising is that of black control of one or more of the existing state governments acquired through the ballot box. Such statewide political takeover

would require substantial immigration of the black population to central areas as well as a tremendous amount of black unity and political involvement. Separatists encourage blacks to remain where they have concentrated, namely the inner city or more specifically in public housing. From these community level bases, establishment of black power can begin.

The problem that did arise out of the large numbers of blacks living together was that they had no economic base to work from so there was no economic development.

Most problems in public housing are also created by white policemen going into a predominantly black housing development. Frictions can develop from a simple incident. Also racial problems that occur in school are brought back to the projects creating unhealthy situations.

The survey shows that there is presently a high percentage of blacks in the public housing study. The breakdown of racial composition showed 85% of those surveyed were black; 15% were white.

Of the heads of households questioned 77% felt racial tensions do exist. In response to what degree the tension bothered them, 69% responded that it bothered them a lot or at least a little. An interesting fact of the survey was that 88% of the residents feared the project would become all black and they would become racially isolated, but 12% did not think so did not care.

The question which assumed that the large numbers of blacks now moving into public housing increased racial tensions over the last decade received qualified support. A high percentage of affirmative responses were recorded in several questions concerning this problem.

Question: V

Management has created stressful situations.

When the Public Housing Act was first promulgated it was considered by many to be in that group of statutes called social legislation. It was a "breakthrough" to wipe out the slums as well as provide the proper housing for low-income people. Although the housing program has fulfilled some of its stated functions, the lack of success in other areas may be because of its indeterminate nature. A housing manager is specifically instructed to run his/her project financially solvent in a deficit-oriented program. If he/she does this, the social aspects of the project may be jeopardized.

Many exasperated housing officials complain about the vandalism and housekeeping of their tenants. To them, tenants appear ungrateful and underserving of the subsidized housing which the taxpayers are giving them. The right of every American citizen to have adequate housing is viewed not as a right but as a form of charity like welfare. Many managers are political appointees, whose decisions are sometimes made in areas where there is a conflict between the tenants' welfare and political expediency. The latest amendments to the Housing Act have removed any bars from tenants serving on the board of directors of local housing authorities. Furthermore, it is mandatory that managers and the tenants have input in the organization of project events. This is an opportunity for project people to participate in the daily organization of their lives. However, a poll, previously mentioned,

disclosed that a majority of the authorities were opposed to such action.

A problem or a grievance that arises can often be solved if the administrator did not attempt to abstract a project-wide solution, but instead handled it on an individual basis which affected a particular group.

Maintenance can fall behind if rents are not paid. Many managers have this problem which is compounded when a project has been vandalized, been given poor maintenance and in the throes of a rent strike.

The lights on the grounds of a project in Providence were turned off every evening at 9 P.M. Under this condition it was dangerous for the tenants to go out at night and it was a possible source of danger for the whole neighborhood. For days the tenants tried to reach management. They phoned the police who advised them to call the project manager who was never available. Subsequently, they tried the electric company and the Department of Public Works. Each time they were shunted to the project authorities who were "never in." The complaint was finally heard by a neighborhood group which also included the project. An interview with the corresponding secretary disclosed how the lights were turned on again. She was enough of a troublemaker to reach the mayor's office and to get her point across.

The conflict between a social operation and a business operation is often difficult to settle in any given project. We are asking political appointees who have no business, social, or housing training

to resolve the conflict. The tactics that make a project financially solvent are often not in the best interest of the tenant.

To tenants of public housing stressful environments have been created by management policies.

From a total picture of the survey abstracting those questions which tend to give a true picture of the Tenant vs Management dilemma, tenants have more negative than positive words about their policy makers.

The majority of the residents (50%) think that breaking and entering is the largest issue of management's problems, because of poor security. Second to breaking and entering were complaints about filth and roaches (23%), management policies (15%) and assaults (12%). When asked about having made formal complaints to management, 89% of those surveyed had registered a complaint at least once, but in most cases several times.

The majority, (74%), said their complaints were taken care of after a considerable period of time. The survey showed that 15% of the complaints were never acted on.

After reading the complaints it was found that a little less than half (42%) had maintenance problems, filth ranked second with 27%, vandalism had 15%, presence of roaches and rats was 9%, and need for a larger apartment was 6%.

When asked about the management's role in security for the housing developments, the tenants overwhelmingly (83%) thought the housing authority was doing little to protect them. The majority of the heads of households knew there was some security program in existence, but knew little about it. Those residents (97%) who were asked about the security force thought the force should be expanded. As far as being actually hassled by the administration 77% of the heads of households had been bothered about paying rent at least once.

The tenants were asked what would be the first change they would make if they could have a role in policy-making and a little less than one-half (48%) stated to screen applicants better, 23% wanted the place cleaned up better, 15% wanted better and more frequent extermination of apartments, and 14% wanted changes in the manager where they resided.

Two-thirds of the residents did not care about having their income checked while 32% disliked the practice. Heads of households also thought favoritism was showed to some families by management, but only about one-third were aware of it.

The question that management has created stressful environments for tenants received support from the data. In looking at the responses from heads of households we find that the majority of the residents are dissatisfied with many of the policies and procedures put forth by the housing authority.

Question: VI

The dense nature of the physical environment along with unpleasant aspects of the housing design itself creates insufficient landscaping, and outdoor recreational areas.

Residential environments which inhibit crime by creating the physical expression of a social fabric which defends against crime itself is the factor most public housing developments have omitted. The different elements when combined to make environments crime free have a common goal. In an environment where there is a sense of community the residents can then translate this into their responsibility for ensuring safe, productive, and well-kept living space. The potential criminal perceives such areas as being controlled by its residents, leaving him to be an intruder who is easily recognized and dealt with.

The larger size of many public housing projects is a major negative factor. It means that the general public can identify the project as a special area of the city and label it a high crime area.

Small scattered projects are preferable developments not only because they lessen the concentration of problem families, but because they often lessen the opposition of surrounding residents to the placement of public housing in non-slum areas.

Large projects are still being built because of presumed cost savings. But there is less social control in large projects, and often a greater feeling of alienation which results in vandalism, a low level of maintenance, and frequent turnover of tenants caused by the bad name of the project.

Architecture is also important in creating a positive or negative atmosphere. The cold-appearing concrete public housing units, built purposely to look unlike private housing, remind tenants of their low status. Building short-cuts, such as poor insulation causes inconveniences and noise problems for residents, which increase tensions and the feeling that it is not a home. Such architecture as pointed out by the data collected indicates to the public the status of the housing and the institutional nature of the project.

One of the key points reiterated by the residents in the survey was that the limited poverty group allowed to use public housing has little power to pressure for better architecture and more recreational space.

When interviewing heads of households an overwhelming majority (70%) were bothered by the many vacant apartments. Better than 90% of those responding to the question of density of their project agreed that it was much too dense.

Ninety-two percent (92%) of the residents think that the project areas were not adequately lighted nor did they have an adequate recreational area. Nearly everyone in the survey (97%) regarded the project as having poor social atmosphere for raising children.

Residents when asked if they were happy with the view of the limited landscaping responded "no" 88% of the time.

In looking at the design and landscaping of projects 94% of the tenants thought that the construction did not allow them maximum privacy or a sense of a warm environment.



The question that the dense nature of the physical environment along with unpleasant aspects of housing design itself creates insufficient landscaping, and outdoor recreational areas; received qualified support by the survey data.

The majority of the residents were not happy with the physical design and landscaping of the public housing development. The majority felt a loss of warmth and privacy. Looking at the responses the question is considered correct.

#### D. Summary

A paradoxical situation exists in low-rent public housing where there is a great demand and a substantial shortage while at the same time there is a growing vacancy rate. Investigations were made of the causes of this phenomenon.

To understand the housing program and the current situation a brief history of its development was given. It explains the reasons why the program did not produce the number of housing units projected and did not add to the total housing inventory. For instance, when the Housing Act of 1937 was enacted, it was an attempt to kill two birds with one stone. On one hand, it tried to live up to its image as a piece of social legislation and on the other, to appease the real estate interests with its "equivalent elimination" clause in which no housing could be added to the existing supply. The idea was to build housing but not enough to upset the private market. Over the years Congress voted authorizations that ran into the hundreds of thousands of units. What actually was built after cuts by the Appropriations Committee resulted in 'drips and drabs' of bare shelter grudgingly given. It took more than thirty years to reach the goal of the first ten years.

The Act also established the principle of federal loans to local authorities who had the responsibility for initiating, planning, building and managing the projects. The various amendments to the Act show how the program evolved from a concern for simple shelter to social requirements of the tenants.

Moral justification is clearly evident when rents in public housing are charged in proportion to the tenants' income. This policy resulted

in the stratification of tenants into a low income group.

Tests were required of prospective tenants to prove that their income was low enough to get into public housing and low enough to stay. In other words, the outside world knew that project families were at the bottom of the income scale. Many of the first tenants during the depression years of the late 1930's and early 1940's were in the temporarily submerged middle class. It was intended that they would stay until their incomes improved and then they would move out. As the depression passed the income of most of this group rose and they were no longer eligible to remain in public housing. Jobs became plentiful especially during the war years. The prospect of jobs attracted groups of urban immigrants who were the first to be laid off after the war and thus became eligible for public housing. People with marginal jobs, the unemployed, welfare recipients, and problem families were shunted into the projects for want of any other place to go.

Most project tenants were now also at the bottom of the social scale. The new tenants were difficult to handle, yet housing authorities were run by public spirited part-time commissioners who generally had no training to deal with them. Managers, often political appointees, had to wrestle with the indeterminate goals of the projects in their care. It took a rare manager who could run his housing as a financially solvent entity and at the same time deal with all the social problems humanely. The problem families are presently left to the mercy of the managers.

The federal policies enacted tended to create a malfunctioning of the program which, in turn, led to the vacancy phenomenon.

Statistics were compiled to show that the average rate of the housing

inventory-increase was far below recommended levels. A great demand for low-rent housing existed. On the private market there was a low vacancy rate while at the same time a greater than average vacancy rate was prevalent in many housing projects. The data showed that a project's tenants and its location affected its desirability and occupancy rate. Other factors affecting the vacancy rate include the number of bedrooms in a unit, vandalism, maintenance, and reputation.

A few years ago a massive failure of a large public housing project in St. Louis (Pruitt-Igoe) attracted considerable attention. It stood out because it was not capable of attracting people, and holding its population through choice. Many people consider Pruitt-Igoe and a few other projects to be isolated examples of housing that did not function for its intended goals. The situation that existed in St. Louis occurs in many types of low-rent public housing.

Row houses and garden-type apartments as well. Few tenants are in the public housing by choice and many are simply there because there is no other place to go.

Certain symptoms such as vandalism, crime, poor management and maintenance, rent strikes, and above-average vacancies which appear are synonymous with Pruitt-Igoe.

A compilation of the factors associated with the vacancy phenomenon is stated in the form of a series of questions. They were drawn from research literature, statistics, historical background of the program, and interviews with housing authorities. Each question was tested for its viability by additional research in the literature of existing housing authorities and by interviews with tenants in the projects.

The questions dealt with the stigma attached to families living in

public housing, the lack of a suitable living environment, the policies instituted by the Federal Government that do not function to accomplish its housing goals, the lack of privacy afforded public housing residents, the politics involved with the program's implementation, and the conflict in the goals of the program.

## Chapter VI - Conclusions and Recommendations

### Conclusions

1. The principal cause of the failure of public housing has been the absence of a continuing commitment from the Federal and local government to the needs of the tenants of the housing. While the legislation had its faults, it might have included an awareness for social programs tied to the physical programs for housing construction.
2. Since the original objective of public housing was to provide safe and sanitary shelter, the original purpose has not failed. From the physical point of view public housing is sound, although there are many inadequacies as to outdoor space for recreational and other activities.
3. Public housing has made little contribution toward the development of a sense of community among its tenants.
4. Tenant dissatisfaction in public housing focuses primarily upon the inadequacy of laundry facilities, the social environment, the problems of sanitation and crime, and the posture of management.
5. The task of providing suitable shelter and a constructive social environment for large, multiproblem, low-income families is much more an institutional function than a housing management function. The criteria for measuring effectiveness must be formulated in terms of meeting social needs rather than the economy and the efficiency of rent collection.
6. Local housing authorities are too pre-occupied with operational matters. As a result they give little leadership in the direction of solving the housing problems of the low-income population generally. They become defensive of what they are doing rather than experimental and innovative.

7. The need exists for legislative action at the Federal and State levels to change entrenched community ideas and coordinate activities of communities toward better housing.
8. Public housing is perceived as an unhappy, stigmatized environment by tenants and public alike. To the tenant, it is a stressful environment created by poor management policies, the unacceptable actions of other tenants, the isolation and size of the projects, and the socially unpleasant aspects of the housing design itself.
9. Some users in the Providence study disliked the housing because of a lack of privacy, poor maintenance, lack of playgrounds, missing design features, poor construction, and other architectural aspects.
10. Tenant-management relations often have been typified by hostility, suspicion, unfriendliness, and disrespect. Tenants, through tenant associations and individually, have complained strongly about the disrespect for the tenant and the lack of privacy afforded them.
11. Alienation between the tenant and the authority has become deep-rooted in many projects.
12. Because of the very low income limitations both for entry and continued residence in public housing, only the very poor are housed there.
13. This high-child density caused numerous problems, ranging from friction with neighbors to vandalism and crime.
14. The large size of most public housing projects is a major negative factor. It means that the general public can identify the project as a special area of the city and thus can label it as a high-crime area.

15. Low income families have larger families than middle and upper income families, and these facts were not planned for in the design of the project. As a result apartments with fewer bedrooms exist. Presently large families use two apartments or internal walls are knocked down.
16. Due to the increase in the number of malicious acts in and around housing projects, there is a need for programs to combat vandalism.

### Recommendations

#### Social

1. One major solution is to broaden the socio-economic range of the families in public housing by not forcing those over a certain income to vacate the unit, but instead by making them pay more rent.
2. Planners must incorporate social plans that can function to create social interaction within public housing framework.
3. Stronger policies should be formulated on the federal level to require local authorities to be more responsive to the needs and aspirations of low-income tenants.
4. Management should be sensitized to the wishes of tenants for safe and sanitary surroundings, possibly by better training and education of the managers. With the expanded problems of public housing residents, planners and management alike must become more sensitive to the needs and aspirations of tenants in the future.



## Recommendations con'td

### Physical

5. Small, scattered projects (often 'turnkey' housing of leased public housing) are preferable not only because they lessen the concentration of problem families and the project's visibility to the public.
6. Planners must solve the problem of poor lighting in walkway areas by securing more efficient networks of lights.
7. One major recommendation is the demolition of a number of buildings to lower the density, leaving the remaining buildings in a less dense setting.
8. Architects should find ways to better control unauthorized access and vandalism to buildings by:
  - a. removing exterior entrance door canopies which have been used in the past to gain unauthorized entrance to second floor dwelling units.
  - b. providing security screens on all first floor windows
  - c. providing for exterior front door control by intercom and door releases in each dwelling unit and
  - d. providing "peepholes" in all apartment doors to stairways.
9. Eliminate the use of incinerators and have garbage removed by a truck away contractor. Receptacles should be well placed, so they may be reach by all residents.
10. The buildings exteriors should be rehabilitated and given a new, more homelike and inviting appearance.
11. To insure esthetic virtue to the project buildings trees should be planted along the walkways. Landscape furniture should be installed to create an interesting and pleasing environment between buildings.

Recommendations - Physical con'td

12. Existing and new open space should be used for controlled game areas and recreational programs.
13. Some of the parking area should be used for additional recreation area.

APPENDIX

1. [faint text]
2. [faint text]
3. [faint text]
4. [faint text]
5. [faint text]
6. [faint text]
7. [faint text]
8. [faint text]
9. [faint text]
10. [faint text]

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TENANTS LIVING IN PUBLIC HOUSING

1. What do you dislike about your project?

2. What do you enjoy about living in your Housing Project?

3. How long have you lived here?

Under 3 months \_\_\_\_\_

Between 3 months and 1 year \_\_\_\_\_

Over 2 years \_\_\_\_\_

Don't Know \_\_\_\_\_

4. How long do you plan on staying?

Under 6 months \_\_\_\_\_

Between 1 year and 5 years \_\_\_\_\_

Over 5 years \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

5. If you had it to do over again, would you move to this project again?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

6. Household Composition

	<u>Age</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
1. Head	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____	_____	_____

Age    Sex    Marital Status    Occupation

8. \_\_\_\_\_

9. \_\_\_\_\_

7. Color? \_\_\_\_\_

8. Since leaving your family, where have you lived?

9. Did your parents ever live in public housing?

10. How do you feel about living in a public housing project?

Proud \_\_\_\_\_

Ashamed \_\_\_\_\_

Don't mind \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

11. If you had a choice, would you prefer living among people of mixed income levels?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

12. In general, how would you describe the people who live in your project?

Are clean \_\_\_\_\_    Dirty \_\_\_\_\_    Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

Quarrel often \_\_\_\_\_    Don't quarrel \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know \_\_\_\_\_    Drink often \_\_\_\_\_

Are friendly \_\_\_\_\_    Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know \_\_\_\_\_    Are not friendly \_\_\_\_\_

13. Have you ever complained to the housing office?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

14. Did management act on your complaint?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Yes, but it took a week \_\_\_\_\_

Yes, but it took a month \_\_\_\_\_

Yes, after you contacted a community person \_\_\_\_\_

15. Was your complaint about?

Maintenance \_\_\_\_\_

Noisy children \_\_\_\_\_

Noisy adults \_\_\_\_\_

Filth \_\_\_\_\_

Vandalism \_\_\_\_\_

Roaches and rats \_\_\_\_\_

Need for a larger apartment \_\_\_\_\_

16. Do you feel crime is a problem in your housing project?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

17. What is the biggest crime problem?

Drugs \_\_\_\_\_

Breaking & Entering \_\_\_\_\_

Assaults \_\_\_\_\_

Handbag theft \_\_\_\_\_

Robbery \_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_

18. Have you ever been personally attacked in the project area?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Has a friend?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Has a relative?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

19. Where in the housing project do the crimes typically take place?

20. Do you feel that most of the people in the project are law abiding or criminal?

21. Do you think that the Housing Authority is doing enough to protect you?

22. Have you been informed of the new Housing Security Officers?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

23. Do you feel that the Security Officers should be armed?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

24. Do you think the force should be expanded?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

25. All around the country tenants have been hassled by management. Have you had hard times with the administration?

Paying rent Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Eligibility Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Other (Explain)

26. If you were to change management procedures. What would be the first change that you would make?

27. Do you feel that management treats some families in the project better than others?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please explain.

28. Do you feel that your apartment is large enough for you?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

29. If you were to move from the project, do you think that you could find an apartment of the same size for the same rent?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

30. If no, has the low rent kept you from moving?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

31. How do you feel about the checking of income by the management?

32. Do you feel that there is racial tension in your project?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

33. If yes, does the tension bother you?

A lot \_\_\_\_\_

A little \_\_\_\_\_

Not at all \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

34. Do you fear they your housing project will become an all Black development?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Don't care \_\_\_\_\_

35. Do you consider living in public housing a temporary move?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

36. As compared to five years ago, do you feel that you are better off now?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ About the same \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

37. When you think of yourself living in public housing are you:?

Happy \_\_\_\_\_

Depressed \_\_\_\_\_

Nervous \_\_\_\_\_

Angry \_\_\_\_\_

Tense \_\_\_\_\_



38. Does it bother you to see so many vacant apartments?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Don't care \_\_\_\_\_
39. Do you feel the project area is too dense?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
40. Do you feel the walk ways in the project area are adequately lighted?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
41. Would you like to see more recreational areas in the project surroundings?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
42. Does your project provide a stable social atmosphere to raise children?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
43. As a tenant in public housing, do you feel there are adequate facilities for your laundry, shopping, or health needs in the community?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
44. Are there sufficient Social Service Agencies available to you in your project surroundings?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
45. Does the design of your apartment give you adequate view of your project landscape?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
46. Does your project provide you with an area where you may meet for discussion with other tenants?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
47. Looking at the design of your apartment in reference to the building you live, do you feel the construction of the walls allows you maximum privacy?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

48. Looking at the landscape in the surrounding areas of your housing project, does it give you a sense of a warm environment?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

TABLE I

## How Respondents View their Apartment

Is Apartment Large Enough?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>73%</u>	<u>27%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>48</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>66</u>

Can you find same apartment for same rent elsewhere?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>15%</u>	<u>77%</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>10</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>66</u>

If no, has low rent kept you here?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>98%</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>50</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>51</u>

TABLE II

Characteristics which respondents like most about public housing.

LIKE MOST

<u>Low Rent</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>30%</u>
<u>Near Family</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8%</u>
<u>Furnishing of heat &amp; electricity</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>62%</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>100%</u>

Characteristics which respondents dislike most about public housing.

DISLIKE MOST

<u>Dirt &amp; Roaches</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>23%</u>
<u>Assaults</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>12%</u>
<u>Management Policies</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>15%</u>
<u>Breaking &amp; Entering</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>50%</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>100%</u>

TABLE III

Characteristics of resident households by total number and ages of children:

<u>Total Number in Household</u>					
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3 &amp; 4</u>	<u>5 &amp; 6</u>	<u>over 6</u>	<u>Total</u>
3	13	21	12	18	66
3%	20%	32%	18%	27%	100%

<u>Number of Children 0-12 years</u>					
<u>1 &amp; 2</u>	<u>3 &amp; 4</u>	<u>5 &amp; 6</u>	<u>over 6</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Total</u>
33%	41%	14%	3%	9%	100%

<u>Number of Children 13-18 years</u>				
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>Total</u>
21%	11%	4%	64%	100%

Characteristics of residents by sex, age, marital status, and occupation.

<u>Sex of respondents</u>			<u>Age of respondents</u>				
<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>18-30</u>	<u>31-40</u>	<u>41-65</u>	<u>Over 65</u>	<u>Total</u>
	47	66	24	25	13	4	66
	71%	100%	36%	38%	20%	6%	100%

TABLE III CONT'D

Marital Status of Respondents

<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Widow</u>	<u>Divorced or Separated</u>
8	22	4	32
12%	33%	6%	48%

Occupation of Head of Household

<u>Welfare</u>	<u>Unemployed</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>Employed</u>
32	8	6	20
48%	12%	9%	30%

TABLE IV

How long respondents planned on being in public housing?

How long they plan to stay?

Under 3 monthsh	0	0
Between 3 mo. & 1 year	14	21%
Over 2 years	0	0
Don't know	52	79%
Total	66	100%

How long respondents have lived in public housing?

How long they have lived here?

Under 6 months	1	1%
Between 1 and 5 years	39	61%
Over 5 years	26	38%
Don't know	0	0
Total	66	100%

Would respondents move in public housing projects?

Would you move in again?

Yes	No	Total
8	58	66
12%	88%	100%

Did parents ever live in public housing?

Did parents live in public housing?

Yes	No	Total
39	27	66
59%	41%	100%

TABLE V

How respondents view themselves at present;

Are facilities adequate, and social agencies available?

Is living in public housing a temporary move?

Yes	No	Total
48%	52%	100%
32	34	66

As to 5 years ago are you better off now?

Yes	No	About the same	Don't know	Total
0	0	0	47%	100%
0	0	0	31	31

Are there adequate facilities for laundry, shopping etc.?

Yes	No	Total
24%	76%	100%
16	50	66

Are there social agencies available to you?

Yes	No	Total
27%	73%	100%
18	48	66



TABLE VI

Respondents feelings about living in public housing.

How do you feel about living in public housing?

Proud	0	0
Ashamed	43	65%
Don't mind	23	35%
Don't know	0	0
<u>Total</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>100%</u>

When you think of yourself in public housing, are you?

Happy	0	0
Depressed	17	26%
Nervous	21	32%
Angry	18	27%
Tense	10	15%
<u>Total</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>100%</u>

TABLE VII

Respondents awareness and feelings toward racial characteristics of public housing.

Race of respondents

Black	56	85%
White	10	15%
Total	66	100%

Do you feel there is racial tension in your project?

Yes	51	77%
No	15	23%
Total	66	100%

Does the tension bother you?

A lot	22	33%
A little	24	36%
Not at all	20	31%
Don't know	0	0
Total	66	100%

Do you fear your project will become an all Black housing project?

Yes	58	88%
No	6	9%
Don't care	2	3%
Total	66	100%

TABLE VIII

Respondents' views of irritating aspects of life in public housing.

How respondents described people who live in public housing.

Clean	Dirty	Don't know	Total
23	32	11	66
35%	48%	17%	100%

Don't quarrel	Often quarrel	Don't know	Total
7	51	8	66
11%	77%	12%	100%

Often drink	Don't drink	Don't know	Total
54	8	4	66
82%	12%	6%	100%

Are friendly	Not friendly	Don't know	Total
35	26	5	66
53%	39%	8%	100%

Is crime a problem in your project?

Yes	61	92%
No	5	8%
Total	66	100%

What is biggest crime problem?

Drugs	5	7%	Handbag thefts	8	12%
Assaults	10	15%	Vandalism	12	18%
Robbery	0	0	Other	0	0
Breaking & entering	31	46%	Total	66	100%

TABLE VIII CONT'D

Have you ever been attacked in your project?

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
You	4	62	66
	6%	94%	100%
A friend	23	43	66
	35%	65%	100%
A relative	8	58	66
	12%	88%	100%

Where in the projects do crimes take place?

<u>In hallways</u>	21	32%
<u>Dragstrip</u>	31	47%
<u>In apartments</u>	14	21%
<u>Total</u>	66	100%

Are most people in public housing law abiding or criminal?

<u>Law abiding</u>	24	33%
<u>Criminal</u>	42	67%
<u>Total</u>	66	100%

TABLE VIII CONT'D

Does it bother you to see so many vacancies?

Yes            46            70%

No             11            17%

Don't  
care            9            13%

Total         66            100%

TABLE VIV

Respondents' feelings toward management's role in security.

Is Housing Authority doing enough to protect you?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>17%</u>
<u>No</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>83%</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>100%</u>

Are you aware of the Housing security offices?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>92%</u>
<u>No</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8%</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>100%</u>

Do you feel officers should be armed?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>77%</u>
<u>No</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>23%</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>100%</u>

Should security force be expanded?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>97%</u>
<u>No</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3%</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>100%</u>

TABLE X

Respondents' reasons for complaints to management; action taken by management.

Did you ever complain to management?

Yes	59	89%
No	7	11%
Total	66	100%

Did management act on complaint?

Yes	7	11%
No	10	15%
Yes, in a week	19	29%
Yes, in a month	30	45%
Yes, after com. contact	0	0
Total	66	100%

Was complaint about?

Maintenance	28	42%
Noisy children	0	0
Noisy adults	0	0
Filth	18	27%
Vandalism	10	15%
Roaches and Rats	6	9%
Need for larger unit	4	6%
Total	66	100%

TABLE XI

Respondents' views on management policies.

Have you been hassled about rent?

Yes	51	77%
No	15	23%
Total	66	100%

Have you been hassled about eligibility?

Yes	12	18%
No	54	82%
Total	66	100%

What is the biggest change necessary by management?

Clean place up	15	23%
Exterminate	10	15%
Change manager	9	14%
Screen tenants closer	32	48%
Total	66	100%

Does management treat some families better than others?

Yes	21	32%
No	45	68%
Total	66	100%

How do you feel about management checking your income?

Like	45	68%
Dislike	21	32%
Total	66	100%



TABLE XII

Respondents' view of physical aspects of their public housing project:

Areas surrounding apartments, and landscape of open space.

Is project area too dense?

Yes        61        92%

No         5         8%

total 66     100%

Is there adequate lighting in walkways?

Yes        61        92%

No         5         8%

Total     66       100%

Would you like to see more recreational areas?

Yes        64        97%

No         2         3%

Total     66       100%

Is there a stable atmosphere here to raise children?

Yes        20        31%

No         46        69%

Total     66       100%

TABLE XII CONT'D

Does the design of your apartment give you adequate view of your landscape?

Yes            8            12%

No            58           88%

Total       66        100%

Does the design and construction allow maximum privacy?

Yes            4            6%

No            62           94%

Total       66        100%

Does the landscape give a sense of warmth?

Yes            4            6%

No            62           94%

Total       66        100%

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bauer, Catherine, "The Dreary Deadlock of Public Housing," Architectural Forum, May, 1957.

"Detailed Provisions on Public Housing," Journal of Housing, January 1, 1971.

Douglas, Paul H., Chairman, Building the American City, 91st Congress, 1st Session, House Document No. 91-34, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Editors of Fortune, The Exploding Metropolis, Anchor Book, Garden City, New York, 1958.

Fisher, Robert Moore, 20 Years of Public Housing, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1959.

Flaum, T. and E. Saltzman, The Tenants Rights Movement, Urban Research Corporation, Chicago, September, 1969.

Freedman, Leonard, Public Housing: The Politics of Poverty, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1969.

Friedman, Lawrence M., "Public Housing and the Poor: An Overview," California Law Review, Vol. 54, 1966.

Gans, Herbert J., "The Failure of Urban Renewal: A Critique and Some Proposals," Urban Renewal: People, Politics, and Planning, Bullush and Hausknecht, Editors, Anchor, Garden City, New York, 1967.

Hartman, Chester, "The Limitations of Public Housing," American Institute of Planners Journal, November, 1963.

Hartman, Chester and Gregg Carr, "Housing Authorities Reconsidered," American Institute of Planners Journal, January, 1969.

Housing A Nation, Congressional Quarterly Service, Washington, D.C., 1966.

HUD Statistical Yearbook 1967, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., 1967.

HUD Statistical Yearbook 1969, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Jacobs, Jane, The Death and Life of Great American Cities, Vintage Books, New York, 1961.

Kaiser, Edgar F., Chairman, A Decent Home, Report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Kriesberg, Louis, "Neighborhood Setting and the Isolation of Public Housing Tenants," American Institute of Planners Journal, January, 1968.

Kristoff, Frank, Urban Housing Needs Through the 1980's: An Analysis and Projection, The National Commission on Urban Problems, Research Report #4, Washington, D.C., 1968.

"Legislative History of Public Housing Traced Through 25 years," Journal of Housing, October 15, 1962.

Lowe, Jeanne R., Cities in a Race With Time, Vintage Books, New York, 1968.

Mayer, Albert, "Public Housing as Community," Architectural Record, April, 1964.

Rainwater, Lee, "Fear and the House-As-Haven in the Lower Class," American Institute of Planners Journal, January, 1966.

Rainwater, Lee, "The Lessons of Pruitt Igoe," The Public Interest, Summer, 1967.

Rainwater, Lee, "Pruitt-Igoe: Survival in a Concrete Ghetto," Social Work, October 1967.

Scott, Mel, American City Planning, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1969.

Smart, Walter, The Large Poor Family - A Housing Gap, The National Commission on Urban Problems, Research Report #4, Washington, D.C., 1968.

U.S. Census of Housing 1970, HC(VI) 1-52, Department of Commerce/Bureau of Census, Washington, D.C., February, 1971.

Weaver, Robert C., The Urban Complex, A Doubleday Anchor Book, Garden City, New York, 1960.

Wilson, James Q., editor, Urban Renewal: The Record and the Controversy, The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1966.