

RELOCATION OF ELDERLY PEOPLE

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVOLUNTARY RELOCATION OF THE ELDERLY

OF THE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

Part 3.—Camden, N.J.

OCTOBER 29, 1962

Printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1963

91883

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C. - Price 25 cents

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

PAT McNAMARA, Michigan, *Chairman*

GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
CLAIR ENGLE, California	BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey	FRANK CARLSON, Kansas
OREN E. LONG, Hawaii	WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah
MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Oregon	PRESCOTT BUSH, Connecticut
WAYNE MORSE, Oregon	JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
ALAN BIBLE, Nevada	WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
JOSEPH S. CLARK, Pennsylvania	
FRANK CHURCH, Idaho	
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia	
EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine	
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri	
BENJAMIN A. SMITH, II, Massachusetts	

WILLIAM G. REIDY, *Staff Director*

JOHN GUY MILLER, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVOLUNTARY RELOCATION OF THE ELDERLY

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey, *Chairman*

GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
OREN E. LONG, Hawaii	JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
JOSEPH S. CLARK, Pennsylvania	WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia	
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri	

FRANK C. FRANTZ, *Professional Staff Member*

NOTE.—Six hearings were held on relocation of the elderly and they are identified as follows:

- Part 1.—Washington, D.C.
- Part 2.—Newark, N.J.
- Part 3.—Camden, N.J.
- Part 4.—Portland, Oreg.
- Part 5.—Los Angeles, Calif.
- Part 6.—San Francisco, Calif.

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Pierce, Hon. Alfred R., mayor of the city of Camden, N.J.-----	235
Cahill, Hon. William T., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey-----	242
Phelan, Warren P., regional administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, region II, Philadelphia, Pa-----	243
Harger, Mrs. Eone, director, State division of housing; Julius J. Seaman, deputy administrator, public housing and development authority; Budd Chavooshian, director, division of state and regional planning; and William Blohm, Jr., deputy attorney general of New Jersey, State of New Jersey-----	251
Feinberg, Alexander, counsel, New Jersey Association of Home Builders--	272
Sirman, Rev. Willard P., Jr., minister, Broadway Methodist Church of Camden, and president, Council of Churches of Greater Camden-----	274
Stretch, Miss Jane, member, board of directors and executive committee, Greater Camden Movement-----	277
Holland, Hon. Arthur J., mayor, Trenton, N.J., accompanied by William J. Faherty, Jr., director of health, education, and welfare; Harvey Mandel, director of planning and development; Thomas D. Haley, relocation director; Michael Taddio and Louis Britton, area residents of John Fitch Way Project, Trenton, N.J-----	284
Driscoll, Mrs. Parthenia; Mrs. Mary J. Fox; Mrs. Verna Johnson; and Mrs. Etta Duple, Pitman, N.J-----	302
Griesmann, Rev. D. A., St. John's Episcopal Church, Camden, N.J-----	310
Candeub, Isadore, president, Candeub, Fleissig, Associates, Newark, N.J-----	313
Niebyl, Mrs. Elizabeth H., executive director, urban renewal program, ac- companied by Mrs. Nadine Newcome, chairman, Urban Renewal Au- thority, Glassboro, N.J-----	319

STATEMENTS

Cahill, Hon. William T., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey-----	242
Candeub, Isadore, president, Candeub, Fleissig, & Associates, Newark, N.J-----	313
Driscoll, Mrs. Parthenia; Mrs. Mary J. Fox; Mrs. Verna Johnson; and Mrs. Etta Duple, Pitman, N.J-----	302
Griesmann, Rev. D. A., St. John's Episcopal Church, Camden, N.J-----	310
Feinberg, Alexander, counsel, New Jersey Association of Home Builders--	272
Harger, Mrs. Eone, director, State division of housing; Julius J. Seaman, deputy administrator, public housing and development authority; Budd Chavooshian, director, division of stage and regional planning; and William Blohm, Jr., deputy attorney general of New Jersey, State of New Jersey-----	251
Holland, Hon. Arthur J., mayor, Trenton, N.J., accompanied by William J. Faherty, Jr., director of health, education, and welfare; Harvey Mandel, director of planning and development; Thomas D. Haley, relocation director; Michael Taddio and Louis Britton, area residents of John Fitch Way Project, Trenton, N.J-----	284
Niebyl, Mrs. Elizabeth H., executive director, urban renewal program; accompanied by Mrs. Nadine Newcomb, chairman, Urban Renewal Authority, Glassboro, N.J-----	319

	Page
Phelan, Warren P., regional administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, region II, Philadelphia, Pa.....	243
Pierce, Hon. Alfred R., mayor of the city of Camden, N.J.....	235
Prepared statement.....	239
Sirnan, Rev. Willard P., Jr., minister, Broadway Methodist Church of Camden, and president, Council of Churches of Greater Camden.....	274
Prepared statement.....	275
Stretch, Miss Jane, member, board of directors and executive committee, Greater Camden Movement.....	277

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Articles entitled—	
"Council Is Sharply Divided on Plan To Redevelop Pitman's Grove Area" and "Widow, 81, Thinks Renewal Would 'Spoil' Historic Area," from the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, October 28, 1962..	302
Letter from Mrs. Parthenia Driscoll to Senator Williams dated November 3, 1962.....	309
Reports and recommendations, Social Service Council of Greater Trenton to Trenton Housing Authority.....	293
Reports from the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development:	
ELD-63062—"Federal Low-Rent Housing, Program in the State of New Jersey—Units Reserved for the Elderly, June 30, 1962".....	256
UR-62313—Status report: "Urban Redevelopment Projects in the State of New Jersey as of March 31, 1962".....	258

RELOCATION OF ELDERLY PEOPLE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1962

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVOLUNTARY RELOCATION OF THE
ELDERLY, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING,
Camden, N.J.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, in courtroom No. 1, U.S. Court House and Post Office Building, Camden, N.J., at 10:50 a.m., Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Present: Senators Williams (presiding) and Randolph.

Committee staff members present: Frank C. Frantz, professional staff member; Jack Moskowitz, counsel; John Guy Miller, minority counsel.

Senator WILLIAMS. We will get underway now, with apologies for the slight delay.

It is a pleasure to welcome all of you to this hearing of the Subcommittee on Involuntary Relocation of the Elderly.

This is an official hearing of the U.S. Senate. A hearing of this kind is an important part of the lawmaking process in this country. It is one of the ways in which the information and ideas that local officials and individual citizens have are made available to the Congress. Everything that is said here will be taken down by an official reporter and will be considered by the subcommittee in making its report to the Senate.

During the past year the Special Committee on Aging held an extensive series of hearings on the problems of older people in this country. It was brought to the committee's attention that among the most serious problems of the elderly are those which arise from the way they are affected by the changing patterns of land use in our cities. For this reason, this Subcommittee on Involuntary Relocation of the Elderly was established to study this subject more intensively.

Most of us seem to think of relocation as a troublesome side effect of our city improvement and redevelopment programs. I think that instead it is an essential part of the whole process of revitalizing our cities. In the case of our elderly citizens, so many of whom are ill housed, it is a great opportunity to improve their living conditions.

The land uses in our central city areas are changing whether we like it or not. What we are trying to do in our urban renewal and urban planning assistance programs, and in our highway and transportation programs is to help local governments speed up and get control of this process of change and to bring out of it the best possible results.

These programs stimulate and guide the redistribution of land use, which means the redistribution of people. Our older citizens who have lived in these downtown neighborhoods, often for decades, must be considered when we find that the land that they occupy should now be used for some other purpose.

In order to plan intelligently for the redistribution of these people within the urban community we must know a great deal more than we now know. First of all we must know how many of them there are. We must try to understand the social and economic relationships, and the values that exist within these neighborhoods which are important to preserve.

I submit, and the witnesses we have heard so far have borne out, that while we realize this theoretically we have not yet found the ways to put it into practice. All too often our programs are pushed ahead with our eyes fixed on the attractive new buildings and urban scenes that will result, and with the people now occupying the land involved being only temporarily in the way.

I am not condemning planners or city officials. On the contrary, I have vigorously supported their good work to counter deterioration and blight and to marshal local resources toward civic improvement. I know that here in Camden the city administration has developed ambitious plans for redevelopment, and that Camden citizens have unstintingly given their time and efforts to the improvement of the downtown area. But Camden will be confronting these problems of displacement and it is this subcommittee's objective to try to develop the facts and, to the extent that it can be done through Federal programs, provide the tools for local officials to use in making these developments a forward step in the lives of our older citizens as well as for the rest of the community.

I am delighted that our Subcommittee on Involuntary Relocation of the Elderly can be in Camden this morning, and more than delighted to have one of our most effective senior Senators here, Senator Randolph of West Virginia.

I know the inspiring plans for redevelopment here in Camden and we all view these plans with great hope and promise for splendid growth and development.

Of course, with the urban renewal and the other growth and development programs come problems and those problems we are here to discuss, the displacement of people, and the desire to see them relocated in the best manner possible, limiting the trauma of having to move.

That is the thrust of our meetings, and, Senator Randolph, do you have an opening statement that you would like to make?

Senator RANDOLPH. I know that we are under the compulsion of time, Senator Williams. I am very happy to be in the State of New Jersey which you join with Senator Case as a representative of its people. I want to say for the record that the membership which I hold on the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Senate has given me perhaps an opportunity to study this need and problem from another approach. The highways and the expressways which are being extended in our country have contributed to this problem, and I am sure you are aware of it. I congratulate you on the hearings which have been held in your State and I am delighted to cooperate with you.

I know that these are necessary hearings and are not just pleasantries

because there is considerable impact on the elderly when they are summarily and sometimes unwisely removed from the neighborhood in which they have spent so many years. I am happy to join with you in this effort.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, Senator Randolph. We are highly honored to have the honorable mayor of Camden as our first witness, Mayor Alfred Pierce. He is one of the architects of much of the program for development in the city of Camden. We are very pleased to have you with us, Mr. Mayor. Proceed in any way you desire.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALFRED R. PIERCE, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF CAMDEN, N.J.

Mr. PIERCE. Thank you, Mr. Senator.

First, as the mayor of Camden, let me welcome such a distinguished subcommittee of the Senate to the city of Camden, to undertake an inquiry of such vital concern.

I have a copy of some statistics and some information which I think might be helpful to the committee which I will make available to the committee and relieve the committee of the necessity of my actually reading the copy, because it contains about 10 pages of information.

I think, at the conclusion of my remarks, I would like to simply file this with the committee.

Senator WILLIAMS. Fine.

Mr. PIERCE. Let me just make some comments about it. I think that we recognize that in almost every one of our old cities where we have substantially large populations, that as we face the problems of the future we must give our wholehearted attention to redevelopment.

In our own city, we are only $8\frac{1}{2}$ square miles. We have a population of 117,000. This is a rather stagnant population. It stays at about 117,000 almost in every census.

In 1930, it was 117,000; in 1940, it was 117,000; in 1950, it rose to 124,000, and in 1960, back to 117,000.

The 1950 increase we attribute to the war years when there was increased war employment in the city.

We, too, as other cities, have the increase in people who are over 60 years of age, due to many factors, the increased health attention, and many other things.

We must proceed with the help of the Federal Government to rehabilitate and to renew cities.

We are the victim of years of deterioration and in many cases blight throughout the cities. We have to compete with shopping centers in suburban communities, so that redevelopment must go on; but with redevelopment come the problems of relocating people in areas that are declared to be deteriorated or blighted.

I think that one of the primary things that can be done and should be done deals with FHA mortgaging.

In this city, and I am sure as in other cities, we find that there are many areas—call it a gray list or a black list, where areas are not eligible for FHA mortgages.

Many people, senior citizens, 60 years of age and over, continue to live in the city because the housing accommodations are much cheaper

in the city than they are in the suburban communities, and when we find it necessary to relocate people because we are trying to redevelop an area and to get additional ratables so that we can help the people in the tax burden which they bear, I think it is unfair to limit the senior citizens in the new accommodations that they try to acquire.

I think that they are placed in a category of competing with the credit background which also includes years of longevity, when the FHA makes a determination as to how long they can give them a mortgage, because it is looked at, I think, too much strictly from a business point of view.

I think aiding our senior citizens to obtain liberal mortgage payments, regardless of their age, would be a tremendous factor in helping people to move from one location to another.

But these people do have a genuine alarm and a genuine fear, because when they are uprooted by redevelopment which must go on, they have passed the prime of their life, and they are in the time period now that to go get additional financing becomes extremely difficult. I think that is the key thing.

I think that the two areas as to housing itself that must be considered are (1) the type of housing that we make available for our senior citizens.

In the city of Camden, we have had, I think, approximately 53 or 54 percent of our total dwelling units consist of row house dwelling structures.

We recognize that now, because of the increased age of our people, that people do not like to walk up and down stairs as they used to, when they get to be 60 years of age and over, so that we are placed in the position of providing new facilities, new types of facilities for our senior citizens, and I certainly urge the committee to do what it can to provide, again, liberal financing arrangements for private developers to furnish new housing for senior citizens, and, in many cases, apartment living, where our senior citizens can maintain all of their functions on one floor, and not be confronted with the problems of walking up and down stairs.

We are well aware of the liberal financing that has been made available in some of the bills that have been passed by the Congress of the United States for housing for senior citizens, but we think that the amounts are inadequate because the need of people for this type of housing is so great that it overcomes the amount that is available.

I think this is a key thing which would be very helpful to us.

I think all the rest of my remarks, Senator, are contained in this pamphlet, and I would be glad to answer any questions that the committee might have to ask.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mayor, you have in the planning stage a very ambitious urban renewal program, as I understand it.

Mr. PIERCE. Yes, sir; we have a comprehensive master plan which is a 25-year plan. We feel that this is necessary because our senior citizens who also are living on retirement incomes and who are property owners are paying taxes, and we in the cities have taxes which are too high.

In order to do something about taxes for people we have got to stop the flight of ratables from the city and bring in new ratables, and by this means we have a master plan which calls for redevelopment of

areas so that we can give this kind of assistance to our senior citizens who are living on meager incomes, so that all of these things must be considered together in order to try to render the all-round help that must be given.

Senator WILLIAMS. Have you designated your areas for redevelopment in your plan?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. By definition, they have to be described as blighted areas. Is that right?

Mr. PIERCE. That is correct.

Senator WILLIAMS. Within those blighted areas there is generally quite a lag after the designation and before redevelopment, is there not?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes; that is correct, Senator.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do the folks that live in those areas have a hard time borrowing money, if they are going to purchase a home there, or to borrow money to rehabilitate one of the homes?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes; that is absolutely the case.

I think probably because we have not made our financing statutory provisions to accommodate these people who are 60 years of age and older living on pension incomes, and also to suit their life expectancy, whether for rehabilitation or for purchase of new homes.

I think both rehabilitation and purchase are vital factors.

Senator WILLIAMS. Have you estimated the number of people who will be displaced and will present the problem of relocation for annual periods?

Mr. PIERCE. Within the next 2 to 4 years, we will probably have, we estimate, about 414 persons of 60 years of age and older who will have to be relocated.

Senator WILLIAMS. Families, or people?

Mr. PIERCE. That is people.

By 1970—I am speaking of people—we have a total of 2,000 people of 60 years of age and older, because of our increased life expectancy and so forth, that we will have to provide accommodations for.

Senator WILLIAMS. What are the programs that will cause this displacement?

Mr. PIERCE. The programs that will cause this displacement, in the specific programs, we have one highway project, an immediate project, which would be the project called the North-South Freeway and the approaches to the Benjamin Franklin Bridge, where we estimate that only 76 people of 60 years of age and older would be involved, and that would be occurring probably within the next 2 years.

Beyond that, we have housing projects and school construction, the total of which would involve a total of 414 people.

The specific projects—

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I just wanted to get in general terms what the projects are.

Mr. PIERCE. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. How about the plans for vastly improved mass transportation and rapid transit, commuter rail service? Will that have any effect on this question of dislocation?

Mr. PIERCE. No, sir; it would not have any substantial effect at this time because, on the basis of the proposals that were submitted to the

port authority existing rights-of-way are utilized primarily, and even with modifications that would be made, this would generally prove to be the case.

We have not been faced in the city of Camden with the problems of displacement of people by reason of highway construction because we have not had any new highway construction within the city of Camden for many years.

Senator WILLIAMS. But that is coming?

Mr. PIERCE. That is coming, we hope.

Senator WILLIAMS. To the extent that the mass transit plans succeed, there will be some relief of the need for additional highways, I would think.

Mr. PIERCE. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. And the mass transit expansion would use these existing rights-of-way, as you said, and this will relieve the problem of relocation?

Mr. PIERCE. That is true, Senator.

Senator WILLIAMS. Senator Randolph?

Senator RANDOLPH. The testimony of Mayor Pierce is very helpful and factual. I would like to clarify and perhaps develop one or two points.

Mr. Mayor, as to the people in these areas, in the neighborhoods, can you make any general statement in describing them?

Mr. PIERCE. The people in the area of the highway project, which will be coming up within the next 2 years, are low-income people and, generally speaking, in all of the areas that are affected by redevelopment would be in low-income areas.

Senator RANDOLPH. Would you say that, in most cases, they have been longtime residents?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes, Senator, I think that that definitely would be the case.

Senator RANDOLPH. Are they located in reference, perhaps, to the background of nationality or the background of religious affiliation? Is there any grouping of residents, as a people, who may have come here a generation before from some country or countries?

Mr. PIERCE. In the areas that are responsible for the figures which I have cited, there would be no grouping which would be primarily of a single group as to nationality.

Senator RANDOLPH. The same would apply as to religious affiliation?

Mr. PIERCE. Religious affiliation; yes.

Senator RANDOLPH. If you can generalize, are they in most instances property owners or renters of property?

Mr. PIERCE. They are both, and I would say that they are fairly well divided as to the percentage of renters versus property owners, perhaps weighed a little more on the property owners' side.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILLIAMS. I am glad you developed that point, Senator. It would seem to me that much of Camden is the single-family, or the row-house, individual ownership situation.

Mr. PIERCE. Yes, as I said before, Senator, about 54 percent of all our living accommodations are in row house type of structures.

Senator WILLIAMS. This makes the problem more acute, as these are truly rooted people.

Mr. PIERCE. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. And as James Kelly, the mayor of East Orange, said last Friday, your problem is to carry out the relocation in a way that will blend them into a new community without losing all that they have enjoyed of the old community. This is one of our greatest problems.

Mr. PIERCE. I think, Senator—if I may add—that we can well take advantage of the opportunity to provide the kind of new facilities that our senior citizens can really utilize; where they can be grouped together with people that have a common interest, where they can take advantage of a combined medical facility, of recreational facilities.

I think this is very important as we look to the future in providing facilities for our senior citizens.

Senator RANDOLPH. May I make one final comment? It is not by way of pleasantry. I think that homeownership in a city, if its level is high, contributes to a better citizenship among the population. That is not certainly a disparagement of the renter, but I think the very fact of owning a home or property makes a person a more active participant in public affairs. Is that true?

Mr. PIERCE. That is correct, Senator, yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we are most helped by your statement, Mayor Pierce. We have your prepared statement and we are going to include it in the record.

Mr. PIERCE. Thank you, Senator.

(The prepared statement of Mayor Pierce follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ALFRED R. PIERCE, MAYOR, CAMDEN, N.J.

I. OVERVIEW OF SITUATION

A. Introduction

Governmental programs such as urban renewal and rights-of-way acquisition for highways have or will alter the supply of housing available in the city. The effects of these governmental programs on housing available to the elderly is discussed in this report.

B. Definition of elderly families

Under the U.S. Housing Act of 1959, it is the policy of the U.S. Government to adequately provide for families of elderly persons in low rental public housing developments. Elderly persons are defined in this law the same as persons eligible for benefits under the Social Security Act—65 years of age for men, 62 for women, and 50 for disabled persons. The basic statistics utilized in this report refer to the 1960 census, which is already 3 years old. Therefore, elderly persons in Camden are defined in this report as heads of households 60 years of age and over in 1960 (either individuals or families).

C. Effects of Camden's housing types on housing for elderly persons

The row house is Camden's typical residential type comprising 53.3 percent of the total dwelling units; apartments, the second most numerous dwelling type, make up 24.1 percent of all dwelling units; a combination of detached and semi-detached units total another 21.8 percent of the dwelling units. These data reveal that the predominant type of dwelling unit available to elderly families who are relocated in Camden is the row house. The row house is not entirely suited to the needs of many elderly persons, because much stair climbing is required, and there may be more living space than is needed or desired. Added to this is the problem that many areas of row housing are not considered insurable under existing FHA policies. Apartments can meet the needs of many elderly families much better than row houses if the rents can be brought within their means. Yet there are not now enough apartments of the size and rent range suitable for elderly families in Camden. Of the 8,913 apartments in Camden in 1960, 1,935

units were public housing with little vacancy. An additional 100 units of public housing for the elderly will be under construction shortly. Another 1,331 units are found in private garden apartments, and the remaining 5,647 apartments were located in an either small walk-up structure, converted single-family residences, or business structures. If the citywide vacancy rate at the time of the 1960 census—4.9 percent—is applied to the entire stock of 6,978 units of private apartments, there were a possible 342 vacant apartments in Camden in 1960. Since this includes units of all price ranges, a survey would be required to determine exactly how many units are of suitable quantity and price for the needs of elderly families.

II. HOUSING NEEDS OF ELDERLY PERSONS RELOCATED DUE TO GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS IN CAMDEN

A. A typical problem area (the area bounded by Penn and Linden Streets; and 7th and 10th Streets)

1. *Estimates of elderly persons affected.*—This area will be acquired for the construction of a major highway linking the Bridge Plaza to the North-South Freeway. Block statistics of the U.S. Census of Housing 1960 show that this area contains 255 dwelling units housing 819 persons. Utilizing the citywide proportions of population distribution by age groups, one finds that 14.3 percent of the total population was 60 or more years of age in 1960. Therefore, it is estimated that this area contains 117 elderly persons. If it is assumed that half of these elderly persons live alone and half consist of husband and wife, then 78 dwelling units are occupied by elderly persons in this area. Consequently, it appears safe to estimate that approximately 80 dwelling units for the elderly will need to be provided to replace those taken for highway rights-of-way in this area.

2. *Problems of the elderly persons affected by this highway program.*—The first big problem that these elderly persons will face when construction begins is where to move. It is believed that most of these persons will wish to remain in Camden if an adequate dwelling unit is available at a price which they can afford to pay. The average value of owner-occupied units in this area is \$4,400; the average rental is \$60 per month.

If these figures could be assumed to represent the total savings (in the case of homeowners) and/or rent paying-potential of an average elderly family in this area, there would not be a great problem. These figures, however, represent the total population; presumably, younger families are earning much higher incomes than the elderly families and thus able to pay much higher rents. One can roughly estimate that many elderly families in the area can afford somewhat less than \$60 per month average of the total population. Standard rental dwelling units priced at less than \$60 per month may be difficult to obtain in the private housing market; and the availability of public housing units are limited even though public housing constitutes about 5½ percent of the city's housing supply. Thus, many of these displaced elderly persons who desire to rent rather than purchase a house, may have some difficulty in finding satisfactory relocation housing even though an additional 100 units devoted exclusively to the elderly will be built shortly in order to alleviate this problem. The problem is further compounded by the fact that residential areas in the city of Camden containing lower priced sales housing, generally that house which would be within the means of many of the elderly families displaced are not found to be insurable under existing FHA policies and criteria.

One must conclude that unless private or public programs are provided to make available standard rental and/or sales housing units for elderly families displaced by this highway construction within their means, many of these citizens may have extreme difficulty in finding suitable housing accommodations that they can afford.

B. Estimates of all present governmental programs

Table 1 contains estimates of the number of elderly persons in Camden who have been, or will be, forced to relocate because of governmental programs completed, underway or programed to begin in the near future.

TABLE 1.—Effects of governmental programs on relocation of elderly persons¹ in Camden, N.J.

	Total households (all displacees)	Total elderly persons dis- placed
Urban renewal housing projects:		
1. Kaighns Point ²	291.....	51
2. Northgate No. I ³	25.....	12
3. Rutgers University ⁴	8.....	4
4. Centerville ⁵	101 (320 persons).....	730
5. Northgate No. II ⁶	249 (789 persons).....	774
6. North-South Freeway ⁶	719 (2,279 persons).....	7216
Urban renewal school sites: ⁶		
1. Cassidy.....	43 (136 persons).....	712
2. 5th and Berkley.....	20 (63 persons).....	76
3. Bergen.....	31 (98 persons).....	79
Total.....		7414

¹ Heads of households 60 years of age and over (families or individuals).

² Relocation completed.

³ Relocation completed.

⁴ Figures from the Camden Housing Authority.

⁵ 1st stage only; additional displacement will be involved.

⁶ Estimates are based upon 14.3 percent of elderly persons and 3.17 percent persons per household of the 1960 census. (It is assumed that 1/2 of these households consist of individuals and 1/4 of man and wife.)

⁷ Estimated.

An estimated 414 elderly persons will thus be forced to relocate by the 5 urban renewal housing projects, 3 urban renewal school site projects plus the right-of-way requirements for the North-South Freeway. (NOTE.—The alinement of North-South Freeway has not been finally determined by the State highway department, but the latest proposal was evaluated.) It should be noted that this estimate of 414 elderly persons who will need to be relocated does not include the entire urban renewal program, but just projects which have been recently completed, are underway, or are programed to begin in the next several years.

III. LONG-RANGE HOUSING NEEDS OF ELDERLY PERSONS IN CAMDEN

The long-range housing needs of elderly persons in Camden can be estimated from population projections contained in the comprehensive plan. Projections by age groups for 1970 and 1980 are as follows:

Age interval	1940		1950		1960		1970		1980	
	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent
Under 5.....	7,965	6.8	12,301	9.8	13,213	11.27	13,039	10.7	14,632	11.6
5 to 9.....	8,189	7.0	10,214	8.2	10,627	9.07	12,342	10.2	12,664	10.1
10 to 14.....	10,078	8.6	8,122	6.5	10,008	8.55	11,832	9.8	11,728	9.3
15 to 19.....	11,185	9.5	7,865	6.3	8,369	7.15	9,643	8.0	11,290	9.0
20 to 24.....	11,785	10.1	9,888	8.0	7,176	6.13	8,824	7.3	10,750	8.5
25 to 29.....	10,563	9.0	11,225	9.0	7,042	6.02	7,500	6.2	8,758	7.0
30 to 34.....	8,872	7.5	10,865	8.6	7,538	6.44	6,406	5.3	8,059	6.4
35 to 39.....	8,188	7.0	9,825	7.9	8,109	6.93	6,193	5.1	6,771	5.4
40 to 44.....	8,315	7.1	8,354	6.7	8,062	6.89	6,500	5.4	5,718	4.5
45 to 49.....	8,441	7.2	7,420	5.9	7,736	6.61	6,855	5.6	5,285	4.2
50 to 54.....	7,197	6.1	7,345	5.9	6,353	5.43	6,574	5.4	5,339	4.2
55 to 59.....	5,357	4.5	6,727	5.4	6,086	5.20	6,354	5.2	5,472	4.3
60 to 64.....	4,900	3.7	5,411	4.3	5,311	4.54	5,194	4.3	5,121	4.1
Over 65.....	7,118	6.1	9,193	7.4	11,420	9.76	14,004	11.5	14,413	11.4
Total.....							121,260	100.0	126,000	100.0

Table 2 shows a steady increase in the proportion of persons 60 years of age and older as follows: 1940, 10.8 percent; 1950, 11.7 percent; 1960, 14.3 percent.

Table 3 projects the proportional size of the group of persons over 60 years of age to again increase by 1970 to 15.8 percent, but then decline slightly to 15.5 percent of the total 1980 population.

Numerical increases have been recorded, or are projected, for each census period:

Year:	Number persons over 60 years	Year—Continued	Number persons over 60 years
1940.....	11, 418	1970.....	19, 198
1950.....	14, 604	1980.....	19, 534
1960.....	16, 731		

Thus, by 1970, there is a projected need for housing accommodations for 2,467 additional persons over 60 years of age just due to the aging of Camden's population. If it is assumed that half of these persons form single person households and half consist of husband and wife, 1,645 units of housing for elderly persons will be required.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It is estimated that 414 dwelling units will be needed in the very near future to relocate elderly persons displaced by governmental programs in Camden. In addition, it is estimated that by 1970 there will be the need for 1,645 additional dwelling units to meet the needs of the growing proportion of elderly persons. A minimum total need for about 2,000 dwelling units for the elderly by 1970 is thus indicated.

To supply the housing needs of its elderly persons, Camden's predominant housing type—the row house—is not altogether suited. Some existing apartments are better suited to the living requirements of elderly persons, but even if all of Camden's present supply of apartment dwelling units are suitable for elderly persons, it is probable that not over 342 vacancies exist. Add to this an additional supplement of 100 units of public housing for the elderly and it is clear that approximately 1,600 or 1,700 dwelling units for elderly persons may be needed to be built in Camden by 1970.

Special needs of this magnitude will require a coordination of energies and funds and programs of all levels of government (Federal, State, and local) plus the efforts of private builders in order to provide elderly persons the decent living accommodations which they deserve.

A reevaluation of existing FHA programs as they affect the provision of housing for the elderly within their means, is indicated as a first step. Of particular importance is the broadening of existing FHA policies so as to provide basic mortgage insurance coverage for all areas of the city based upon the city's future plans for conservation, rehabilitation, and renewal, rather than existing conditions.

Senator WILLIAMS. I see that Congressman Cahill is here. We are happy to have Congressman Cahill with us this morning, and would be very happy to hear from our colleague in the Congress.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Representative CAHILL. Well, Senator Williams and Senator Randolph, I, of course, heard of the hearings that were scheduled here in the district that I have the honor of representing in the U.S. Congress. I had no notice of it officially and, of course, I am not listed as a witness, so I came merely as an observer for the purpose of trying to acquaint myself, as you gentlemen are of course properly trying to acquaint yourselves, with the need for legislation in the Congress of the United States in relation to the elderly of our Nation.

I recognize, of course, because I have lived in the city of Camden most of my life and because I, as a young boy, recall what occurred when the Delaware River Bridge was constructed, and what an impact it had upon all of the people of the North Camden area, and the failure to intelligently and adequately provide a solution at that time and I think Mayor Pierce and everyone else who has served as mayor

of the city of Camden would recognize this as being one of the real problems confronting the city for many decades.

I regret that I cannot stay around personally and listen to all of the testimony but I shall, of course, read the transcript of the testimony when it is prepared and when it is available from the subcommittee.

I would ask, Senator Williams, that if possible the staff members be asked to provide me with a copy of the testimony of today's hearing so that I can examine that and try and acquaint myself with the facts that are developed here.

I would say too, both Senator Randolph and Senator Williams, that we here in the First District appreciate the fact that the hearings are being held here. We also appreciate that the U.S. Senate, through this subcommittee, is demonstrating in this problem of the elderly and to the best of my limited ability, if I am given the opportunity, I shall assist in every way possible to make the road easier for those displaced persons who in any way are harmed by this new area redevelopment program.

Thank you very much, Senator Williams and Senator Randolph.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we are pleased that you joined us here today, Congressman Cahill. We appreciate your statement and we certainly will keep you advised of our findings as they develop.

Representative CAHILL. Thank you very much.

Senator Randolph, I would particularly like to welcome you to the First Congressional District as the distinguished Senator from the great State of West Virginia.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you, Representative Cahill. I am delighted, of course, to be here. I am impressed with the responsibility which we all share—you included—in the Congress to face up to these problems. They are immediate urgent problems, and cannot be delayed.

I know that you and others of the House will join with us of the Senate, in the 88th Congress, regardless of party affiliation, to make a concerted frontal attack on these problems. Too often we have handled it in a rather haphazard, hit-or-miss, piecemeal fashion.

This is a national problem. It is also a New Jersey problem and a Camden problem. I am sure that you will want to be knowledgeable on the subject, as will all Members of the Congress.

Representative CAHILL. Yes, that is why I wanted to be here today and listen to this testimony, and in the absence of my personal appearance, I appreciate your affording me a transcript of the record. Thank you very much.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, Congressman.

We have Mr. Warren Phelan here, who is regional administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, region II, Philadelphia, but serves the needs of this area as well.

We are glad to have you with us, Mr. Administrator.

**STATEMENT OF WARREN P. PHELAN, REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR,
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, REGION II, PHILADELPHIA, PA.**

Mr. PHELAN. As you have indicated, our region does cover New Jersey, also Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

The State of New Jersey has 823,000 persons 60 years of age or over. This is approximately 13 percent of the total population of the State.

In our immediate geographic area, the eight southern counties, the percentage of elderly persons ranges from 9.2 in Burlington County to 22.9 in Cape May.

Elderly citizens live in conditions varying from excellent to very poor, with a considerable number in the latter category.

The constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency are directly as well as indirectly involved in senior citizens' problems. Their problems range from financial difficulties to plain loneliness.

Housing, in the broadest sense, touches upon solutions to many of their problems.

Regardless of age levels, housing is fundamental to human well-being. It also represents a significant claim upon the income to all but the very wealthiest families.

Much of the immediate housing problem of elderly families stems from their low incomes.

In New Jersey, the 1960 census shows the median income of household heads 60 and over at \$2,600. The median income for all families is \$6,786.

Special census tabulations on senior citizens' housing expenses indicate that this group as a whole are apparently willing to devote a high percentage of their incomes to housing. A large proportion spend 32-33 percent or more. This can be misleading, however. Usually, those spending such a heavy proportion of their incomes for housing are concentrated in the lower income groups.

From this, we must conclude that they are forced to devote less of their income for some of the other items of need.

I know Sidney Spector of Dr. Weaver's office in Washington has already talked to this subcommittee and I won't repeat the information in his statement but I would like to say that our programs are directed specifically to senior citizens, include public housing, the Community Facility Administration's direct lending program, and FHA-insured housing.

From the economic viewpoint, these three separate programs aim to serve the low, the middle income, and the higher income elderly persons.

The emphasis in each of these programs is to provide design features calculated to enhance the prospects of comfortable, independent living for senior citizens.

This objective goes beyond the special design features internal to the structure. It includes all of the amenities contributing to a pleasant, convenient environment.

FHA, as you know, also insures nursing homes, and in this way serves those whose health does not permit independent living.

As the existence of your subcommittee ably testifies, involuntary relocation of the elderly is a matter of genuine concern. Very few people can accept with equanimity the necessity to uproot themselves and move to what will be perhaps a strange environment. It is basic to human nature that personal hardship or inconvenience influences us more directly than the more abstract objectives of the common good.

Meaningful progress is, I think, appreciated by nearly everyone, but legitimate personal interests dictate that family displacement is not easily accepted by the displaced.

It is especially difficult for elderly persons to accept the judgment that they must leave their homes.

Often they have lived in them for many years.

In many cases they have been there all of their adult years.

The shock of having to leave is doubtless severe.

Younger persons are more flexible. The statistics on family mobility clearly show that younger persons change their residence more frequently than those in the age group 60 and over.

In addition to the psychological impact of displacement, the fixed low-income status of senior citizens imposes limitations upon potential relocation opportunities. More pertinent to involuntary displacement are two of HHFA's programs, urban renewal and the workable program. Both of these programs impose rigid requirements upon localities as to their relocation responsibilities.

Continuous emphasis upon improving relocation standards and methods has been, I think, characteristic of our programs. We shall find still better methods in the future, I am certain.

I think it is fair to say that our standards respecting relocation are exceeded by no displacing agency at any level of government.

Urban renewal applications are given a thorough review of the family displacement and relocation resources at the earliest possible date. No other aspect of planning is more closely scrutinized during the localities' initial planning proposals. If there is any apparent feasibility question, the locality is required to submit a special relocation study prior to the application for a loan and grant contract. We must be entirely satisfied that relocation can be satisfactorily implemented.

By "satisfactory" we mean, first, that each family or individual must be accommodated within a standard housing unit; second, this housing unit must be reasonably accessible to the wage earner's place of employment; third, the housing must conform to the needs of the family in terms of its size; fourth, the sales price or rental must be within the family's ability to pay.

It is significant to note several areas affecting relocation from urban renewal which have been developing recently.

Within the past year, we have required a far more intensive analysis of relocation resources. Each locality must present data on housing expected to be available in great detail as to sizes and prices or rents. We have always had general requirements in these matters, but we can now see a more explicit pattern of resources.

The Urban Renewal Administration and the Public Housing Administration have strengthened their cooperative efforts. Where new public housing will be a relocation resource, planning is coordinated at progressive levels from start to finish. This assures that when the families are displaced, public housing will be available as needed.

The Public Housing Administration has also been emphasizing housing for the elderly, and at present in New Jersey, there are 1,294 units occupied by elderly, and 3,855 in planning.

Senator WILLIAMS. What program? This is the direct loan?

Mr. PHELAN. This is the public housing program.

We must, of course, analyze the physical and economic resources for relocation. More important are the social or, if you will, the human problems. To this end, we are making considerable progress within our agency. We have expanded our staff to include persons

educated and experienced in social work. Their responsibility is dual. They must anticipate possible problems. They must also assist localities to mobilize local assistance agencies and advise them how to deal with the problems.

I shall be candid in saying that we have no body of experience data concerning involuntary displacement of senior citizens, as such.

As I have implied in the preceding comments, however, we must be satisfied that all displacees will be treated fairly. This would include any elderly persons, of course. We have encouraged special attention to single person displacees, a classification that often includes elderly persons.

Relocation from urban renewal projects should offer an opportunity to displacees including elderly displacees.

We are never satisfied with moving families and individuals to simply equivalent conditions. Their rehousing must be an improvement over their former living conditions.

The workable program for community improvement is broader in scope than individual urban renewal projects. Again, a significant portion of the workable program is devoted to relocation. Its objectives coincide fundamentally with those of the straight title I urban renewal project programs.

Annually, every city involved in our agency's programs must submit a workable program for our review of progress and plans in certain areas affecting housing and planning. Relocation covers a broader area in the workable program. It includes displacement from any source: Code enforcement, public works, highway, urban renewal, and others.

Before any workable program can be approved, family displacement must be related favorably to relocation resources. If these resources are not considered adequate for displacement, plans for development of new resources must be made.

We have no direct control over displacement from sources other than urban renewal.

We encourage localities to assist displacees. We help them in planning, and offer our program aids whenever appropriate, but if the total volume of displacement is excessive in our opinion, we would not approve a workable program, and not permit urban renewal displacement until an equitable solution can be found.

In summary, I would say that HHFA's programs for the elderly are growing in response to a growing awareness of their needs. This awareness is also evident in our communities' increased willingness to seek the program aids available.

In the State of New Jersey, FHA has some developments completed, others in planning.

In the newer direct-loan program under the Community Facilities Administration, the section 202 program, we have been working with potential sponsors for 10 separate proposals in several cities of the State, and I have already noted the progress in public housing.

Relocation resources can be provided, particularly in the case of public housing, and under our direct loan program.

In identifying the needs of the elderly resulting from displacement, urban renewal requires detailed solutions to all displacement problems. Our requirements relative to community organization and

the emphasis on social problems will be of specific application to the elderly. In this way, we expect to offer still better services to displaced senior citizens.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Phelan, one or two observations or inquiries that come to my mind: Some of us had high hopes for the program of home rehabilitation that was part of the 1961 housing legislation. I have inquired about this at other hearings and have learned that the program has not been very much used by homeowners.

I wonder if you could give us your experience on the rehabilitation program, and any observations as to why it is not working out better, and it is not more useful.

We had a banker from Passaic tell us in Newark the other day that he thought among other things the interest rate was not realistic—this was Mr. Norman Brassler—who felt the simple bank interest rate for the lending period involved is not realistic. The rate of return is too low, there is a lot of paperwork, and this is why the bankers have not been much attracted to the rehabilitation program.

Could we have the benefit of your observations on this?

Mr. PHELAN. Well, that certainly has been one of the reasons given for disinterest on the part of lending agencies in participating more fully in this program.

Under the old title I program, they were getting from 9 to 12 percent. They get 6 percent under this program, and have not responded in the way which we would like to have seen.

I believe that one answer might well be that we have some kind of an educational program, an information program, to make them more aware of the great need for funds in this area, and we hope that even at the interest rate provided, then, they would be more willing to come into the program.

I think to some extent, it is a matter of education of the people in the field of finance.

I would like to add that I think also it is a lack of information, lack of awareness, and a lack of experience on the part of borrowers.

This is the first time into a lending institution for some of the homeowners, and they are not all well educated, even if educated are not familiar with the procedures, and so forth. So I think that education on both sides might be helpful.

I would like to add that I believe, first of all, it is a new program, and is just getting started over a relatively short period.

I am not trying to apologize for it, but I think it needs more time, perhaps, and by that I mean it is a rather complex kind of a program, the way it is set up, particularly in the urban renewal areas.

It takes a community effort to get anything really worthwhile, because one person does not want to move by himself, another does not want to move if the neighborhood itself is not moving along, so the basic requirement becomes a neighborhood or community effort to that extent and that takes a lot of time and education and development, especially against the background of a lack of experience in financial affairs.

I think that a couple of the larger cities, if I may, have made some progress.

Baltimore is doing well in a project known as "Harlem Park."

Philadelphia is beginning with large rehabilitation programs, and I think that with more education, public information, call it what you will, on both sides, it will be made to work.

Senator WILLIAMS. I am sure there must be many examples in the State of New Jersey where this community or neighborhood effort has caught on, and it is a neighborhood improvement program of individual homeowners.

Mr. PHELAN. All over the State, I think you probably heard some of those from Newark itself yesterday, when you were up there.

Senator WILLIAMS. I did not see it in Newark, but I did in East Orange.

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. It was remarkable how whole blocks have been rehabilitated by people who are acting as a community.

Mr. PHELAN. Before I came over here this morning, we had representatives from Atlantic City, not government, but citizens and business representatives there, expressing the same kind of interest in a total effort on a community basis.

Senator WILLIAMS. I imagine as a credit question, these problems you have enumerated are compounded when we are dealing with older people. Their credit opportunities are far more limited than the younger people.

Mr. PHELAN. They certainly are. But, on the other hand, I would not want the impression to be given that there are not some programs that can be used for the elderly, and I would say that as another part of public education, public information, there should be more response from communities.

We have had the direct loan program for housing for the elderly at modest income levels, just above public housing and below the luxury or so-called middle-income housing. This is a direct loan, to nonprofit sponsors, at 100 percent mortgage, up to 50 years, and we have not had many requests. We have had 10, I think I have mentioned, from New Jersey, and a few from Pennsylvania, but in response to what seems to be the need, we have not had any great surge of demand or evidence that people are willing to spend a little time. We have been anxious, we have been eager to make this kind of program work because it cuts through a very crucial cross section.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is that the 202 program?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes, that is the 202 program.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, that program is more difficult for sponsors than the FHA program because, in the case of FHA, the sponsor has the opportunity to go out and get a professional planner or developer to work with him from the beginning. Am I right in that regard?

Mr. PHELAN. That is true, yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. And this is not true under the program administered by Community Facilities? As I understand it, the sponsor under that program has to do his own work; get a plan developed, and then put it on a bid basis, and the lowest responsive bidder gets it.

Mr. PHELAN. We can do that with the CFA program now.

Senator WILLIAMS. You can?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is not my understanding.

Mr. PHELAN. I think this is part of the new policy put out by the Community Facilities Administration quite recently.

Senator WILLIAMS. We had testimony from the Reverend Lawrence Upton, who is secretary of the United Church Board for Homeland Missions.

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. And it was his feeling that this lack of opportunity for his groups to get at the outset, without bid, professional help, was a serious handicap.

Mr. PHELAN. I will check the policy and correct it if necessary, but it is my understanding that the CFA will now permit retention of professional assistance.

Senator WILLIAMS. Can you check that?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is all I have.

Senator RANDOLPH?

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Phelan, you indicated that before you would approve a workable program, you would require that the family displacement be related favorably to relocation and resources.

Would this apply only to the number of displacees or would it go into the matter of the relocation units involved?

Mr. PHELAN. Let me go back a minute. The workable program must be annually certified, must be currently in effect whenever we put in urban renewal funds or public housing money in a city.

Now, in order to get this, they must submit the workable program, which will include a relocation plan, a section on relocation, and it is very simple. The number of units must be there to satisfy the displacement across the board in total, and we are speaking of houses, homes, places for people to live.

Senator RANDOLPH. Does that include a special category for the senior citizens?

Mr. PHELAN. No, we have not touched on that yet.

Senator RANDOLPH. Do you believe that this should be given more attention, or is it embraced within your program?

Mr. PHELAN. It has been embraced, but probably should be given more separate attention now, as we have looked at other groups in the past.

For instance, minority groups, and so forth.

I think we would do well to concentrate a little while doing a good overall job, to concentrate just a little more on the elderly, because they have special problems.

Senator RANDOLPH. It would seem so, where the percentage of population to which you refer would be as high as 22, 29; is that true?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes, in one county.

Senator RANDOLPH. As regional administrator, region II, Philadelphia, you are responsible, in degree, for this region. Is that correct?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes, sir.

Senator RANDOLPH. Has there been a reluctance on the part of apartment owners to discourage the relocation of those who rent the apartments?

Mr. PHELAN. I would not think so. I would not know. I don't believe so.

Senator RANDOLPH. We have read, that there are owners of apartments in some cities who have, let us say, almost an antipathy to the programs of relocation, because the return to the owner of the apartment is very high. Although the building itself has been allowed to deteriorate, the plumbing is not modern, and the structure, in other words, is not compatible with what we call good living standards. However, the rate of return on such rental property is very high.

Mr. PHELAN. Yes, sir.

Senator RANDOLPH. So the owner, or corporation, opposes the relocation. Is that true?

Mr. PHELAN. You hear this kind of conversation.

You never get down to clear-cut cases, or infrequently do, but with this, we try to use another part of the workable program. We insist that cities have a housing code and a building code, a whole set of codes, and a program of enforcement, so that at least to the extent of the code requirements, they are thereby not permitted to let their buildings fall below the standards, and therefore—

Senator RANDOLPH. It would be an isolated case, then, in the Philadelphia area. Is that true?

Mr. PHELAN. I would think so, yes.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I would emphasize what Mr. Phelan said about the people who live in an area, and move involuntarily or voluntarily to another area, especially as it affects our elderly citizens. We have had that, Mr. Chairman, in our coal mining regions in West Virginia.

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Senator RANDOLPH. Where automation has moved in, the machine has displaced the worker. The coal tonnage is still there and the operation is a very active one. We find that the coal miner, as he becomes of more advanced age, is reluctant to leave that area and to leave his home. Oftentimes it appears that it is just hanging, almost on a hillside, but it is his home. He has lived there. So even though he has skills which can be either used or retrained to fit him for a position in another area of the State, he is reluctant to move. He fights against moving into another section of the State, where a new job is available, so this poses a problem in rural areas as well as in city areas.

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Senator RANDOLPH. In moving of the elderly, it is the human element that is involved, is it not?

Mr. PHELAN. It certainly is.

Senator RANDOLPH. It is the clothing of the figure with the person himself.

Mr. PHELAN. And it is tied together not only with the human, the emotional, the religious ties, the group ties, the family's ties, but also in a sense he has there often the only security, really, that he has. This would include some of the hospital resources or friends who can take care of him in a moment of need or even some of the pension programs that are available to him, possibly in that area, and nowhere else.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, in the committee's hearing last year in another area of the county, a woman testified. She was perhaps 72 or 73 years of age. She indicated how difficult it would be for her to go into another neighborhood, because she wanted to attend the

church that she had been attending since she was 25 years of age. She wanted to continue to worship at the church where she knew members of the congregation. This is a human problem. I am stressing it because I hope, Mr. Phelan, that you and others with you in the agency in which you practice this important function, will never forget that in all we do, we must try to recognize and have reasonable restraint as to changing of the economy which might be accomplished, perhaps, in another way with a little more planning and a bit more patience.

Mr. PHELAN. We will, I can assure you.

Senator RANDOLPH. I appreciate your statement.

Senator WILLIAMS. We are very grateful to you.

Mr. PHELAN. Thank you, Mr. Senator.

Senator WILLIAMS. Talking about displacement, we have displaced the senior judge this morning, and the record should reflect our thanks to Judge Maddon for his hospitality, for this most comfortable courtroom for our hearing.

Now we have an interesting method of hearing from four distinguished people who I, as a citizen of New Jersey, am proud to say are very knowledgeable, very experienced, very dedicated in their work, and they can help us with our problems on the involuntary relocation of the elderly.

Mrs. Eone Harger is director of the State division on aging.

Mr. Julius Seaman is director of the State division of housing.

Mr. Budd Chavooshian is director of the State division of State and regional planning.

Mr. William Blohm is deputy attorney general of the State of New Jersey, and I think it has been arranged for you to come as a group around the table, and we will discuss our problems en masse.

STATEMENTS OF MRS. EONE HARGER, DIRECTOR, STATE DIVISION OF HOUSING; JULIUS J. SEAMAN, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY; B. BUDD CHAVOOSHIAN, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF STATE AND REGIONAL PLANNING; AND WILLIAM BLOHM, JR., DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY, STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Senator WILLIAMS. We certainly welcome you before this subcommittee. It is good to see you all here, and I gather, Eone, are you quarterbacking this team?

Mr. HARGER. I think I should have my say and let the specialists carry on.

Because housing for older citizens ranks high in priority among the concerns of the division on aging, it is a special privilege to be here today. Governor Hughes emphasized on Friday the interest of this administration in services to people, especially those least able to speak for themselves. Such are the elderly who are most likely to be displaced by programs designed to rebuild the old and deteriorated parts of our communities. This theme was emphasized earlier by Governor Meyner in the opening speech at a conference on housing for an aging population held in New Brunswick in October 1961. He concluded by saying—

a tool of government that can be a blessing or a curse to the senior citizen [is] urban renewal. * * * Urban renewal has particular significance for the senior citizens in New Jersey because more than 88 percent of them live in urban

areas. The curse to the senior citizen comes about when the relocation plan is haphazard and neglects the human element and disregards the values of neighborhood. A relocation plan that provides for the building of relocation housing can be a blessing for the senior citizen.

As a State agency with the wide ranging assignment to serve as a central source of information on problems and programs of the aging in New Jersey and charged with a coordinating function in relation to such programs—although without any direct service, the division on aging is in the unique position of seeing the problems of the involuntarily displaced older person from a point of view different from that of the agency with direct responsibility.

Our observations are distilled from correspondence flowing to our office from individuals affected—such letters always referred to an operating agency; from a voluminous file of clippings accumulated over the last 4 years, including both urban renewal news stories and letters to the editor; and from a series of direct inquiries made as our staff visited communities and participated in meetings where the subject was raised. While information gathered in this fashion does not represent a “scientific sampling” it does have a “straw in the wind” quality that may prove helpful in pointing directions for future consideration.

I would like to address my remarks to four main points:

I. Greater use of State government resources in developing housing for elderly—cooperation.

II. More aggressive casework service for single elderly in relocation.

III. Special attention to older people whose sources of income, as well as their homes, are wiped out by urban renewal.

IV. Provision of more “middle income” housing to those not qualifying for public housing, including outright rent subsidies.

I. One observation is that housing and urban renewal programs are a matter of Federal-municipal relationships with no place for real State participation. While there is a State member on each public housing authority, this has little value in drawing on other resources at the State level of government. That a relationship to other State agencies, even an informal one, could be helpful, is particularly true in helping the elderly.

Of course, we would like the specialized knowledge of our division used, but we also believe the special knowledge of other agencies, particularly those involved in planning, could be used to greater benefit. The division of planning has new approaches to living arrangements and the Green Acres program has knowledge of State needs for open spaces, all of great significance to the future of our State. There are some tragedies in housing for the elderly about to occur that could have been avoided if there had been some way of involving these three State agencies in local housing plans—not only urban renewal sites but other areas looking at housing for the elderly. Federal legislation ignores such resources.

II. Another problem observed is that housing officials seem too often isolated from other community agencies that could well help older people relocate. Relocation requirements provide that families shall be cared for, but do not specify special attention for a single person. Relocation officials assure us that when they are asked for help, it is

given, but there are few requests. Workers with older people say that a different approach is needed for older people for they ask for help late and much patience is needed in handling their problem. Through remarks by housing personnel, we have a distinct impression that professional social workers are not utilized in these situations, and in plans approved by Federal agencies this might well be given some attention. We are aware that only a comparatively small number of older people in our State are on the old-age assistance rolls, the program for those over 65 carried on by the county welfare departments. The needs of relocation for this group is never reflected in reports at the State level. The State bureau of assistance believes that local welfare agencies carry out needed services effectively as part of a routine service.

If this is so, it is possible that the special skills with older people acquired by the professional social worker could be utilized by urban renewal agencies more often. Such interaction is now being promoted by the public housing commissioner, and those of us that have observed past failures of cooperation sincerely hope this is a prelude to a much closer cooperation among multiple government agencies. Such cooperation can only magnify the accomplishments of all those involved, inasmuch as no single person has enough knowledge or enough personnel to do an optimum job.

III. While most of our concern is for those who lose their dwellings, I would like to mention briefly the problem of the small businesses run by older people that are swallowed up in urban renewal projects. A release by the Small Business Administration in December 1960 stated that 25 percent of the small businesses uprooted simply disappeared. The ones with which we are familiar are those marginal little shops that supplemented the small incomes of the elderly. Dependent on the neighborhood clientele, such operations are unable to start up again in a new location and reimbursement is unlikely to equal the continuing value of the trickle of income previously available. Sometimes the loss is that of rentals from the property taken. A letter from an elderly woman several years ago told of receiving \$20,000 for four buildings from which she received \$3000 a year rent—her total income. "Where," she asked, "can I invest \$20,000 in order to receive the same income?" The economic future of such individuals is even more difficult of solution than that of finding places for them to be housed.

IV. Another area in which there is a need for new efforts is provision of suitable housing for elderly citizens who have an income too large to permit them to qualify for public housing for the elderly. While there has been an impressive program of public housing for the elderly in this State, accommodations for those with incomes just above this level is woefully lacking. There are numerous reasons for this, many of which do not offer immediate solutions. One problem is the loss of tax income to municipalities when urban renewal lands are given over to nonprofit housing. We grant the need for municipalities to look to their tax resources, but there is also a responsibility for adequate housing for citizens of long standing which cannot be morally evaded. Added to the tax problems of the governing body is the fact that rentals of much of the so-called middle income housing that is proposed exceeds the ability of the older person to pay. An exciting potential answer to this is under development in Paterson and will be

described by Mr. Seaman, but even this is not enough and I believe that a direct subsidy should be provided for those older people who cannot pay the rental necessary. Such an idea was developed in 1960 by representatives of the Department of Conservation and Economic Development and the Division on Aging, but was too new to gain immediate acceptance. It was proposed that the State initiate a program tied to the Federal title II provisions, Direct Loan for Housing for the Elderly, enlisting the support of municipalities and nonprofit groups. The division of material contribution would be as follows:

(a) Federal: Long-term capital at a subsidized interest under title II.

(b) Municipal: Contribution of building site land and agreement to take a payment in lieu of full taxes.

(c) Nonprofit group: Payment of one-half of subsidy needed to supplement rent which aged tenants are capable of paying.

(d) State: Same payment as nonprofit group.

Financial computations accompanied the proposal, indicating that rentals at \$45 or under could be achieved as well as an outstanding program of cooperation between all levels of government as well as volunteer groups. I think this proposal still has much merit and will continue to press for it at whatever time it may prove feasible. In the meantime, I would urge that the idea of a subsidy for payment of rental supplements might well be considered as an amendment to the title II provisions for housing for the elderly.

These are some of the matters related to involuntary displacement of older people that have come to our attention. Thank you for permitting this recital. If this division can be of assistance in finding solutions, we are at your service.

Those four points are the ones that I would like to leave with you, Senator. Thank you very much.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you. You will stay with us, won't you?

Mrs. HARGER. Yes. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. Proceed, Mr. Seaman.

Mr. SEAMAN. My name is Julius J. Seaman, Deputy Administrator of the Public Housing and Development Authority of the State of New Jersey.

Senator Williams, a basic responsibility of the urban renewal program is the proper rehousing of families displaced from urban renewal areas.

This statement was taken from a bulletin issued by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and tells very briefly, yet clearly, the importance of a program for relocating site occupants if urban renewal is to be successful.

In the State of New Jersey, which is the most urbanized State in the Nation, 52 communities are actively engaged in urban renewal programs. In these programs a total of 3,000 acres of slums and blighted areas will be cleared. Federal and municipal funds in excess of \$250 million will be expended for this purpose. The proposed reuse plans call for a mixture of residential, commercial, industrial, public and recreational developments.

But of paramount concern to us today is the fate of the thousands of families, and more particularly the fate of untold numbers of elderly

citizens which are being involuntarily displaced by these renewal programs.

Many statistics and much data have been previously cited in other studies, hearings and discussions on the overall housing needs of our senior citizens.

Because of this, I would like to limit my remarks briefly to a discussion of the direct loan program (sec. 202) for senior citizens and the possible use of the New Jersey limited dividend housing corporations law in conjunction with that Federal financing program.

If adequate housing is to be provided at reasonable rentals in today's market, for elderly persons or families in lower middle income groups, there are certain factors which must be considered and used. These tools which must be provided are low-interest rates, long-term amortization, tax exemption or abatement, and cheaper land cost. Each of these factors in varying degrees has a direct bearing on reducing the rentals which must be charged for proper operation and maintenance of a project.

Under the direct Federal loan program as amended by the Housing Act of 1961, low-interest rate, long-term loans are available to certain types of sponsors of rental or cooperative housing for the use of senior citizens. This program is designed primarily to meet the needs not met by public housing available for the elderly and the FHA mortgage insurance program for rental housing for senior citizens.

In New Jersey, there is a real and pressing need for this type of assistance and this type of housing program. To my knowledge for reasons which I am unable to understand, there has not been a single project built in New Jersey under this program. I am, however, aware that there is interest by various nonprofit groups in applying for the financial assistance available. Several of these groups have been in contact with my office, and in discussions with them, I have suggested the possibility of additionally utilizing the tax exemption provisions of the New Jersey limited dividend housing corporations law to provide another tool in reducing the rentals to be charged.

Basically, the limited dividend housing corporations law is a legal vehicle whereby a private corporation is specifically authorized to construct, operate, and maintain housing projects in areas where private enterprise is not supplying units in sufficient quantities at rentals at or below the average rent to be charged in the project. It is further authorized to enter into an agreement with a local municipality to make a payment in lieu of taxes of 15 percent of the rentals for a period not to exceed 50 years.

This 15 percent of rental in lieu of tax payment is equivalent to about a 40 to 50 percent normal tax payment. This reduction in taxes would have the effect of further reducing rentals about \$3 to \$4 per room per month or about \$12 to \$16 per month on a 3- or 4-room unit.

If, for example, a dwelling unit can be provided for \$80 to \$90 per month under the present low interest financing of section 202, you can readily perceive that because of the in lieu of tax payment under the limited dividend housing corporations law the rentals would be further reduced to \$68 to \$74 per month.

The combination of the provisions of the limited dividend housing corporations law, and other Federal programs, has been successfully achieved in the following:

(1) College Towers Apartments—320 units, Jersey City, N.J., insured under section 213 cooperative FHA mortgage insurance. Rentals in this project—a cooperative, nonprofit type—average about \$19 per room per month. This project has been occupied since October 1956.

(2) Riverview Towers—376 units under construction in an urban renewal area in Paterson, N.J. This is the first high-rise middle income housing development in the Nation to be constructed under section 221(d)(3) (below market rate interest program). This is also a cooperative-nonprofit type project where rentals will average \$21.50 per room per month.

In addition, several other projects of similar type are now being processed through the Federal Housing Administration and should be under construction in the near future.

In each of these cases, the apparent conflicts in the provisions and regulations of the Federal and State acts, were amicably settled with adjustments being made by both agencies in their requirements in the interest of achieving the best results for the greater well-being of our citizens.

Based on the successful combination of both State and Federal laws, which I have already recited to you, I feel sure that the housing program for the elderly as envisioned by section 202 can be greatly enhanced and be more advantageous for our senior citizens from a rental standpoint, if the tax exempt provisions of the limited dividend housing corporations law are used in combination with it.

Thank you very much, Senator.

(The documents attached to the statement follow:)

FEDERAL LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY—
UNITS RESERVED FOR THE ELDERLY, JUNE 30, 1962

REPORT NO. ELD (63062)

Department of Conservation and Economic Development, H. Mat Adams, commissioner; Division of Resource Development, Kenneth H. Creveling, director; Bureau of Housing, Julius J. Seaman, chief; compiled by Milton W. Schmidt, P. Ralph Hill

Summary

Municipalities participating.....	39
Projects:	
Occupied.....	23
Under development.....	42
Total.....	65
Units:	
Occupied.....	1, 294
Under development.....	3, 855
Total.....	5, 149

RELOCATION OF ELDERLY PEOPLE

257

Units reserved for the elderly, June 30, 1962

Location and project name	Project number	Units reserved for elderly	Status
Asbury Park: Comstock Manor.....	7-5	50	Occupied December 1959.
	7-6	60	Construction 35 percent complete.
Bayonne: Kill Van Kull Gardens....	12-5	48	Occupied September 1959.
	12-6	62	Construction 80 percent complete.
	12-7	250	Development program submitted.
Berkeley Township.....	56-1	40	Reservation.
Boonton.....	52-1	18	Final planning.
Bridgeton.....	49-2	14	Final planning.
	49-3	50	Preliminary planning.
Burlington.....	20-2	36	Reservation.
Camden.....	10-7	164	Development program approved.
Carteret: Edward J. Dolan Homes....	47-1	10	Occupied December 1961.
	47-2	50	Construction 5 percent complete.
East Orange.....	50-1	63	Construction 5 percent complete.
	50-2	24	Preliminary planning.
Edison Township.....	43-2	30	Construction started.
Elizabeth.....	3-4	250	Construction 55 percent complete.
Franklin Township.....	42-3	20	Reservation.
Garfield.....	34-3	70	Final planning.
Glassboro.....	51-2	40	Preliminary planning.
Guttenberg:			
Centennial Towers.....	36-2	36	Occupied April 1960.
Golden Gardens.....	36-3	24	Occupied November 1961.
Hackensack: Sunset Court.....	28-3	50	Occupied October 1960.
Highland Park: Park Terrace Apartments.	44-1	6	Occupied November 1961.
Hightstown: Hightstown Homes.....	45-1	6	Occupied June 1962.
	45-2	22	Preliminary planning.
Hoboken: Harrison Gardens.....	15-3	50	Occupied August 1961.
Irvington: Camptown Gardens.....	37-2	42	Occupied October 1961.
	37-3	60	Construction 80 percent complete.
	37-4	190	Preliminary planning.
Jersey City.....	9-11	282	Do.
Lakewood.....	54-1	38	Development program submitted.
Lodi.....	11-2	80	Preliminary planning.
	11-3	40	Application submitted.
Long Branch: Hobart Manor.....	8-6	57	Occupied February 1961.
	8-7	60	Construction 8 percent complete.
Morristown.....	23-3	50	Development program submitted.
Neptune township.....	48-2	50	Preliminary planning.
Newark:			
Stella Windsor Wright Homes....	2-15	128	Occupied December 1959.
	2-16	198	Construction 85 percent complete.
Otto E. Kretchmer Homes Extension.	2-17	198	Occupied January 1962.
William P. Hayes Homes Extension.	2-18	98	Occupied February 1962.
	2-19	252	Construction 85 percent complete.
New Brunswick: Samuel D. Hoffman Homes.	22-4	60	Occupied March 1962.
Ocean City.....	53-1	20	Final planning.
Passaic.....	13-3	100	Preliminary planning.
	13-4	50	Reservation.
Paterson: Christopher Columbus Homes.	21-5	29	Occupied July 1960.
	21-6	192	Occupied November 1961.
	21-7	110	Preliminary planning.
	21-8	290	Reservation.
Perth Amboy: Richard F. Stack Apartments.	6-4	48	Occupied December 1961.
Phillipsburg: Andover-Kent Towers.	24-3	36	Occupied June 1961.
Plainfield: Elmwood Gardens.....	39-2	30	Occupied September 1961.
Rahway.....	32-2	36	Final planning.
Red Bank.....	46-2	24	Suspended.
Trenton.....	5-9	152	Construction 80 percent complete.
	5-10	50	Final planning.
	5-11	200	Site selection.
West New York:			
Sunshine Gardens.....	30-3	20	Occupied August 1958.
Sunset Gardens.....	30-4	40	Occupied August 1959.
Rainbow Gardens.....	30-5	36	Occupied October 1961.
	30-6	100	Construction 90 percent complete.
	30-7	100	Preliminary planning.
Woodbridge.....	33-2	60	Final planning.

Status report—Urban redevelopment projects in the State of New Jersey as of Mar. 31, 1962

REPORT NO. UR 62313

[Department of Conservation and Economic Development, H. Mat Adams, Commissioner; Division of Resources Development, Kenneth H. Creveling, Director; Bureau of Housing, Julius J. Seaman, Chief]

Municipality ¹	Agency ²	No.	Survey and planning contract		Loan and grant contract		
			Date	Amount	Date	Loan amount	Grant amount
Asbury Park: Springwood Ave.....	H. A.....	R-1.....	October 1950.....	\$65,000	March 1959.....	\$2,847,068	\$2,362,283
Atlantic City: Northside.....	H. A.....	R-16.....	January 1952.....	49,473	January 1959.....	1,662,592	1,457,172
Bayonne: Midtown.....	H. A.....	R-67.....	March 1960.....	72,260			
Belmar: 9th Ave.....	G. B.....	R-76.....	July 1961.....	56,471			
Camden.....	H. A.....						
Front St.....		R-26.....	March 1953.....	65,627	April 1959.....	1,887,283	1,442,483
North Gate.....		R-43.....	(*).....	(*)	(*).....		
North Gate No. 2.....		R-87.....					
Marlton Pike area.....		R-80.....					
Centerville area.....		R-82.....					
Camden Campus.....		R-66.....	(*).....	(*)	(*).....		
Clifton.....	G. B.....						
Brighton Allwood.....		R-81.....					
Botany area.....		(*).....					
East Orange.....	H. A.....						
Dodd Town.....		R-36.....	September 1958.....	47,668	December 1960.....	2,439,923	1,821,006
4th ward.....		R-42.....	May 1960.....	75,164			
Brick Church.....		R-96.....					
Edison.....	H. A.....						
Potter area.....		R-11.....	January 1956.....	80,000	July 1959.....	1,196,625	993,790
North Edison.....		R-61.....	June 1960.....	35,000			301,159
Elizabeth.....	R. A.....						
Washington Ave.....		14-1.....	February 1952.....	109,000	May 1957.....	1,439,304	697,133
Pearl St.....		R-23.....	September 1957.....	49,357			
New Point Rd.....		R-64.....	December 1960.....	71,820			
Englewood: Forest Ave.....	R. A.....	R-48.....	February 1960.....	101,234			807,750
Glassboro: Elsmere.....	H. A.....	R-44.....	January 1960.....	92,234			
Glen Ridge: Bloomfield Ave.....	G. B.....	R-67.....	January 1961.....	53,931			
Hackensack.....	H. A.....						
Moore-River Sts.....		R-25.....	October 1957.....	23,282	March 1959.....	1,207,790	643,540
Central Ave.-Passaic St.....		R-41.....					
Hoboken: Lead Pencil.....	H. A.....	R-10.....	February 1956.....	59,415	July 1960.....	1,048,799	831,113

Jersey City.....	R. A							
Gregory.....		2-1	April 1950	32, 130	October 1952	2, 397, 952	2, 093, 552	
Henderson.....		R-13	do	63, 049	August 1960	2, 903, 984	2, 320, 442	
Holland Tunnel.....		R-14	February 1956	110, 000	November 1959	3, 089, 046	1, 780, 336	
Jackson Ave.....		R-12	November 1956	115, 000	August 1960	2, 057, 880	1, 636, 428	
St. Johns.....		2-2	February 1956	115, 000	September 1952	3, 247, 621	2, 521, 716	
Keansburg: Grandview	G. B	R-69	August 1961	56, 800				
Long Branch.....	H. A							
Russell Ct.....		R-15	March 1957	15, 189	August 1958	133, 933	105, 667	
Shrewsburg-River Front		R-20	December 1953	42, 923	June 1959	1, 751, 164	1, 151, 051	
Union Broadway.....		R-17	January 1957	22, 302	June 1958	474, 951	341, 564	
Morristown: Hollow area	H. A	R-2	July 1954	46, 400	June 1957	1, 248, 395	799, 372	
Mount Holly: Water St.	G. B	R-47	January 1960	63, 800				
Neptune: Atkins Ave.	H. A	R-56	May 1960	73, 651				
Newark.....	H. A							
Branch Brook Park		3-1	June 1950	96, 021	June 1953	2, 053, 377	2, 398, 177	
Broad St.....		3-2	do	62, 382	do	4, 171, 560	2, 871, 081	
Old 3d ward.....		R-6	January 1956	186, 006	January 1960	13, 081, 115	11, 354, 211	
Essex Heights.....		R-62	October 1960	143, 420				
Central Ward.....		R-32	August 1958	125, 000				
Clinton Hill.....		R-38	December 1958	50, 000				
College expansion		R-45	March 1960	133, 782				
Hill St.....		R-49	January 1960	59, 000				
Educational Center		R-50	February 1960	125, 000				
South Broad.....		R-52	June 1960	139, 680				
Newark Plaza.....		R-53	August 1950	90, 000				
United Hospitals.....		R-72	August 1961	102, 630				
New Brunswick.....	H. A							
Albany St.....		R-54	April 1960	89, 344				
Bishop St.....		4-2	July 1954	25, 000	April 1958	368, 500	186, 700	
Burnett St.....		4-1	June 1950	52, 198	May 1957	2, 945, 630	1, 845, 630	
George St.....		R-31	March 1958	72, 925				
Orange: Washington-Dodd	H. A	R-29	May 1958	71, 161	May 1960	1, 743, 334	920, 000	
Park Ridge: Station Plaza	G. B	R-78	August 1961	41, 000				
Passaic.....	R. A							
Pulaski Park.....		12-1	April 1959	75, 115	March 1955	950, 000	734, 000	
North Dundee.....		R-39	January 1959	58, 349				
Downtown.....		R-71	November 1961	124, 976				
Paterson.....	H. A							
Project Site No. 1.....		R-27	April 1954	84, 890	May 1958	4, 155, 510	3, 490, 500	
Bunker Hill.....		R-21	January 1958	51, 569	July 1959	3, 867, 470	2, 311, 075	
Central Paterson.....		R-63	October 1960	62, 870				
Perth Amboy.....	H. A							
Forbesdale.....		1-2	June 1950	56, 238	December 1952	825, 443	499, 085	
Willocks.....		1-1	do	282, 248	do	1, 135, 603	856, 922	
State St.....		R-15	February 1956	97, 000	June 1960	1, 101, 144	612, 576	
Phillipsburg: Fayette St.	H. A	R-8	September 1955	60, 000	July 1958	649, 596	571, 076	
Plainfield.....	H. A							
South 2d St.....		10-1	April 1953	38, 000	May 1958	175, 108	142, 860	
Madison Park.....		R-53	(?)	(?)				
Watchung.....		R-75	(?)	(?)				

See footnotes at end of table.

Status report—Urban redevelopment projects in the State of New Jersey as of Mar. 31, 1962—Continued

Municipality ¹	Agency ²	No.	Survey and planning contract		Loan and grant contract		
			Date	Amount	Date	Loan amount	Grant amount
Princeton: John St.	H. A.	R-4	August 1955	70,000			
Rahway: Lower Main St.	R. A.	R-60	April 1960	72,500	February 1962	2,133,750	801,862
Stanhope: Main St. area	R. A.	R-77	July 1961	52,133			
Trenton	H. A.						
Coalport		13-1	September 1951	51,000	December 1955	2,248,711	1,831,361
John Fitch Way		R-59					
Project 1959-60			June 1960	38,000	June 1960	6,641,911	3,038,175
Project		2	July 1961	44,500			
Do		3	do	174,275			
Union City	H. A.						
Washington Park		R-3	August 1955	45,000	June 1959	961,587	743,702
Ice House area		R-70	August 1961	49,500			
Wayne: Pequannock	H. A.	R-33	December 1958	73,262	(³)	(³)	(³)
West Orange: Municipal Sq.	G. B.	R-86	August 1961	77,314			
Woodbridge	R. A.						
		R-73					26,727
		R-95					
Total				5,260,662		81,144,709	58,349,337

Municipality ¹	Project details					Proposed reuses				Status
	Acreage	Estimated gross cost	Estimated net cost	Estimated Federal grant	Estimated municipal share	Public dwelling units	Private rental dwelling units	Private sale dwelling units	Other	
Asbury Park: Springwood Ave.	50.2	\$3,961,000	\$3,513,293	\$2,386,000	\$1,171,098	0	200	110	Commercial, parking, playground,	25 percent demolition.
Atlantic City: Northside	25.7	2,305,393	2,099,973	\$1,404,449	704,274	0	0	95	Commercial	Sale contract executed.
Bayonne: Midtown	13.5	5,845,333	5,054,333	3,791,000	1,263,333				Public building parking	Appraisals.
Belmar: 9th Ave.	21.6	1,492,300	1,256,000	942,188	313,812				Commercial	Preparing loan and grant application.

Status report—Urban redevelopment projects in the State of New Jersey as of Mar. 31, 1962—Continued

Municipality ¹	Project details					Proposed reuses			Status	
	Acreage	Estimated gross cost	Estimated net cost	Estimated Federal grant	Estimated municipal share	Public dwelling units	Private rental dwelling units	Private sale dwelling units		Other
Mount Holly: Water St.....	41.8	1,397,396	1,037,192	\$ 776,460	240,732	-----	-----	-----	Industrial and office building.	In litigation.
Neptune: Atkins Ave.....	17.3	1,304,000	673,200	565,369	60,300	60	80	30	Commercial.....	Preparing loan and grant application.
Newark										
Branch Brook Park.....	20.6	4,000,586	3,454,886	2,303,257	1,151,629	-----	560	-----	Commercial, school, church.	Completed.
Broad St.....	22.6	5,287,803	4,454,078	2,969,385	1,484,693	-----	680	-----	Commercial.....	Do.
Old 3d ward.....	154.8	19,126,871	17,399,967	\$11,354,211	6,383,756	-----	2,160	-----	Rehabilitations, parking, school, playground.	75 percent demolished; preparing amended loan and grant application.
Essex Heights.....	47.3	13,933,100	9,988,100	\$ 7,385,573	3,329,367	-----	1,350	-----	Commercial.....	Awaiting approval of loan and grant application.
Central Ward.....	241.0	17,155,548	14,905,548	\$10,337,032	4,968,516	-----	141	-----	Industrial.....	Amended survey and planning application filed.
Clinton Hill.....	17.0	2,985,085	2,412,335	\$ 1,669,255	804,110	-----	50	-----	Rehabilitations.....	Loan and grant application.
College expansion.....	54.1	12,027,399	10,692,390	\$ 7,966,886	3,564,133	-----	-----	-----	Educational.....	Loan and grant application filed.
Hill St.....	12.9	6,180,279	5,286,022	\$ 3,731,515	1,762,007	-----	400	-----	Commercial.....	Do.
Educational Center.....	17.3	5,260,000	4,425,000	\$ 3,010,800	1,475,000	-----	-----	-----	Educational.....	Preparing loan and grant application.
South Broad.....	35.6	10,355,100	9,088,460	\$ 6,696,373	3,029,487	-----	1,500	-----	Commercial.....	Do.
Newark Plaza.....	50.0	-----	-----	4,003,133	-----	-----	1,500	-----	do.....	Do.
United Hospitals.....	29.0	6,161,620	5,166,720	\$ 3,541,980	1,722,240	-----	-----	-----	Medical center.....	Survey and planning application approved.
New Brunswick										
Albany St.....	17.0	4,000,000	3,000,000	2,250,000	750,000	-----	-----	-----	Rehabilitations.....	Preparing loan and grant application.
Bishop St.....	5.2	465,000	280,000	186,700	76,000	-----	168	-----	Cooperative.....	Completed.
Burnett St.....	10.0	3,687,453	2,973,453	1,982,302	991,151	-----	-----	-----	Commercial.....	Preparing for sale.
George St.....	22.0	4,800,000	3,900,000	\$ 2,681,000	1,300,000	-----	500	-----	do.....	Preparing loan and grant application.
Orange: Washington-Dodd.....	47.0	3,475,077	2,549,077	1,699,384	849,693	-----	-----	-----	Rehabilitations, commercial, industrial.	85 percent land acquired.
Park Ridge: Station Plaza.....	10.5	430,843	330,843	248,132	82,711	-----	-----	-----	Commercial.....	Appraising.
Passaic										
Pulaski Park.....	12.0	1,282,000	1,101,000	734,000	367,000	-----	144	-----	School, park, parking	Completed.
North Dundee.....	24.0	769,000	706,000	\$ 492,000	235,000	-----	48	-----	Rehabilitations.....	Loan and grant application approved.
Downtown.....	178.8	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	Commercial and parking.....	Survey and planning application approved.

Paterson											
Project Site No. 1.....	45.7	4,628,894	5,834,408	¹ 4,108,520	1,944,608	498	800			Commercial, park, school, playground, parking.	100 percent demolished.
Bunker Hill.....	35.0	4,396,847	3,018,501	¹ 2,311,075	783,426					Industrial	Favorable Supreme Court decision.
Central Paterson.....	35.3									Commercial	Preparing loan and grant application.
Perth Amboy.....											
Forbesdale.....	47.5	1,565,104	1,238,746	499,085	739,650		220			Commercial	Completed.
Willocks.....	12.0	1,373,823	1,070,822	866,922	213,900		275			do	Do.
State St.....	10.5	1,295,678	807,110	¹ 637,763	269,037					do	Land 70 percent acquired.
Phillipsburg: Fayette St.....	20.0	884,014	753,054	¹ 571,076	285,538					Industrial	Ready for sale.
Plainfield.....											
South 2d St.....	1.7	251,373	234,373	156,243	78,125					Park, playground	Complete.
Madison Park.....	4.5	4,549,640	3,749,950	¹ 2,834,775	937,488					Commercial	Filed loan and grant appli- cation.
Watchung.....	1.5	348,331	288,131	¹ 227,448	72,033					Court and public	Part I loan and grant filed.
Princeton: John St.....	8.5	1,037,770	652,066	463,210	217,000					Park, commercial, through street.	Preparing loan and grant application.
Rahway: Lower Main St.....	75.3	2,336,737	1,323,549	992,662	330,887		600			Rehabilitations	Loan and grant application filed.
Stanhope: Main St. area.....	7.5									Commercial	Survey and planning appli- cation approved.
Trenton.....											
Coalport.....	25.7	3,147,000	2,747,000	¹ 1,831,361	878,000					Light industry	Completed.
John Fitch Way.....											
Project 1959-60.....	50.0	8,020,716	4,557,263	¹ 3,178,458	1,519,088					State-county office building.	80 percent demolished.
Project.....	10.0	1,893,900	1,023,900	¹ 709,800	341,300					Commercial, park	Planning.
Do.....	42.5	7,217,000	5,355,000	¹ 3,746,200	1,785,000					Commercial, office building.	Do.
Union City.....											
Washington Park.....	11.5	1,256,724	1,024,286	683,857	341,429		300			Playground, school	School construction started.
Ice House area.....	14.2									Rehabilitations	Survey and planning appli- cation approved.
Wayne: Pequannock.....	90.3	5,552,000	2,289,500	1,526,333	763,167					Industrial	
West Orange: Municipal Sq.....	19.6	1,818,500	1,410,375	1,057,781	352,594		200			Public use, commercial	Preparing loan and grant ap- plication.
Woodbridge.....											
	60.0										
	88.0	40,090								Community renewal	Completed.
											Survey and planning appli- cation submitted.
Total.....	2,941.3	251,567,643	202,150,696	145,276,622	65,854,548	1,074	17,138	1,275			

¹ In addition to the municipalities listed above, the following agencies have also been designated to carry out urban renewal programs in their respective localities; no statistical data is available at this time because initial studies are being undertaken to determine the scope of their problems: Berkeley Housing Authority; Berkeley Heights Redevelopment Agency; Bloomfield governing body; Bordentown Redevelopment Agency; Bridgeton Redevelopment Agency; Garfield Redevelopment Agency; Harrison Housing Authority; Lodi Redevelopment Agency; Meadowlands Redevelopment Agency; Montclair Redevelopment Agency; Norwood Redevelopment Agency; Ocean City Redevelopment Agency; Pennsauken Redevelopment Agency; Pleasantville Redevelopment Agency; Red Bank Redevelopment Agency; Scotch Plains Redevelopment Agency.

² Agency: H.A., Housing Authority; R.A., Redevelopment Agency; G.B., governing body.

³ Federal grant includes relocation funds.

⁴ City using own funds.

⁵ Rutgers College funds.

⁶ Not available.

⁷ City planning.

⁸ Project terminated by URA; Federal funds supplied for flood control in same area.

Source: Bureau of Housing; Department of Conservation and Economic Development; Julius J. Seaman, Chief.

Senator WILLIAMS. I think we will hold any questions until we have had the whole panel's presentation.

Who is next?

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. My name is B. Budd Chavooshian, director of the division of State and regional planning.

In New Jersey, during the period 1950 to 1960, the number of persons aged 65 and over rose from 394,000 to 560,000, a striking increase of 42 percent. While the percentage of the total population who were senior citizens was 8.2 in 1950, in 1960 this percentage reached 9.2.

These statistics, reflecting the ever-increasing growth of our aging population, portend a serious housing problem, both for the elderly in general, and for those who have been displaced by urban renewal and other public actions in particular.

By way of background to the problem we are facing, I might relate that according to a recent survey conducted in nine counties in northeastern New Jersey, total displacement as a result of actions such as public housing, title I redevelopment, and Federal-aid interstate highway construction, could well involve over 34,000 dwelling units between 1960 and 1970. It has been estimated that well over 42,000 dwelling units will be displaced throughout the entire State within the coming decade, a figure which could involve 137,000 people including approximately 14,000 senior citizens.

As a result of this same survey, it was found that displacement would not only occur as a result of clearance programs but through mandatory rehabilitation which would call for an increase in rent.

By means of this survey, it was found that, next to the nonwhite, households with elderly persons would be the hardest hit by rehabilitation programs calling for an increase in housing costs. Of the individuals over the age of 65 found among all sample households, two-thirds were in households which would be displaced by a rehabilitation program costing more than \$500 per unit. Between 1960 and 1970, assuming a rehabilitation cost of \$3,000 per unit, it is likely that such programs may cause the displacement of between 2,000 and 6,000 elderly persons in northeastern New Jersey.

The tendency for a large proportion of our elderly citizens to live in the path of public action programs, coupled with the fact that this segment of our population constitutes a specialized housing market, compounds the situation. Generally, the elderly are of low income. They have special medical needs. Some may not be able to pay the minimum rents established for entrance into public housing. And even among those who are homeowners, some may not be able to repurchase and keep up mortgage payments after dislocation, while the likelihood of their income increasing diminishes over the years.

Federal programs designed to alleviate some of these disadvantages have not always met with complete success. The direct loan program authorized under title II of the Housing Act, which provides for direct Federal loans to "private nonprofit corporations" for the construction of rental housing for senior citizens, does not easily achieve the \$30 to \$50 per month rent which can be paid by senior citizens most in need of housing and likely to be displaced. The mortgage insurance program for individual elderly borrowers, under section 203 of FHA, has not been adequate simply because those senior citizens most able to make the amortization payments generally are

homeowners and are most likely to be able to enter the competitive housing market. And so on.

Presently, although public housing has assumed a large role in caring for our displaced elderly citizens, and although not enough of them are being built to take care of the relocation load which we perceive, consideration might be given, in the case of the elderly, to reducing or even eliminating the minimum rent requirement for entrance.

It is paradoxical that a significant number of our elderly cannot be admitted into public housing because they cannot afford to pay a minimum required rent. Consideration should also be given to the issuance of rent certificates.

Although such a program does not necessarily increase the volume of housing in the low rent category, this form of subsidization may very well help to give our senior citizens some choice in selecting the type of private homes in which they wish to live.

Another alternative would be a direct lending program, wherein the terms of the loan would be quite liberal. This type of program would allow for adjusting the extent of the subsidy; unlike the rent certificate program, it would also tend to insure new construction to some degree.

In addition, consideration should be given to increasing relocation payments to elderly families who are displaced from title I project areas, because it will be very difficult for them to reestablish a new pattern of living after they have been forced to move. Further, consideration should be given to granting relocation payments to all families who will be displaced because of the construction of highways and other public actions, to whom relocation payments currently are not granted.

No one can be sure how effective any of the programs suggested above might be in alleviating the problems faced by our aged population in the wake of public action programs causing dislocation. But we do know that nothing must be left undone in the attempt to assure adequate housing for our senior citizens.

There is another side to this problem that we often forget—the human side. Great care must be taken in the relocation process that the lives of our elderly are not totally disrupted. Very likely they have lived in the same neighborhood for a good many years. They have sentimental attachment to their old community. Now they are to be torn away from friends, family, the church, and services they have grown accustomed to receiving. These ties cannot be broken easily. Consequently, in any plan for the relocation of our senior citizens exceptional attention should be given to their specialized needs and wants.

Further, in terms of present Federal planning programs, the community renewal program can contribute greatly toward eliminating a number of problems associated with relocating our senior citizens. This program requires, among many other things, that relocation demands be considered well in advance; thus communities are provided with more time to prepare an adequate program, especially for our elderly, who, as has been pointed out, comprise a large proportion of our displacees.

The CRP, further, examines all of a community's resources, social as well as financial, in planning future programs.

Of special significance here are those programs designed to meet the needs of the elderly in a manner which has not been utilized heretofore. For example, the planning of old age relocation housing, through methods discussed above, may result in less institutionalized projects, distributed throughout the community in a manner allowing our aged to assume an active social role in the community. Such a role would allow the aged to assume, domestic chores and the like, thus supplying a need which has always existed. Such activities would help the elderly remain productive and useful, rather than being segregated in large institutional projects.

We in New Jersey feel that it is this type of thinking which must be given more and more attention if we are to reinvigorate our cities, make them human, and do the right thing by our country's elderly citizens.

Thank you, sir.

Senator RANDOLPH (presiding). Thank you, Mr. Chavooshian.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator RANDOLPH. We will continue. Mr. Blohm, would you proceed?

Mr. BLOHM. Thank you, Senator Randolph.

I am William Blohm, Jr., deputy attorney general assigned to the State housing council and to the State housing bureau.

Recently, inquiries have come to our office with respect to the legal interpretation of nonprofit corporations in the State of New Jersey. In particular, church organizations are evidently interested in building for the elderly. And under the Federal rules as I understand it, they must apply as a nonprofit organization.

We, in New Jersey, are suggesting that the answer be that they use the Limited Dividend Act, which act, of course, permits payment in lieu of taxes.

At the present time, as Mr. Seaman has pointed out, College Towers Apartments in Jersey City is operating under this act successfully. A review of the charter or the incorporation papers of College Towers Apartments reveals that the members of the corporation there have agreed that they would operate as a nonprofit corporation.

Even though our State act provides that the corporation is limited to 8 percent in dividends, it is my opinion that the corporation papers could state that they are to take no dividend, and that they are to act as a nonprofit corporation.

If this corporation style were to be followed by the churches and other groups that are interested in organizing a nonprofit corporation, it is my belief that the questions that have been raised by the prior speakers would be answered, in particular the idea of being able to reduce the rent, so that they would be comparable to the amounts that the elderly can afford to pay, and, therefore, it is my opinion that if these organizations, nonprofit organizations, would make use of the Limited Dividend Act in this State, that it would be one aid in accomplishing the problem of trying to help the elderly.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you very much, Mr. Blohm. Mr. Seaman, your statement included a belief that there is a real and pressing

need for a certain type of housing. You indicated that this type of housing which is now available under the provisions of the law is not being embraced, and you indicated also that you could not say why it was not being used.

Could you enlarge on that, sir?

MR. SEAMAN. Well, Senator, I think that in my statement I made the remark that to my knowledge not one single project in the State of New Jersey had been built under section 202 of the National Housing Act, and I am amazed, as I say, because this is a program which was designed primarily to be of great assistance to the elderly, and I know from statistics available in our State that there is a great need for this kind of a program.

Now, several organizations have already been in contact with my office, and I have in mind one in particular which has submitted an application to the Community Facilities Administration, and, in the course of the correspondence, I was notified several days ago that their interpretation of the limited dividend housing corporations law and the regulations of the Federal act were such that the corporation could not be nonprofit under that act, and that is the reason I am stressing the point today, because in other Federal programs where we have worked in conjunction with the FHA in section 213 and also with the FHA in conjunction with section 221(d)(3), in each instance the Federal agency was able to interpret the fact that the limited-dividend law could in effect be used for a nonprofit situation, and I think that was expanded by the Attorney General.

So I am offering this today because I think that with the use of the limited-dividend law, and the low interest rate of section 202, that there are church organizations and that there are nonprofit organizations which should be advised that this can be done, and I am sure if this is the case, then the housing that is needed within the rentals that these people can afford to pay can be produced. The money is available under the Federal program. It is a shame that it has not been used.

Senator WILLIAMS (presiding). Well, do you think this can be done under the present law?

Mr. SEAMAN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. It just takes regulation?

Mr. SEAMAN. It does not even take a regulation, sir. The Attorney General was speaking while you were out, and he said that it could be provided for in the terms of the certificate of incorporation for the corporation. That even though the State act says that they are entitled to up to 8 percent dividends, which makes it a profit organization, that if the terms are written into the certificate of incorporation, that it be nonprofit and no dividends be taken, that that should be interpreted and can be interpreted so that it would be eligible, we think, under the Federal act, for nonprofit.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, it would not meet the State law provisions?

Mr. BLOHM. Well, there is nothing in the State law that says that you have to take the dividends.

Senator WILLIAMS. The advantage here is a tax advantage.

Mr. BLOHM. That is correct, sir.

I just want to add one thing. While you were out, Senator, I pointed out to Senator Randolph we have in Jersey City a project which has been operating for years where they have a provision in their incorporation that they are not going to take any profits, and, of course, the result there is that they have low rentals.

Senator WILLIAMS. I sure hope that this is working out.

Are you working on it?

Mr. SEAMAN. We are, Senator. The last bit of correspondence on it was only last week, in which the local agency or the one who had submitted the application was notified of a contrary interpretation that limited-dividend law could not be used for a nonprofit use.

Senator WILLIAMS. Who made that ruling?

Mr. SEAMAN. It came out of the Community Facilities Administration of Philadelphia, and this was—

Senator WILLIAMS. Have you talked this over with Mr. Phelan?

Mr. SEAMAN. I have not had the opportunity yet. It is so recent that it is just a chance, and I want to make the point that we think it can be used, and it is a matter of adjusting regulations and provisions of our act as against the Federal regulations.

I want to point out that we have done that successfully with other Federal programs, and I think we can do it in this particular case.

Senator WILLIAMS. It sounds promising.

Senator RANDOLPH. May I just continue this line of thought for a moment?

Mr. Seaman indicated that the rental would be in the area of \$68 to \$74 a month, which was an amount that could be paid by senior citizens. Can these people afford \$68 to \$74 a month? Mrs. Harger, has your division on aging studied this?

Mrs. HARGER. I doubt if very many of those that are being displaced could. However, I think that it is possible you can get apartments lower, using this program, if you make them utility apartments.

You see, the real need that we have for older people is not the two- and three-room apartment. We need what they call—some people call it—the utility apartment. There are various names for it—but there are very many single individuals, and our apartments have not been planned that way until recently. We need lots and lots and lots of these, and I am sure that those could be considerably less, and these people could pay the rents.

However, when I was testifying, Senator, I suggested that there needed to be a program of direct subsidy for people who could not afford these rents. This is something that is missing in our laws, and we have looked at this in the State, have not been able to work it out yet, but I was suggesting that while we are still interested, that perhaps the Federal Government should take a look at this kind of proposal also.

Senator WILLIAMS. You have given us, certainly, a great deal of grist for our mills, and have been most helpful.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Chavooshian raised a point that I would like to have him expand further.

He stated that in the next 10 years, or approximately 10 to 12 years, we would have 42,000 dwelling units which would be demolished in the State of New Jersey.

How did you arrive at that figure?

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Senator Randolph, we have been conducting a survey of the nine northeastern New Jersey counties.

Incidentally, this was done as a demonstration project with a two-thirds grant from the Urban Renewal Administration, section 314 of the Housing Act, and based upon samplings and surveys and projections and analyses of various programs in the 9 counties, we have come to the conclusion—and it is really an estimate, frankly—that 34,000 dwelling units in the 9 counties and the 42,000 is projected across the entire State, will be cleared by public housing, urban renewal, and the Federal-aid and interstate highway programs.

These were things that we knew were going to happen, and we have enough evidence to show us approximately to what magnitude these will occur. This was how we arrived at the 42,000 figure, but at least one important aspect of these public action programs was left out perforce, because we had no information on the highway programs undertaken by the State, county, and municipalities, other than the Federal-aided Interstate System.

Senator RANDOLPH. The actual highway development program may perhaps cause half of this number.

Is that a possible figure, Mr. Chairman?

Senator WILLIAMS. How do our staff people view that?

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Now the Federal-aid interstate highway program, Senator Randolph, would cause about half of this, you would say?

Senator RANDOLPH. I would not say the interstate program alone would cause it, but interstate plus the primary road programs could do so.

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Yes.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Forty to fifty percent.

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Particularly in our metropolitan areas, such as northeastern New Jersey. This would be a very significant dislocation problem.

Senator RANDOLPH. You speak of 14,000 senior citizens. Is that based on 137,000 persons?

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Yes, sir, we use approximately 10 percent there.

Senator RANDOLPH. I can see that your survey and your planning have been conceived and carried forward in some depth.

I appreciate the fact that you have tried to find these answers. It is not only the changed pattern of living, but the scope and depth of the change that makes and gets the impact, on the senior citizens. Is this correct?

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Yes, sir.

Senator RANDOLPH. It is abrupt and sometimes it is quickly brought into being, is it not?

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. When you develop a figure of this type, it certainly does. The primary purpose of the survey, Senator, was to determine what are the regional implications of urban renewal when you take a large metropolitan area such as northeastern New Jersey.

In other words, if Jersey City undertakes an urban renewal project, it has ramifications, an impact across the entire region. The kind of reuse it plans for, residential, industrial, or commercial, is to a great extent what happens in the entire region, in the pattern of what takes place in Jersey City.

The housing market, for instance, is a very important matter.

Now, there are cities, of course, that will not be able to solve all of their relocation problems within their own municipal boundaries. Some relocatees will spill over the metropolitan area into other municipalities. Well, how much of it will spill over? How much of it can be taken care of by other municipalities? And are other municipalities also faced with the same problem? These other municipalities think their problems are going to spill over. And there are municipalities who are planning and zoning against families who are being displaced from slum clearance project areas, so, therefore, this creates another problem. Our effort here was to try to give a broad picture of the entire north Jersey region, so that when each individual municipality undertakes its urban renewal program, it will be done within a frame of reference in terms of what is happening in the entire region.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will you indulge me in one final observation and perhaps a couple of questions?

Mrs. HARGER, Mr. Seaman, Mr. Chavooshian, and Mr. Blohm, do each of you agree that the laws, Federal, State, and local, are sufficient? Can we operate this program effectively for senior citizens within the existing framework, to use the word Mr. Chavooshian has used? Are the statutes adequate, with the exception, as Mrs. Harger suggested very appropriately, of the subsidy element that might be considered in the future? Is there any disagreement on that point?

Mrs. HARGER. I don't think that they are entirely adequate. I am not prepared to give all the points, but I do think that when I started out I said I feel that the Federal laws bypass the State laws, and I think this is what has been illustrated by what my cohorts here have been saying, that there ought to be some better way of utilizing the sort of information that we have.

The Federal people don't coordinate closely enough with what we have to offer at the State level, has been my impression.

Senator WILLIAMS. That brings me to a question, too. Now, we have 52 communities in New Jersey that are in the urban renewal program one way or the other. We do not know how many communities will face problems of dislocation and relocation because of the highway development, but certainly, each day, there is increased experience in the question of relocation.

I just wonder, is there any gathering place of experience, is there any place where a new community in urban renewal or a community now that is going to have a highway running through it, can go to at least get the benefit of the experience we have to date? Is there any gathering place of experience in what happens and how best to handle it, and how relocation can be made easier? Is there any place for communities to go?

Mr. SEAMAN. Not on the State level, Senator, at the present time. It is probably something that should be gathered. It is a relatively new program, as far as we are concerned. In fact, at the present time, we are engaged in a survey to ascertain just how many units are built for the aged, all over the State, in all the communities of the State, and where we have been making a mailing survey, and we hope to start getting the information in soon so that we will have some idea as to the quantity of units that are being built.

We have statistics on the urban renewal programs that are developing in the State, but we do not have anything at all on the dislocation of the people. That would be only on a local basis, and we yet on the State level have not brought it together and coordinated it.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would think that there should be a body of case history here that would be useful to a community that is now for the first time faced with this problem.

Now, take Camden, here: I wonder where they would go to get all the experience that other communities have had?

Does the Housing and Home Finance Agency have a service, so to speak, to communities to help them with advice and counsel on relocation programs?

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Well, Senator Williams, I won't speak for the HHFA, but between Mrs. Harger's program and Mr. Seaman's programs and our program, we have, we believe, gathered sufficient—perhaps not sufficient, but considerable information which will help municipalities, but as Governor Hughes has pointed out, this is one of the reasons why he wants to establish a department of community affairs, to bring together all of these programs and properly coordinate them so that a better service can be rendered to the local unit. This service is being rendered today, but unfortunately by a hit-or-miss method by Mrs. Harger, or Mr. Seaman, or ourselves.

Senator WILLIAMS. Fragmented.

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Now, I had something and lost it.

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Senator Williams, may I respond to Senator Randolph's question as to the laws?

Senator, if you mean the laws that are presently on the books, perhaps they are adequate. I really don't know. But I believe it would require law to grant relocation payment to families who are being dislocated by other public actions.

This, I feel, is a shortcoming.

It is another shortcoming that even under the present urban renewal program, where all families are assisted financially in moving to homes, I believe—and I sincerely believe on the basis of my prior experience as urban renewal director in Trenton—that elderly families and elderly couples and elderly people, who have purchased a home, in what has now become a slum area, for \$2,000, and then let us say they are offered \$5,000 in fair market value, these families unfortunately cannot go out on the open market and purchase a home that will be satisfactory to them in every way, primarily financially. If they buy another house for, say, \$6,000 or \$7,000, they still have to pick up a mortgage of \$2,000 or more, and this is the big problem. They have not the financial means to meet this new problem.

So, something should be done, because the relocation problems of the elderly are much more unique than any other group who are forced to move out of the urban renewal project area.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Has the city of Camden approached you in any of the problems of their urban renewal program? Any of you? If so, what particularly?

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Not with regard to relocation, Senator, but they have approached us with respect to their overall comprehensive planning program and their community renewal program. The State of

New Jersey offers a one-ninth grant to the local unit who wishes to prepare a community renewal program. We offer both technical and financial assistance.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do most of these urban renewal programs in the various communities have a relocation bureau or service or whatever you would call it?

Mr. CHAVOOSHIAN. Where they have an urban renewal program underway? Yes, sir. Senator, I believe it is required by the HHFA.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we are most grateful to all of you for your testimony.

We have another distinguished son of New Jersey, and if the cameraman will turn up the lights we will hear from Alexander Feinberg, who is here as a representative of the New Jersey Association of Home Builders.

STATEMENT OF ALEXANDER FEINBERG, COUNSEL, NEW JERSEY ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS

Mr. FEINBERG. Senator Williams, Senator Randolph, I wish to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation on behalf of the New Jersey Association of Home Builders for extending us this privilege to be heard.

At the outset, let me tell you now that I shall be very brief and for many reasons.

I think that much of the statistics that your committee is seeking has been given to you by other witnesses, who are perhaps in a much better position to submit these statistics to you to aid in your consideration and deliberation as to prospective legislation to cure the obvious ill and the need for assisting our senior citizens and particularly in relocating them where mass dislocation has occurred throughout the urban areas and throughout our State and municipalities.

It is rather difficult to narrow down to a concrete issue the specific part or role that private industry can play, but I think, that perhaps it might be of some advantage, or edifying, at least, to you, in your deliberation that we stress one or two points that might render some assistance along that line.

We readily accept the fact that private industry in itself is not completely equipped nor can they from an economic standpoint provide all the necessary housing that is required to take care of these senior citizens, because of their low income.

We recognize the fact that despite the protestations that have long been heard from the building industry in opposition to public housing that there must be as of a necessity some public housing, and some subsidy. But, by the same token, I refer you gentlemen, to your report in which you stated that 18 percent of the people who are relocated and who are moved involuntarily to go into homeownership rather than renting, and only 4 percent as tenants.

It is our humble opinion that if we can encourage homeownership and can provide it within the economic means and bounds of these senior citizens that this will lend itself to create better citizenship not only for our communities and for our State but for our National Government as well.

I am not for the moment saying that we are opposed to the subsidy that obviously is necessary on occasion, but then we think perhaps it would be better and more helpful from an economic standpoint if we could reduce the necessity of subsidy to a minimum.

One of the greatest difficulties that we find in trying to create the housing that would require a low rental or a low monthly payment with this type of individual who is desirous of providing his own home, could assume, is because of the restrictive and unrealistic imposition of zoning requirements in the suburban communities to which these people move from urban areas.

We find that these communities as a whole resist any development along this line, even to the extent of resisting the creation of these other developments which were talked about and testified to by witnesses who preceded me, where there is a subsidy.

I remember going to San Antonio, Tex., not too long ago, to witness a demonstration of what could be done in lieu of public housing. Where ground was purchased at a very low cost, where houses were built at low cost, and the monthly payments were low, which made it possible for these people and these families, rather than going into a public housing area, to be able to purchase their own homes and to be able to exercise the pride and privilege which is necessarily inherent and in any individual to own their own homes and made better citizens.

We also believe that this question does not confine itself to just money. We believe most sincerely that the individual home, a small home, would be more adequate and would be better suited for these individuals, from a moral aspect as far as these citizens are concerned.

We don't want to just treat this segment of our population as people who are particularly available only for institutions or placing them in so-called nice ghettos. We want to get away from that sort of thing, and we feel, in answer to your query before Senator Randolph, as to whether or not it was the opinion of my predecessors who testified that there are sufficient and adequate laws on the books today to serve this purpose. It is my humble opinion that the necessary laws are existent, and it is a matter of administration. It is a matter of coordination not only between the National Government but with the State government and our local municipalities as well.

If they would only exercise a little more liberal discretion in the approach to this problem, we sincerely believe that this could be resolved.

In addition, if I may refer to the other question, Senator Randolph, when you inquired of one witness as to why he thought there was a slowdown in the rehabilitation program, I respectfully submit that this is due to the fact that there is a lack of enforcement on the part of municipalities to enforce the rehabilitation. For example, that this or that property should be condemned because it is not habitable, is not fit for a person to live in. Such enforcement would generate and give strength and stimulate the rehabilitation which is now available under our FHA regulations.

I thank you very much for this opportunity, and I may not have presented anything too helpful, but this is the view of the build-

ers of private industry, and may I extend to you our sincere thanks and appreciation for this opportunity to express ourselves.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we are always very glad to hear from you personally, Mr. Feinberg, and we are very frequently aided by the wisdom, knowledge, and experience of the home builders associations of various communities. I know I always hear them with a great deal of interest.

Thank you.

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Feinberg. It is encouraging to hear you state that there must be a greater flexibility in the administration of these programs.

Mr. FEINBERG. That is right.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Now I understand Reverend Sirman is here, minister of the Broadway Methodist Church here in Camden, and I know you have a prepared statement, which we will receive for the record, if you want to summarize it, or you can handle it however you would like.

STATEMENT OF REV. WILLARD P. SIRMAN, JR., MINISTER, BROADWAY METHODIST CHURCH OF CAMDEN, AND PRESIDENT, COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF GREATER CAMDEN

Reverend SIRMAN. Thank you.

As is before you, this statement says that the Christian Church is for progress, Senator Williams and Senator Randolph, of the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging.

I am the Reverend Willard P. Sirman, Jr., minister of the Broadway Methodist Church of Camden and president of the Council of Churches of Greater Camden.

We are concerned about the progress and we are concerned about people, people's feelings, as has been stated here by many of the predecessors who have been before me.

The fact that people are involved in these relocations and in the fact that when you are involving people, you are concerned about people's needs.

We feel that the church has not filled a significant role in remembering people, apart from any accomplishment or lack of accomplishment in the secular world, that faith in God is the most constructive force in preserving self-respect, and supplying a motivation for living.

We submit to you some of these figures that have come from the National Conference on Aging. The statement was made that "the church is one of the most fruitful sources of service to the aging."

Our churches in the central cities, including Camden, where 58 percent of the senior citizens live, want to serve them.

It has been pointed out by the report of the New Jersey Old Age Study Commission that—

The great majority of older persons throughout the Nation continue to live right where they did before they got old. What is more, there is overwhelming evidence that to continue living where they are and as they are is the No. 1 objective of older people. Many of their problems in housing and living arrangements begin right here; that is, in their attempts to maintain a prior status quo as their economic and physical resources decline.

Then, too, we submit to you these other figures from the New Jersey Old Age Study Commission report, indicating the types of employ-

ment, sources of income, from which they derive their benefits and the percentages of these people.

For the most part, the income of our senior citizens is not high, and certainly not high enough to enable them to meet increased expenditures in housing during those years when their medical needs will become more expensive because of greater possibility of illness.

So some may say that the senior citizen who is displaced may move to the suburbs, and it will interest the committee to see what the Camden City Courier reported in the October 26 issue, listing 15 Camden city homes for rent at an average rental of \$77 per month, whereas in the suburban areas, the rental was \$122 per month, and being displaced from the city in terms of housing to renters could cost \$540 more per year for the senior citizen who must move out of his city dwelling to say nothing of additional costs for transportation that bring him back to the city from time to time, and so we consider this a very real problem that faces us when we talk about relocation of our senior citizens as you do, and we are well aware of the problems involved in urban renewal.

We are for urban renewal, but we do want you to remember the people involved in it, and particularly these senior citizens, and we appreciate the opportunity to be here to present this statement.

(The prepared statement of Reverend Sirman follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REV. WILLARD P. SIRMAN, JR.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, I am Rev. Willard P. Sirman, Jr., minister of the Broadway Methodist Church of Camden and president of the Council of Churches of Greater Camden.

The Christian Church is for progress. It is also for people. But it is not for progress of a material nature secured at the expense of our elderly citizens. The churches fill a unique role in today's society as the one organization that places a prime value upon individuals apart from any accomplishment or lack of accomplishment in the secular world. Faith in God is the most constructive force in preserving self-respect and in supplying a motivation for living.

The National Conference on Aging held in Washington some years ago said, "The church is one of the most fruitful sources of service to the aging."

Our churches in the central cities including Camden where over 58 percent of the senior citizens live want to serve them. It has been pointed out by the report of the New Jersey Old Age Study Commission that "the great majority of older persons throughout the Nation continue to live right where they did before they got old. What is more, there is overwhelming evidence that to continue living where they are and as they are is the No. 1 objective of older people. Many of their problems in housing and living arrangements begin right here, that is, in their attempts to maintain a prior status quo as their economic and physical resources decline."

We recognize that some housing in our cities is below standard and every effort should be made to renew this type of dwelling. However we believe that the human element should not be ignored in a program that demolishes homes of senior citizens who are in no financial position to reestablish their homes.

The New Jersey Old Age Study Commission report indicates that 30 percent—139,397 people over 65—receive income from full or part-time employment, either as earners or as wives of earners. About half of those over 65 receive income from social security. An estimated 8 percent receive income from programs for retired railroad, government workers or veterans. Five to six percent receive income from private insurance or annuities. Three percent collect from private industrial or commercial retirement programs. Five percent receive benefit from old age assistance. An unidentifiable but relatively small number of our senior citizens receive income from investments and children and relatives.

For the most part the income of our senior citizens is not high and certainly not high enough to enable them to meet increased expenditures in housing during those years when their medical needs will become more expensive because of the greater possibility of illness.

Some may say that the senior citizen who is displaced may move to the suburbs. It will interest this committee to know that the Camden City paper of October 26, 1962, listed 15 Camden city homes for rent at an average rental of \$77 per month. The same paper listed 32 suburban homes for rent at an average monthly rental of \$122. Being displaced from the city in terms of housing to renters could cost \$540 more per year for the senior citizen who must move out of his city dwelling to say nothing of additional costs of transportation to bring him back to the city from time to time where familiar and needful conveniences must be sought. Should he be a homeowner, he would be faced with an exceedingly low sale price for his city home from which he is being displaced. This sale price may be little more than the down payment on new housing for which he may not even be able to secure mortgage financing.

We believe wholeheartedly in well and wisely planned urban renewal. However we would urge extreme care and caution be exercised to preserve the rights and best interests of our senior citizens. They should not be uprooted from homes which meet their needs and which are not below safe housing standards. In cases that do require replacements, ample remuneration should be given them, not just on the basis of what they owned, but in terms of what they will require in today's economy to maintain their accustomed standard of life.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we are grateful to you, Reverend Sirman, and it is helpful to have your position on this human problem.

I have no questions.

Senator RANDOLPH. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say it is my understanding that Reverend Sirman comes not only as the minister of his own church but representing the Council of Churches of Greater Camden.

Reverend SIRMAN. Yes, I am president of the Council of Churches of Greater Camden.

Senator RANDOLPH. I think for the record it would be factual and perhaps helpful: How many churches does the Council embrace?

Reverend SIRMAN. 176.

Senator RANDOLPH. What is the approximate membership of the 176 churches?

Reverend SIRMAN. I am not prepared to answer that question, Senator.

Senator RANDOLPH. Well, I think it is salutary, Mr. Chairman, that a council representing more than 175 churches believes that this hearing is important. Your statement expressing intense interest and concern is most helpful.

Senator WILLIAMS. I certainly agree, and I am very glad you made that addition, so the record will properly reflect the broad concern and broad interest of the church people of Camden.

Thank you very much.

Reverend SIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Now we have talked our way into quite a bit of the lunch hour.

Our plan was to return at 2 p.m. If anybody is a little tardy and makes it by 2:15, I think he will probably find he is on time.

(Whereupon, at 12:50 p.m., the committee recessed to reconvene at 2 p.m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator WILLIAMS. We are highly honored to have Miss Jane Stretch, member, board of directors and executive committee, Greater Camden Movement, and an editor of one of the Nation's great papers. Will you come forward, please, Miss Stretch? I would like to introduce Senator Jennings Randolph.

Senator RANDOLPH. Good afternoon, Miss Stretch.

Miss STRETCH. How do you do, Senator Randolph.

Senator WILLIAMS. Senator Randolph is also a newspaper owner and publisher, and he has a very interesting masthead which I would like to describe to you.

Senator RANDOLPH. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

STATEMENT OF MISS JANE STRETCH, MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, GREATER CAMDEN MOVEMENT

Miss STRETCH. Senator, I am speaking as a member of the executive committee of the Greater Camden Movement.

Relocation ranks high on the list of very real problems that must be solved if our country's urban areas are to be effectively rebuilt.

Since the Greater Camden Movement has necessarily been preoccupied with helping to resolve such local matters as the lack of a plan for piecemeal planning, the shortage of municipal funds, private investment capital indifference, poor communication or lack of cooperation between public officials and private leadership, we confess that not nearly enough attention has yet been devoted to this vital social problem of relocating potentially displaced persons and families.

However, we also submit that a beginning has been made, and we thank you for this opportunity to offer suggestions.

As we understand the twofold purpose of these hearings, your committee wishes to both learn more about the impact of existing and future developments and hopefully to obtain suggestions for dealing with the relocation housing need growing out of these numerous and varied local rebuilding plans.

Before outlining some of the projects which the Greater Camden Movement is currently working on, together with our own specific relocation suggestions, I should like to make these preliminary remarks.

The Greater Camden Movement is concerned with the human as well as the physical and economic resources of the Greater Camden area. If it appears that to date we have been preoccupied with the latter, we submit that such procedure was dictated by the hard financial facts of public and private life. It takes money to plan, just as it takes money to clear blighted areas.

It takes public and private funds, working together, to build up our urban renewal areas.

Unless the planning seed money is followed up by ratables which will help augment municipal finance, the money won't be available for all the human and social welfare problems.

Hence, our initial preoccupation with physical and economic matters. Local public funds being as limited as they are, the Greater Camden Movement has initially contributed its own planning funds and concentrated on the Camden center city area, where we firmly believe the greatest potential returns to all the area's citizens will be, young and old, of whatever income group.

Fortunately, it appears that the recapture of Center City Island, which is also at the hub of this South Jersey economic region, will not only give employment opportunities and major long-term ratables, but from a relocation viewpoint, it will also result in a substantial net increase to the overall housing supply.

What, then, are these proposed programs which the Greater Camden Movement is currently working on? In the field of transportation, we are currently completing a study involving mass transit, highway and railroad freight facilities, the North-South freeway, and a New Jersey transportation terminal.

The Greater Camden Movement fully recognizes that these proposals will necessitate the relocation of families previously living in areas where substandard housing conditions prevail, particularly along the Delaware River front.

However, we submit that this is a condition which has needed remedying for many years. We believe to do so now will be advantageous. It will be so for family humanitarian reasons and also because of the continuing and long-range economic drain that such unsanitary facilities constitute on the tax base.

To remedy this situation, the cost would be greater under a separate slum clearance proposal at a later date than doing it now in combination with current plans.

We also note that a large number of families in the Center Tower area of downtown Camden would have been displaced by previous alternative proposals.

Rather than take up your time at this hearing with the detailed description of these major transportation proposals, we would be pleased to make a later supplementary submittal in writing which spells out each proposal.

We would, however, like to point out right now that we share your long-range viewpoint of the very great need for coordinating the planning for all kinds of transportation facilities with urban renewal project area planning.

Obviously, this also means relocation planning, which I shall come to in a few moments.

Because of practical considerations and the imminence of other large-scale multimillion dollar projects, we have merely given first attention to these transportation matters.

In respect to the urban renewal projects, the Greater Camden Movement has already completed a preliminary downtown plan which has been largely incorporated into the citywide comprehensive plan prepared by the city, and adopted by the Camden planning board only this past summer. This downtown plan includes a number of specific projects which have been delineated as legally eligible to receive Federal financial assistance under the urban renewal program, operating through the Camden authorizing and redevelopment authority.

Let me reiterate that while relocation was also a factor in delineating these projects, we were at this time primarily concerned with hard facts and practical matters of project legal eligibility, finances, and known marketability for the land.

In addition to the transportation proposals referred to above, the urban renewal or land-use projects recommended in this downtown plan include:

- (1) A new private office building center.
- (2) An industrial research and development center to capitalize on this area's known leadership and further potential in space technology.
- (3) An expanded campus for Rutgers University in order to meet future university needs and help make Camden the academic center of South Jersey.
- (4) A social and cultural services center.
- (5) A major private riverfront residential project of over 2,000 dwelling units for a variety of housing and income groups.

Dependent on the outcome of the current transportation proposals which involve planning or policy questions and use, include negotiations with the New Jersey State government, the Delaware River Port Authority, the Pennsylvania and Reading Railroads and municipal officials, we recommend that there be a second, more final stage in downtown planning.

At that time, among other things, specific relocation studies should be entered into, as you can readily judge. The areas which will require relocating families are dependent now upon both the policy determinations affecting alternative transportation routings and on agreed-upon renewal project priorities.

Recognizing the relocation need that will then be specifically documented by the relocation studies, we would at this time like to make the following recommendation: That there be established a central relocation agency to handle urban relocation problems on an areawide basis.

The functions of such a relocation agency would include at least the following:

- (1) To make studies of both the supply of and the demand for rental and sales housing. On the supply side, the agency might inventory the community's housing resources. On the demand side, it could analyze both potential and long-range needs created by all of the public improvement programs. This would include families who needed to be relocated due to transit facilities, highway improvements, housing code enforcement, slum clearance projects, et cetera.

This inventory should be done on both a qualitative as well as a quantitative basis. That is, it should include a study of all types of housing accommodations in lower, middling, and higher price ranges, for families both young and old. We do not think that the elderly should be segregated. The housing data collection process must, of course, be related to a working knowledge of the income and housing purchasing power of the affected families requiring relocation.

- (2) The central relocation agency should meet periodically with those agencies whose activity has greatly contributed to the relocation requirements in order to arrive at financially feasible proposals, and equitable solution might be worked out whereby an agency contributed funds in proportion to the number of families it caused to be relocated, for example, under the Urban Renewal Administration, Congress has mandated that all affected families be relocated in decent, safe, and sanitary housing. Provisions have also been made to aid in relocating businesses. Accordingly, the Urban Renewal Administration pro-

vides direct Federal relocation assistance to meet this requirement.

In the event Congress extends this requirement to other public programs, then the local central relocation agency could eliminate local duplication of effort and competition for scarce housing resources by handling all relocation requirements on a contractual basis.

(3) This agency would be directly responsible for recommending various types of housing programs, based upon their analysis of the relocation need and the housing market.

This would include recommendations for both public and private programs. It would be evolved in cooperation with the building industry, including lending institutions, builders, trades and labor council, real estate firms, and the housing authority.

(4) We think an effective relocation program should concern itself with more than just physical housing resources. To achieve the goals Congress outlined in the National Housing Act, we think it important for such a local agency to work with those groups who are directly concerned with the community's educational and rehabilitation efforts. Rehabilitation agencies can make a significant contribution due to their background and experience in working with families and neighborhood groups. As a community, we might well ask ourselves what gain there would be in merely shifting families from one neighborhood to another, unless this process was accompanied by an improvement of their standard of living.

We believe the relocation effort simply must be accompanied by a continuing educational process. This is true for both project relocated families as well as those relocated into private housing.

Another key function of this relocation agency would be to inform the public via all news media of the impact on the community of the total rebuilding effort. An informed public which is aware of the numerous and specific local advantages inherent in slum clearance activities, improved housing facilities, increased employment opportunities, and the general upgrading through creation of a more desirable urban environment is much more likely to cooperate with public officials.

Such an agency could also serve as an information clearinghouse on policies and techniques with other cities whose relocation and rebuilding efforts have been successfully executed.

As a further suggestion, and in conclusion, I am pleased to note that many cities already have a nucleus for such a central relocation bureau. I know that this is true here in Camden. For example, in the Camden Housing and Redevelopment Authority, there are experienced staff personnel who have previously effected relocation activities.

In the various social agencies, we also have dedicated personnel, anxious to assist in the total community rehabilitation effort.

We submit that the time is fast approaching when these groups be brought together in an effective fashion to achieve such relocation objectives as those outlined above.

On behalf of the Greater Camden Movement, I should like to thank you, Senator, for the opportunity to present our views.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, that is a magnificent statement of the program and the suggested answer to one of the human problems of

redevelopment, and the growth programs for the city, this central relocation agency.

We have seen in our hearings that frequently relocation is a hit or miss proposition, no one really charged with the responsibility of going to the folks who have this problem. They drift in.

In one area, we found that really the only people who got advice and counsel and help were those who happened to come in as welfare problems, and then it was discovered that they were also being displaced involuntarily, and had to find new homes.

I think a central relocation agency is a fine suggestion and your suggestion that it be financed in part on a proportionate basis by the various Federal agencies who have programs that are causing displacements seems to make a great deal of sense. This, I am sure, would take some legislative doing. There is no authority for that in present law, at least as far as the highway program is concerned. There is not even an allowance for moving under the present highway plans.

Miss STRETCH. That is true.

Senator WILLIAMS. So we will certainly follow this one with staff work and analysis, where regulation can accomplish some of these things, and where it takes more than that, we will bend our efforts to see what can be done.

Let's see, now, I might have one or two observations, over and beyond our deep gratitude, after Senator Randolph has an opportunity to discuss some of your suggestions.

Senator RANDOLPH?

Senator RANDOLPH. Before doing that, Miss Stretch, since Senator Williams has mentioned highway development plans, and the lack of provision in this area, I wish to say that the chairman of the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate is the Honorable Pat McNamara of Michigan.

He is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Public Works Committee of the Senate. Having this dual role, we will be able to talk with him and find that from these hearings, these ideas have been brought into focus. Perhaps early in the 88th Congress, we may definitely move on the need which has been stated by you, Senator Williams, and has been incorporated in the splendid statement by Miss Stretch.

I would wish, Mr. Chairman, to add that the Congress did take cognizance of this problem and by section 5, Public Law 87-866 (Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962) provided the authorization for certain relocation assistance for eligible persons who are displaced by construction of a project approved under section 106, title 23 of the United States Code.

Now to go to the Camden Movement, and I like the word "Greater" which precedes it. Not only do you embrace a territory from the standpoint of geography, but you realize that we cannot be narrow, and this is a broader concept plan. So, you think in terms of tomorrows. We hope these will give not only an area outlook but involved to a degree will be the opportunity for necessary expansion, and a new concept for better living for the individual. Is this also in your plans?

Miss STRETCH. Correct, absolutely.

Senator RANDOLPH. I sensed it as I looked at this plan. As I checked your figures, I was stimulated by your efforts, and what you are attempting to do here is truly challenging to me. I do not want to moralize, because I have no right to do that. But I was thinking, here is a plan which is cooperative in nature, where you have the persons who are responsible in civic and industrial activities, and they are joined or cooperate with the city government officials. You also have had direct contacts with other agencies within New Jersey, and, of course, the Federal Government. Therefore, in a very real sense, Miss Stretch, you are doing what sometimes is not done. You are joining with others and saying, "Let's get the job done," because in Greater Camden, as in New Jersey, you have the status quo-ers, those who say, "What was good enough for yesterday and today is good enough for tomorrow."

You also have those individuals who sense the need, who understand the job which should be done, and yet they never associate themselves with the doing of it. They point to the other organization, the other person, and say, "Now they have the time, they have the resources. I know it should be done, but let them do it."

But you have done something beyond that. You have joined hands and you have said, "Let's move forward," and I like that, and I am sure that even though it takes a little longer, perhaps, it will be coordinated. It is cooperative coordination, if we could use those two words together.

Miss STRETCH. Right.

Senator RANDOLPH. Specifically, how long has the Greater Camden Movement been in existence?

Miss STRETCH. I think the Greater Camden Movement was incorporated about a year and a half ago. Let's see if I can find somebody.

FROM THE FLOOR. February of 1961, Senator.

Miss STRETCH. Well, that is about a year and a half ago.

Senator RANDOLPH. Miss Stretch, in that time, have you placed emphasis on moving in the direction of something that is tangible and have you also been talking with groups and others who are on the board of directors?

Miss STRETCH. Oh, yes, all of us.

Senator RANDOLPH. Have you been meeting with people, and enumerating the reasons for doing something?

Miss STRETCH. Yes, sir, we have. We have spoken—our staff members as well as my fellow trustees—have tried to spread the gospel of the Greater Camden Movement, and we did call it that; even though we are concentrating our initial efforts on the city of Camden, where it obviously needs it the most, we intend to encompass the entire area.

Senator WILLIAMS. Parenthetically on that, you spoke of this central relocation agency as having an areawide responsibility. This would be beyond the city of Camden?

Miss STRETCH. Oh, yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is extremely forward-looking.

Senator RANDOLPH. I agree with you, Senator Williams. May I interrupt?

As you know—and this is not the philosophy of a person of any party—but today, we realize that the so-called geographical borders of yesterday are gone.

Miss STRETCH. Absolutely.

Senator RANDOLPH. We move from one point to another in minutes and for us to think that we can set the job to be done over in one corner, then move over into another corner to do the job is not practical. I like the idea, as I understand it, which you have reaffirmed in response to Senator Williams, that this is a program, pinpointing specific needs, in Camden, and ready to have, let us say, the outer layers added.

Miss STRETCH. Oh, yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you. One further point. It occurred to me this morning when we had our friends from State government here that more and more communities are going to be faced with the problems of displaced people in the path of progress in terms of programs, redevelopment, renewal, community facilities, and highways, the whole group of activities that are combined to make urban areas better and more livable.

Now, I think for a community that has the highway come through, has never had the highway come through, has never had experience in a public sense of relocation, it seems to me that it might be useful to think in terms of gathering places of experience on the hows and the whys and the whats of relocation so that a community faced with a new problem could see how another community solved it, and how experience can run down to where it is needed.

Does this impress you as one of the factors?

Miss STRETCH. Well, this is where our Central Relocation Bureau could come into being, I think, and while it is true that a great many of our suburban communities haven't really been affected seriously by major highways or urban renewal, still we find right here in the Camden Housing and Redevelopment Authority that we are being asked to house more and more people dislocated in the suburbs, and this is a city authority, a city agency, but there isn't one of the 37 municipalities in the county that has such an authority except in the city of Camden.

Now, we have a total of 1,833 family units in the six public housing authority projects, and of that there are 427 senior citizen families living in those units, which comprises 22.1 percent of the total population, and I think that is a rather creditable amount.

Now, they did not all come just from the city; they have come in from the suburbs, too, because the suburbs are not able to take care of them.

Senator WILLIAMS. And we can look forward to more and more highways, I think, too.

I certainly applaud your efforts here in developing through a very painful process, I might say, Senator Randolph, the mass transportation program, which took quite a bit of doing as I recall. We not only have a multitude of municipal jurisdictions, we have two States involved, and it has pretty much developed to the satisfaction of most people affected in the area, has it not, as a plan?

Miss STRETCH. Well, we are not sure yet, Senator. We have still got a few weeks to go.

Senator WILLIAMS. Good luck.

Miss STRETCH. On this, on our phase of the transportation problem, the highway speed line realignment, the Greater Camden Movement

was asked by Governor Hughes several months ago to make a study, which we have done. It has been completed, and we are just awaiting the Governor's pleasure to have him get a chance to study it, and then make known what his reactions are, but he is currently studying this new transportation alinement, along with the State Highway Commissioner, and we are hoping to hear within 2 to 3 weeks what his conclusions are.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I certainly hope that develops to the general satisfaction, so that we can see the job done. It certainly will reduce the problem of displacement and relocation, which we discussed this morning, because a lot of it is using existing rights-of-way.

Miss STRETCH. Right.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I have not anything further, except to thank you very gratefully from the subcommittee.

Miss STRETCH. Thank you, Senator.

Senator WILLIAMS. Now, I see that the mayor of the city of Trenton has joined our forum. The Honorable Arthur J. Holland.

Are you ready to come forward, Mr. Holland? The mayor of the capital city. We are very pleased that you could be with us.

STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR J. HOLLAND, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF TRENTON, TRENTON, N.J., ACCOMPANIED BY WILLIAM F. FAHERTY, JR., DIRECTOR OF HEALTH, RECREATION, AND WELFARE; HARVEY MANDEL, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT; THOMAS D. HALEY, RELOCATION DIRECTOR; MICHAEL TADDIO, AREA RESIDENT OF JOHN FITCH WAY PROJECT; AND LOUIS BRITTON, AREA RESIDENT OF JOHN FITCH WAY PROJECT, CITY OF TRENTON

Senator WILLIAMS. I flew over Trenton, N.J., this morning, and was truly impressed with some of the areas of renewal. A lot of the new housing that is developing, it was just a year ago, we went to a project there.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Louis Josephson Memorial Homes, which were then under construction and are now open, 152 units.

I am going to refer to that project.

Senator WILLIAMS. We would like to see it. I have been to groundbreaking ceremonies for housing for the elderly. You are moved by the concept of the great principle involved, but you go back a year later and then it is no longer principle, it is beautiful homes for people who need them.

I was happy to visit Paterson, and now Trenton.

Mr. HOLLAND. Senator, I have with me our director of development and planning; our director of health, recreation, and welfare; our relocation director; and two elderly residents who are being involuntarily displaced.

Senator WILLIAMS. We have to get a view of your problems and you are the people who are finding answers.

Mr. HOLLAND. This is Mr. William F. Faherty, Jr., director of health, recreation, and welfare, and Mr. Taddio and Mr. Britton, two residents who are in need of relocation; Harvey Mandel, director of planning and development; and Thomas Haley, who is director of our relocation office.

Senator WILLIAMS. Fine.

Mr. HOLLAND. We understand you wanted to have us make about a 20-minute presentation, however short or as long as you wish.

Senator WILLIAMS. I think we have that length of time. Do you have a prepared statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have only about a 2-minute statement, and then the rest of the time can be used as you wish, if you wish to question any of these men.

Senator WILLIAMS. Fine.

Mr. HOLLAND. The most difficult aspect of urban renewal is that of relocation. This is especially so when those to be relocated are elderly.

Trenton has anticipated this special urban renewal need by constructing a 152-unit, low-rent housing project for the elderly so that its opening coincides with the relocation phase of our John Fitch Way project. Priority on admission to these new units is granted to those involuntarily displaced from the urban renewal area. The timing required cooperation of two city agencies since the Trenton Housing Authority is responsible for the construction of public housing projects while the city government is the local public agency for urban renewal.

Another low-rent public housing project is scheduled for construction in time to accommodate those involuntarily displaced from another section of the John Fitch Way project. This project will contain 256 units and is designed for all age groups. Some older people prefer to live with persons of other age groups.

Not all older people, of course, even though eligible, wish to live in a public housing project.

One such resident made this clear when priority on admission to the new Josephson Homes for the Elderly was mentioned to her. She did not want to move anywhere and since she had to, she wanted a house like the one she was required to vacate. Our relocation office was asked to try to find for her the kind of a house she desired and which she could afford.

People are involuntarily displaced by other than urban renewal projects and adequate provision has not been made for such cases. As of October 23, with the signing by President Kennedy of the 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act, such provision is made for highway displacees. The Federal Government will pay relocating expenses of up to \$200 for families and \$3,000 for businesses and farms, with State contributions in the same proportion as the State share of highway construction—50 percent on regular Federal-aid projects and 90 percent on the Interstate System. This is good news for Trentonians who will be displaced by the New Jersey Route 29 southerly extension.

Similar legislation is needed, however, for those displaced by housing and other public projects.

The increasing complexity of urban renewal programs points up the need for Federal and State departments of urban affairs. All of the programs of the Federal and State Governments would be sure to be coordinated and made available to the cities which are so in need of urban renewal. It is important, I think, to realize that when we refer to the city, we keep in mind that the city is really the people in it; and those most in need of assistance are the elderly with low fixed incomes.

I shall ask our State government to pass legislation which would enable New Jersey to participate in this new Federal program.

This would also seem to be a good time, since the precedent now seems firmly established, to request our congressional representatives to seek enactment of legislation which would establish relocation payments to persons displaced by all public—Federal—action, particularly in connection with the construction of low-rent public housing projects.

My congratulations to Senator Williams and the members of his subcommittee for studying one of the most pressing problems facing the cities of the United States.

Senator WILLIAMS. And I have learned that this very afternoon, State highway director, Commissioner Dwight Palmer, is meeting with a representative of the U.S. Public Roads Bureau to implement this Federal legislation so far as our State is concerned.

Thank you very much, Mayor Holland.

What is the name of the elderly housing program?

Mr. HOLLAND. Louis Josephson Memorial Homes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is that fully occupied?

Mr. HOLLAND. No, it is in the process of being occupied now. We have just had the formal opening.

Mr. FAHERTY. It is fully committed.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is fully committed, but not occupied.

We have had open house several times in the past few weeks. November 1 is when occupancy actually takes place, as of November 1.

Senator WILLIAMS. This is public housing?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, this is the site, the project that you viewed when you conducted your hearing in Trenton.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you have in the city of Trenton any of either of the other two programs in plan or construction or being thought about—the direct loan, or the FHA supported?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will ask Mr. Mandel to reply to that.

Mr. MANDEL. Senator, we have recently sold a piece of property; the city board of education has sold a piece of property to a private developer who has proposed an FHA-supported senior citizens' housing project on the site.

This project is proposed to accommodate probably 90 to 100 units.

Senator WILLIAMS. Has he applied, or is it still in discussion?

Mr. MANDEL. It is still in the discussion phase.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I add there that we are very pleased to see this development, because it is meeting a sociological need through private enterprise and, while we are certainly prepared, as we demonstrated through the Josephson Homes project, to meet this need, when it is demonstrated that it can't be met by private enterprise, it is always helpful ratablywise, of course, to have this new construction made possible through the Federal program.

We estimate a \$65,000 ratable from this project when it is finished.

Senator WILLIAMS. This would be housing for what level of income people?

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is middle and lower middle.

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes. Well, that is one of the areas of real need and a gap, when you get just above the eligibility for public housing.

Do you have apartments in the Josephson project for single individuals?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of the 152 units, 48 are efficiency apartments for 1 person, 88 are one-bedroom, 2 persons, either man and wife are 2 single persons, and 16 are two-bedroom, man and wife and older brother and sister.

Senator WILLIAMS. All right, sir. Very good.

This was geared to be completed, geared with the redevelopment project?

Mr. HOLLAND. With the Fitch Way redevelopment project.

Fortunately, the first phase of that project where the labor and industry building is going, does not have many residences in it, and this project will be sufficient, we feel, for accommodating at least the older people in it.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, how many individuals will be living in this housing that have been displaced by the other program? Can you judge that now?

Mr. MANDEL. Well, sir, our experience has been the same as most cities nationally, that while possibly 50 percent of the residents in urban renewal projects areas are eligible for public housing, only about half of those choose to go into public housing.

Our experience has been running around 20 percent of total project area residents will accept public housing when offered to them.

Now, in Trenton, we have been meeting this need. Our turnover in public housing units is about 225 a year, which are made available by annual turnover rates, and, as the mayor has indicated, we have 152-unit senior citizens' project completed, which will increase our overall capacity and certainly the turnover rate, and we have a 256-unit project now under construction which will more than meet relocation needs from existing projects in the city, and again add to our total turnover for future undertakings.

Senator WILLIAMS. Can you estimate the relocation problem on an annual basis for the next 5 years? The number of people that will be faced with it, probably?

Mr. HOLLAND. We have just reconstituted our relocation committee or are in the process of doing it on a much broader basis, and perhaps in these discussions we might have something definitive on that.

Mr. MANDEL. Well, the only total clearance project under way in Trenton, Senator, is the John Fitch Way urban renewal project, and we are fully covered in terms of meeting the relocation needs out of that project.

Now, I think, as a result of the expanded public housing program in the city, that we can also meet—although we do not have scheduled any additional clearance projects, other than some State highway construction which will be going on in the city—I feel certain that in terms of public housing we do meet and have met that need in the city of Trenton.

However, I feel there is another area where we are not meeting a need.

If I may, I would like to just state a few facts, Senator, about the situation in Trenton, briefly analyze these facts, and then make a few statements on them.

Now, Trenton, like many of the cities in New Jersey, the older central cities in New Jersey, has lost population between 1950 and 1960. As matter of fact, our net resident population is down about 11 percent in these years.

During this same period, as has happened in other cities, while the white population of the city is down some 22 percent, the Negro population has increased by some 80 percent.

Now, this white decrease is largely in the age groups 20 to 44 years old, where we have lost some 45 percent of our population in the last 10 years in this age group alone.

The elderly population in the city of Trenton, those over 65, has increased some 25 percent in the last 10 years. Those over 70, the percent increase has been 35 percent.

Now, here is the paradox. While the population—the total population of the city—has decreased some 11 percent, and while the number of houses containing two persons or less in the city has increased some 50 percent, there is a great deal of underoccupancy of housing in the city of Trenton.

As I said, the number of houses containing two persons or less now constitute 43 percent of the total housing stock in the city of Trenton. Forty-three percent of the houses now contain two persons or less. This is an increase of some 50 percent in the last 10 years.

However, paradoxically, overcrowding in the city of Trenton has also increased. Overcrowding in the city of Trenton as classified by the Census Bureau has increased by some 20 percent, so we have, on the one hand, the tremendous increase in underoccupancy and, on the other hand, an increase in overcrowding in the city. A seeming paradox.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me interrupt to try to explain this paradox. I think there is a twofold explanation.

One, as has been indicated, the younger people have left for the suburbs. Their parents are living in the family home, in what at one time were heavily concentrated population areas. The overcrowding is a result from the lack of residential integration, resulting in the Negro population, which constitutes about 25 percent of the population, being crowded into about 10 percent of the geographical area.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is this a matter of low incomes that is in part responsible for the overcrowding? Is there housing discrimination?

Mr. MANDEL. Well, certainly it seems that the resource is there. These big old houses are there. You have got an elderly couple or a single person now living in this house, and on the other hand, we have overcrowding in Negro areas where this housing is not being put on the market, not being made available apparently to the Negroes who, at this time, need it and could certainly use it.

Now, it seems to me that what we are faced with is an old housing stock, houses which are not at the present time economic. First of all, they are not economic for the older person to maintain. He is hurting.

At the same time, these houses are not being converted and are not being made available either where senior citizens can get together and move into a number of apartments in one of these big houses, or this

housing stock is not being made available to the Negro residents of the community.

So the solution now, therefore, a major solution, other than providing more public housing to meet these needs, would certainly seem to be to loosen up this existing stock of housing and get it on the market in the form that the market can assimilate, and the form that the market can use, and by this I mean, No. 1, certainly conversions of these units, and this would call for liberalization of all home improvement programs now sponsored by the Federal Government, coupled with realistically determined and strictly enforced housing code provisions.

I would certainly—since the Federal Government is recognizing more and more that the workable program—and certainly the code enforcement element of the workable program—is probably the key, the long-range key to our total renewal problem, that the Federal Government consider legislation which would assist communities to implement the workable program.

Right now, the workable program is a requirement. The Federal Government is approaching, I think, Federal assistance, although the workable program is a comprehensive document, the Federal Government is not assisting communities to implement the workable program on any comprehensive basis. They are picking out certain elements and providing aid here and providing aid there.

I would certainly feel, if we want to bust open this code enforcement operation, that Federal assistance could do a lot, certainly in the city of Trenton, to improve and speed up our program and, as I said, I think this could be an effective step in getting this housing on the market and cracking this problem.

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Mandel, I do not wish to be critical, but I do not follow you there.

What do you believe the Federal Government should do?

Mr. MANDEL. In terms of assisting of the implementation of the workable program, sir?

Senator RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MANDEL. Well, I would say right now you are paying two-thirds of the cost of local planning assistance in communities. Why not pick up one-third of the cost of the Federal program in communities?

Senator RANDOLPH. You are saying the Federal Government should do more. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. MANDEL. I think more money could be spent.

Senator RANDOLPH. Do you want more money spent, or do you want it spent more judiciously?

Mr. MANDEL. I hesitate to say more judiciously, although I have certain ideas about that, although I would certainly say more in certain areas which I think are critical areas, and I think code enforcement, as is recognized, by your present administrators of the program, is probably the most important element.

I think that if we are ever going to solve this problem, that here is an area that cries for Federal assistance in many areas.

Mr. HOLLAND. Had I arrived earlier, this is one of the points we wanted to discuss. I want to modify that statement, because I recall very vividly at the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the question came up

of asking for Federal assistance for social workers. I opposed it, and I think that is primarily—and it is not exclusively—a municipal function, and I would recommend that we be very careful, Harvey, in bringing in Federal assistance to code enforcement.

I appreciate Federal assistance as it is now given, and undoubtedly while the cities are in crisis, there is justification in asking for additional assistance, so that we can keep supplying the tax revenue that helps the Federal Government and other levels to continue operating, but this is a very sensitive area, and I think perhaps it is the responsibility of the city to just allocate whatever money is necessary in order to strengthen its code enforcement program.

Senator WILLIAMS. Where would you suggest that Federal contribution for code enforcement would be spent? Where would it go?

Mr. MANDEL. Well, I certainly haven't thought out this program, Senator. Mayor Holland, maybe we should have talked about this sooner. I don't agree with you, as you see.

Mr. HOLLAND. I point to the democratic nature of our administration of Trenton.

Senator RANDOLPH. It would appear to me that the program in Trenton, the State capital city, and its environs has been successful and I would like for you to discuss it further. Mr. Mayor, has there been this spirit of enthusiasm, or has this been a difficult process?

Mr. HOLLAND. Well, it happens that here in this room I observed as I came in, two men, Hal Holker of the Greater Trenton Council, now the Greater Camden Movement, and Isadore Candeub, who was retained by Trenton some years ago to draw up a central business district plan, and they and others who have observed the situation of Trenton are aware that we have had a difficult time, because we were going through a change of government process. We switched from commission form, as they did in Camden, to a council administrator.

Senator RANDOLPH. Do you have a city manager as well as a mayor?

Mr. HOLLAND. Well, we had a city business administrator who had been a city manager, and who was employed with the idea that he act as a city manager, and this was made clear to the department heads.

But we had some internal problems which slowed us, there is no question about it.

The governing bodies as a whole made an unfortunate choice in the selection of a developer. This decision has been rescinded.

We are in the process now of selecting a new developer.

But I would say that, as a result of cooperation with the State, with the county—we are also a county seat—and with the cooperation of the Federal Government, and with this change in government that has taken place in Trenton, there is a whole new atmosphere, and I am confident that while we have been moving slowly, we are going in the next few years ahead to make great strides, and one of the key areas, as Mr. Mandel mentioned, is this one of code enforcement.

I do not want, because of the levity, in any way to deemphasize that point, and I know what he has in mind.

We are tight, budgetwise, and we need some more housing inspectors, but we have just got to get them, I think, and save some money elsewhere for our program in Trenton through our own budget appropri-

ation. But Federal assistance in other respects, or possibly State assistance, you can be of help there, as they have in Pennsylvania.

We have it in the community renewal plan now. We have used State as well as Federal funds along with ours to do an overall study of the need of the communities so far as renewal is concerned. Perhaps some assistance there, to which no one would take exception, might enable cities to give greater emphasis to the really personal phases of the program, such as code enforcement.

I think we have a good Housing Authority. They have worked independently but cooperatively, all things considered. I have introduced recently or suggested to the council that we really go at this question of meeting the housing needs of all of the people in the city, and we hope through education and moral suasion, if necessary on occasion some enforcement—to the extent that it can be—to make some housing available where heretofore it has not been.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you have anything else?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would like to ask Mr. Faherty, who is director of health, recreation and welfare, to briefly and succinctly state any points he feels should be on the record.

Mr. FAHERTY. Senator Williams and Senator Randolph, the following recommendations were prepared and submitted to the Trenton Housing Authority on October 3, 1962. It is a subcommittee of the social service council of Greater Trenton, a private agency, dealing with the health, recreation and welfare services of both public and private agencies in the Greater Trenton area, which made the following recommendations pertaining to the Louis Josephson homes for the elderly:

(1) That a fully qualified person, especially trained and skilled in social service be employed to carry out the comprehensive program for the individual and group adjustment of the tenants. This should be a professionally trained social worker.

(2) That an advisory committee be officially established, comprised of professional and lay leaders with experience and interest in the problems and welfare of elderly people.

(3) That the public image of the project is important and that a planned program of public relations and community interpretation be established.

Other recommendations made were counseling, health, income maintenance and employment, recreation and program, and even transportation.

I would like to briefly dwell on why they want a specially trained professional person to help with the elderly.

As you know, it has probably been stated that there are 1,287 existing units in Trenton; public housing. There are 256, Mr. Mandel said, under construction, which will be used up primarily by people from the John Fitch Way, and there are 150 elderly projects that will be opened November 1.

The reason we are asking Federal appropriation for a professional person for 152 units is that this specially skilled professional person should be located directly in the Louis Josephson Memorial Homes, commencing with the day the first tenant moved into the project and preferably before.

The functions and requisite training and experience of such a professional person would differ from that of a housing manager, which automatically the Federal Government pays for.

Although funds are required for this, the value in terms of long-term money saving through preventive work as well as the human values in the improved adjustment and continuing satisfying independent living of tenants must be emphasized. Such helping services are as important as the physical facility.

This professional worker should do screening and evaluation, translate it into a confidential file for all tenants, but with proper consideration for the rights of tenants to freely determine their participation.

Such skilled interviewing and evaluation would relate to prospective tenants' desires and their adjustment to the changes involved in moving, and to their fitting into the project.

This activity should also point out, or point up generally, the composition and special needs of the total tenant group, and lead to recommendations in other areas, such as health, recreation, and related needs.

The social worker will offer help to individual tenants or make appropriate referrals. He or she would help with discussion groups and self-government programs, and might also use and supervise competent volunteer lay assistants in friendly visitor and other programs. I just might say that the Soroptimist Club of Trenton is spending approximately \$1,500 in renovating the special recreation room that was set aside under the Federal program. The Federal funds did not give the needs of the room, the actual physical needs.

They—the Soroptimist Club—will buy the equipment and staff the room.

On October 22, the Housing Authority of Trenton referred to the Social Service Council of Greater Trenton that the reports and recommendations that I am putting here officially on the record today have been sent to the regional office of the public housing authority in Philadelphia, and that they are presently being reviewed by the authority in Philadelphia, and we should hear from them in the very near future.

We feel very strongly that in getting people together and living together in such as the Josephson Homes for the Elderly, we just can't say, "Well, all right, this is your room; here is where you live." We must give them a well-rounded program, and without it, I think we are going to fail.

(The report referred to follows:)

REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, SOCIAL SERVICE COUNCIL OF GREATER TRENTON,
TO TRENTON HOUSING AUTHORITY

The attached recommendations have been made by the committees listed below:

COUNSELING

Jerome Y. Palevsky, chairman
Miss Ruth E. Beck
Dr. Adelbert Botts
Mrs. Robert Forer
Mrs. Erma Gerlach
William Grace
Thomas Mahoney
Seymour Mandel
Miss Elizabeth Northcutt
Msgr. Theodore Opdenaker
Miss Elinor Portser

INCOME MAINTENANCE AND EQUIPMENT

Ruben Blane, chairman
Mrs. Madeline Amico
John Elkins
William B. Wharton

TRANSPORTATION

Walter Parker, chairman
Charles Goldenbaum
David Jones
Felix Parkinson

RECREATION AND PROGRAM

HEALTH EDUCATION AND SERVICES

Dr. David Eckstein, chairman
Mrs. Amy Atchley
Raymond Dougherty
John Ellis
Dr. Marvin Fishmann
Mrs. Agnes Klinkowstein
Miss Evah Miller
Miss Anita Nicholson
Miss Elizabeth Stewart

Mrs. Frieda Garber, chairman
Capt. Edwin J. Freeh
Mrs. Ethel Gault
Mrs. Mary Jemison
Mrs. Rose Movitch
Mrs. Lilliam Szesze
William Wharton

Committees on adult education, gifts, interfaith, management and rental policies, physical facilities, volunteers are still formulating plans and will report in the near future.

COMMITTEE ON AGING, SOCIAL SERVICE COUNCIL OF GREATER TRENTON

Recommendations concerning services to the tenants of the Louis Josephson
apartments

I. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That a fully qualified person, especially trained and skilled in social service be employed to carry out the comprehensive program for the individual and group adjustment of the tenants.

NOTE.—Preferably, this should be a professionally trained social worker.

2. That an advisory committee be officially established, comprised of professional and lay leaders with experience and interest in the problems and welfare of elderly people.

3. That the public image of the project is important and that a planned program of public relations and community interpretation be established.

II. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

A. *Counseling*

1. The professional worker should do screening and evaluation of all tenants in relation to their desires and special needs and set up a confidential file.

2. The professional worker should help the individual tenant with problems and personal adjustment; develop group counseling and discussion groups; self-government programs; and friendly visitor projects.

B. *Health*

1. An indoctrination program (not identified as a health service, but integrated in the overall program of recreation and education) should be directed first at mental attitudes and then should deal with medical, dental, psychological, social, nursing, and related problems.

2. The building should house an emergency first-aid unit and certain full-time employees should be trained in the minimum essentials of first aid.

3. An evaluation of tenant health and medical needs might point up the value of further health program, if needed.

C. Income maintenance and employment

1. It is recommended that job placement facilities be provided the residents and that shortly after moving into the project each resident interested in working should be interviewed.

2. Negotiations should be held with the Mercer County Council for Senior Citizens with a view to relocating its office in the Josephson Apartments.

3. Simple training courses should be made available to develop new employment skills and to sharpen old ones.

4. A general equipment shop should be set up in the project.

5. A series of meetings should be held regularly on pertinent subjects; should be open to the public in order to make the Josephson Apartments a center for senior citizens activities.

D. Recreation and program

1. A questionnaire to ascertain the recreation interests of the tenants would be an important aid in program planning.

2. Two types of program should be offered:

(a) Large group activities.

(b) Individual program.

3. General suggestions for programs:

(a) Large group meetings (one afternoon a week): Lectures, dramatic productions, birthday parties, films, special holiday programs, potluck suppers, musical programs. (One evening a week): Films, bingo, lectures, dances.

(b) Special events: Bus trips, picnics, etc.

(c) Special interest groups: Painting, arts and crafts, music-rhythm band, choral group, sewing and knitting, rug making, card game instruction, discussion groups, gardening, outdoor games, dancing.

E. Transportation

1. The transit company should be asked to route some of the buses directly to and from the Josephson Apartments on a regularly stated schedule.

2. Every effort should be made to secure reduced fares for all senior citizens on all public transportation in the city.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON HEALTH EDUCATION AND SERVICES

Possible health needs of the residents of the Josephson Homes have been explored thoroughly and as a result of our discussions the following recommendations are offered for implementation or information:

1. The committee feels that an intensive indoctrination program must be instituted. This program should be directed first at mental attitudes, and the subsequent lectures or films deal with medical, dental, psychological, social, nursing, and related problems. This series should be integrated in the overall recreation program and not identified as a health service. The State museum library should be a good source of visual aids.

2. The next most important activity should be the acquiring and dissemination of a complete directory of services so that residents may know what health facilities are available, and where and how they may be obtained. The committee on aging is now revising the 1957 edition of the "Guide to Community Services for the Aging" and will have this ready for distribution by end of the year.

3. The building should house an emergency or first aid unit. In addition, some of the full-time employees must be trained in the minimum essentials of first aid. The committee is obtaining a list of necessary components for a first aid unit and recommends enlisting the help of the Red Cross in training the personnel.

4. The committee discussed rather thoroughly the problems of nursing, medical, and dental care for the residents. Any program for this service must be based on needs and resources. At this time we have no knowledge of the needs nor do we feel that residents should be invited or led to expect such services. It was the unanimous opinion of the members present that only experience could determine how much health care should be offered as a community service. We feel strongly that these residents must continue to live as independ-

ent individuals and should continue to find medical, dental, and paramedical services just as they have prior to entering the homes.

The committee unanimously states that it stands ready to recommend and help implement any overall group medical service which might be found necessary. We feel that no commitments can or should be made at this time.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

The committee recommends that the housing authority request the transit company to route some of the buses directly to and from the Josephson Homes to make it as convenient as possible for tenants of the homes and that every effort be made to secure reduced fares for all men and women over 65 years of age.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RECREATION AND PROGRAM

At a meeting of the committee, held early in the summer, many suggestions and ideas were brought forth and talked through. With much pertinent information unavailable at present, we could set down only generalizations. They are as follows:

(1) A simple questionnaire be given to each tenant to learn interests and likes of same. This would serve as important aid in program planning.

(2) Two types of programs to be offered:

Mass program, large group activity.

Individual program.

General suggestions for programs—

Large group meetings (one afternoon a week):

Special holiday programs.

Musical programs.

Lectures or speakers on topics of interest.

Dramatic productions.

Birthday parties.

Films.

Potluck suppers.

One evening a week (for persons still employed or otherwise occupied):

Films.

Bingo.

Lectures.

Dances.

Special events:

Bus trips.

Picnics.

Special interest groups:

Painting.

Arts and crafts.

Music-rhythm band.

Choral group.

Sewing, knitting.

Rugmaking.

Card game instruction.

Discussion groups (current events or personal problems).

Gardening.

Outdoor games—shuffleboard, horseshoe pitching, etc.

Dancing.

Community service groups:

Prepare mailings for organizations.

Sewing for cancer society.

Projects for hospitals.

Make toys for retarded children.

Opportunity for unscheduled activity:

Reading newspapers, books, and magazines.

TV.

Card games.

Self-government group:

Plan activities for group.

Assist in maintenance of recreation area.

These were the suggestions made by our committee members. The membership of our committee remains as listed.

Sincerely,

FRIEDA H. GABBER.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INCOME MAINTENANCE AND EMPLOYMENT

It is recognized that when an aged individual retires from employment, he loses a great degree of status within his family unit, among his acquaintances, and within his community. In addition to these negative influences, he is personally affected by a loss of pride and a keen feeling that he is no longer useful. This is all due to the fact that he is no longer engaged in productive work and because he is no longer earning income from his own labor.

As a result, experts and senior citizens themselves agree that retirement should include some employment if possible. This would serve not only to maintain the retiree's physical and mental health, but also produce a welcome source of needed income.

With regard to the residents of Josephson Homes, few will be actively working due to the income limitation set as a condition for admission. Most will be at least 62 years of age. Many will be on social security and desirous therefore of not earning over \$1,200 a year. Their greatest demand will as a result, be not for full-time or permanent jobs but for part-time, temporary, and short-term employment.

The committee realizes that these conditions plus the health status of the residents, their changing interests, and the general attitude toward hiring older people that prevails in the area—all these elements limit the job opportunities available. Despite these factors, the committee believes the benefits to be derived are overriding and therefor recommends job placement facilities be provided the residents.

Initially, of course, their employment skills and interests should be cataloged. The committee recommends that shortly after admission, each resident interested in working be interviewed. The placement officer should help him fill out an application, obtain the necessary information, and set up a file for him. The application can be a simple one like the attached form presently being utilized by the Mercer County Council for Senior Citizens. The applicant should be counseled by the placement officer as to how he can prepare for the employer interview. A list of suggestions on how to create a favorable impression when he applies for the job should be reviewed with him.

It is desirable that the placement office be as close as possible to the residents. For this reason, the committee recommends adequate space and telephone service be provided in the project itself. Room for merely a desk, a chair, and a filing cabinet would be sufficient.

The placement officer should be a mature individual who can win the confidence of these older clients, who is sympathetic to and understanding of their needs, and who has had some practical experience, if possible, in the field of aging.

To avoid duplication of effort, to utilize existing community resources, and to keep costs to a minimum, the committee recommends negotiations be held with the Mercer County Council for Senior Citizens with a view to relocating its office to the homes. It is believed the additional workload that might result could readily be absorbed by the council placement officer. We do not believe the State employment service is in a position to furnish the intensive counseling service needed at the homes; however, the older worker specialist is available to offer general guidance and assistance as requested.

Greater publicity concerning the placement office will have to be given. Information must be transmitted to senior citizens looking for jobs and to employees who might have suitable vacancies. Certainly many human interest stories can be produced involving individual residents; these would be especially adaptable for publicizing the work of the employment facility through the press and radio.

Spot announcements the radio offers as a public service will reach both more applicants and more employers. Posters displayed at strategic locations as well as direct mail sent on a selective basis can be productive. Telephone contacts on a regular schedule will also be helpful.

A prime source of publicity is talks before service clubs, civic groups, PTA's, church clubs, Golden Age groups, and business organizations where potential employers meet. These engagements could also be used as opportunities for stimulating organizations into supporting the placement service through funds or volunteer work. All this would be an important responsibility of the placement officer and available volunteers—with nominal clerical assistance to be furnished by the project administration.

The placement officer must also make the rounds by telephone and in person with individual sources of jobs to ascertain employer attitudes, attempt to "sell" the desirability of hiring older workers, solicit their advice, and locate vacant positions.

Information concerning the kind of jobs available and jobs desired by older workers is significant in determining how to bring the right workers and the right job together. The Mercer County Council for Senior Citizens that presently operates a placement agency in our area specially for this age group furnished the following listing with which the State employment service agrees:

JOBS USUALLY OFFERED

Waitresses (part time)	Gardeners (part time)
Dishwashers	Handymen
Janitors	Housekeepers (live in)
Companions	

JOBS USUALLY DESIRED

Dishwashers	General clerical
Janitors	Laborers
Companions	Salesclerks
Houseworkers	Painters
Watchmen	Carpenters
Typists	Babysitting (daytime)

After analyzing the above schedule, the committee believes the council services persons who are in better health, are more independent, and have more funds than those who will be living in the Josephson Homes. For these reasons, the committee believes it will be desirable in the interest of the residents and recommends that simple training courses be made available to develop new employment skills and to sharpen old ones. These courses must be chosen voluntarily by interested individuals; they should not be imposed upon them.

The committee believes that selections will usually be an extension of hobbies. This phase of training and retraining should therefore be closely coordinated with the arts and crafts classes that will be proposed by the adult education committee.

The products and services marketable will be those resulting from such crafts and skills as weaving, braiding, caning, refinishing, sewing, crocheting, repairing, art-metal work, wood novelties such as footstools, and cake decorating. We have learned that practical nursing courses are limited to women under age 55 in accordance with the directive of the State board of nursing. We are led to believe that since babysitters are employed primarily in the evening, training for this type of work will not be of much interest to the residents.

To help with these courses, the committee recommends a general equipment shop be set up in the project. This proposal falls more within the realm of the adult education committee and has probably been made by them. That committee has also probably explored the availability of instructors from the city recreation department, the board of education, the industrial arts senior students at State College, central trade unions, or paid from funds donated by service clubs as an annual project.

We have checked out the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act that was recently enacted. Our residents cannot qualify since this new program is designed to train persons for jobs for which there is a shortage of applicants. Also, persons to be trained must have reasonable expectation of employment in such openings or must give assurance of their willingness to accept employment outside their area of residence.

As an integral part of a planned program on income maintenance, the committee recommends a series of meetings be held regularly on pertinent subjects. Since these will be integrated with the administration's overall education program, these sessions should be the direct responsibility and under the active direction of a professional member of the administration staff. Of course, assistance in planning, arranging, and conducting these meetings may be furnished by residents or by volunteers.

These meetings should be scheduled regularly once a month as part of the overall plan. For maximum attendance, they should be held during the daytime. They should run from 1 to 1½ hours depending upon whether a refreshment period is provided. The meetings should be open to the public in order to make the homes a center for senior citizens' activities and to afford the residents an opportunity to mingle with many other people. The format may be varied—lecture, seminar, debate, demonstration, film, exhibit.

Following is a suggested list of topics and resources. Although specific dates have not yet been set, satisfactory preliminary contacts have been made in most

cases; in others, preliminary contact prior to establishing an agreeable date are not deemed necessary.

1. "Am I Getting the Most Out of Social Security?" Speaker and film from Social Security Administration, 437 E. State St., Trenton (EX 6-3545).
2. "Medical Care Insurance for the Aged—What's the Best Way?" Before election day—Debate between: Congressman Frank Thompson, Jr., and Congressman Willard Curtin (Bucks County—Invite members of Senior Citizen Day Center in Bristol in Congressman Curtin's district) or—Debate between: Irving Engleman, Director of State Division of Welfare and Dr. David Eckstein, 725 Greenwood Ave., Trenton (representing State Medical Society point of view).
3. "How To Shop Wisely." Speaker will be Mrs. Peggy Lawson, Mercer County Home Demonstration Agent (EX 6-4593).
4. "How Are Senior Citizens Being Cheated?" Speaker will be provided by Frank Verga, Deputy Attorney General, State Consumer Frauds Bureau, 1100 Raymond Boulevard, Newark, N.J. (1-MA 4-1414).
5. "Fake Medical Remedies." Speaker can be obtained from U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 42 Broadway, New York City (Whitehall 3-2424).
6. "How To Budget Your Funds." Speaker will be provided by Frank Bowers, vice present, Trenton Trust Co. (EX 6-4030).
7. "Why Make a Will?" Speaker will be Irving Friedman, attorney and chairman of Legal Aid Society, 239 E. Hanover St., Trenton (EX 3-5920).
8. "Second Careers." Symposium of selected individuals who practiced new employment skills after retiring from first careers.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COUNSELING

1. An especially skilled professional person should be located in a private office at the Louis Josephson housing project, commencing with the day the first tenant moves into the project and preferably beforehand. The functions and requisite training and experience of such professional person would differ from that of the housing manager. Although funds are required for this, the value in terms of long-term money saving through preventive work, as well as the human values in the improved adjustment and continuing satisfying independent living of tenants, must be emphasized. Such helping services are as important as the physical facilities.

2. This professional worker should do screening and evaluation, translated into a confidential file, for all tenants, but with proper consideration for the rights of tenants to freely determine their participation. Such skilled interviewing and evaluation would relate to prospective tenants' desires and their adjustment to the changes involved in moving, and to their fitting into the project. This activity should also point up generally the composition and special needs of the total tenant group, and lead to recommendations in other areas (as health, recreation, etc.). The social worker will offer help to individual tenants with varied problems and personal adjustment, including helping with appropriate referrals. He might develop group counseling or discussion group and self-government programs, and might also use and supervise competent volunteer lay assistants in friendly visitor and other programs.

3. The public image of the project, as related to feelings of stigmatization is important, and is related to tenant selection and community interpretation.

4. It is important to have a planned program to furnish information to prospective tenants, as through use of mailings and group meetings, and interpretation through press and radio. Group meetings of prospective tenants, and later of actual tenants very shortly after they have moved into the project, should be well planned.

5. Qualifications for admission and standards for tenant selection should be clearly stated in writing and publicized. Tenant selection standards and priorities should be primarily based on comparative personal and social need, as determined by the social worker.

6. Legal, policy, and administrative responsibilities, mandatory and permissive, should be clearly determined and noted in writing. This would include Federal, State, city, and Trenton Housing Authority directives and available funds for such ancillary services as recreation, counseling, etc.

7. An ongoing advisory committee should be officially established, comprised of professional and lay leaders with experience and interest in the problems and welfare of elderly people. This ought to be done as soon as possible, so as to be effective in assisting the housing authority with planning before the first

tenant moves into the project, and with establishing qualifications for the "social worker" position. In fact, the housing authority has already indicated its desire to use the Social Service Council's Committee on Aging for this purpose, and has been doing so, for which it is to be strongly commended. However, an official, formalized citizens' advisory committee with proper status and specified responsibilities would be very helpful.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not know whether this has happened elsewhere but, as Mr. Faherty pointed out, here we have a private organization, the Soroptomist Club, spending over \$1,000 in a public housing project, and the Social Service Council of Greater Trenton, which is a council of private agencies, which work along with the Trenton Housing Authority. So we have a nonpublic atmosphere in this project.

Senator RANDOLPH. I would like to bring out that the Soroptomist Club is a club composed of women.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is right.

Senator RANDOLPH. I think it is important to say that sometimes the women can do something on their own, without men.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is this connected with the Optimists?

Mr. FAHERTY. No, no connection.

Senator WILLIAMS. All right. Just in a word, have you been able to come to a conclusion, a feeling of how the people in the Josephson Homes feel about this housing after they have been there a while?

Mr. HOLLAND. My reaction was, when I saw that place: "I can't wait to get old."

Mr. Taddio is being moved in. I would like to present him.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Taddio?

Mr. TADDIO. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Where do you live?

Mr. TADDIO. At present?

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. TADDIO. I live in a small apartment at 199 Brother Street.

Senator WILLIAMS. How long have you lived there?

Mr. TADDIO. Oh, since December.

Senator WILLIAMS. Where did you live before that?

Mr. TADDIO. John Fitch Way area for 40 years.

Senator WILLIAMS. Did you own your own home?

Mr. TADDIO. No, I rented it.

Senator WILLIAMS. And you were 40 years in one community?

Mr. TADDIO. Yes, sir.

Mr. FAHERTY. One location.

Senator WILLIAMS. One apartment. Were you in business there?

Mr. TADDIO. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. What was the business?

Mr. TADDIO. Confectionery and grocery store.

Senator WILLIAMS. Where?

Mr. TADDIO. At 381 South Warren Street.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you still have that?

Mr. TADDIO. No, that is gone.

Senator WILLIAMS. Your home and your business went?

Mr. TADDIO. That is right.

Senator WILLIAMS. You had a double belt, so to speak, a one-two punch. Tell us just how you felt, and what developed, and how you feel about it now, would you?

Mr. TADDIO. I feel all right.

Senator WILLIAMS. How about losing your business, was that a hardship?

Mr. TADDIO. No. But I would prefer a somewhat lighter job, some responsibility. I would like that.

Senator WILLIAMS. Where do you work now?

Mr. TADDIO. No work at all. I am 71 years old.

Senator WILLIAMS. You are retired?

Mr. TADDIO. That is right.

Senator WILLIAMS. If this had not come along, would you still be at your confectionery store?

Mr. TADDIO. Well, I don't think so. I think it is a little too late to start over again.

Senator WILLIAMS. No, no; I mean if you had not been moved out.

Mr. TADDIO. That is right.

Senator WILLIAMS. You would.

Mr. TADDIO. I would still be there. I suppose I would die back of the counter.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, did you miss your old community after you moved?

Mr. TADDIO. For a while; yes. I missed it very badly, but now, I am used to it, I suppose, but in life you have to have some kind of a job, responsibility

Senator WILLIAMS. That is interesting, and I think important, too. You are a vigorous man, and you have a lot of productive years ahead of you.

Mr. TADDIO. That is right. I still feel I am able to do any light kind of a job. I mean, no material or heavy jobs, or things like that, but some responsibilities; something, anyhow.

Senator WILLIAMS. I have a friend—I will not go into what his avocation is—but from time to time, he needs workers. His name is Thorne Lord. I am going to tell him about you, and I think he could use you to great advantage. Do you know Mr. Lord?

Mr. TADDIO. Yes. I never met him personally.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I think I am going to try to make a point of that, because I am going to suggest to you that he can give you some light but very important work to do from time to time.

Mr. TADDIO. All right.

Senator WILLIAMS. How do you feel about things? Do you look forward to going over to Josephson?

Mr. TADDIO. Yes. Why, I will like it very much.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you have friends over there?

Mr. TADDIO. Oh, I suppose I will meet a few friends.

Senator WILLIAMS. You do not know of any, offhand?

Mr. TADDIO. I know already a couple of them. They used to live down in my neighborhood.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, it will be good to get together again.

Mr. TADDIO. That is right.

Senator WILLIAMS. Fine. That is excellent. I am glad to hear that report.

We know that a lot of people do not adjust as well as you do to a new community, new housing, new circumstances. We have some charming ladies in the first row back there I want you to meet who have a little different attitude about moving out of their homes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Excuse me, Senator. May I add that this is the reason we are advocating the program that Mr. Faherty pointed to, having a professional person in there to see that the situation is eased somewhat.

Mr. FAHERTY. I did not refer to this because of the time, but the committee—and this is another important phase—I just referred to it as a committee, but they also reported on the income maintenance, and employment, and in reference to just what Mr. Taddio just said, the committee pointed out—and I will leave a copy for your committee—it is recognized that when an aged individual retires from employment or such as Mr. Taddio, he was forced out of business, he loses a great degree of status within his own family unit, among his acquaintances, and within his own community.

In addition to these negative influences, he is personally affected by a loss of pride and a keen feeling that he is no longer useful.

This is all due to the fact that he is no longer engaged in productive work, and because he is no longer earning income from his own labor, and as a result, experts and senior citizens themselves agree that retirement should include some employment if possible.

This would serve not only to maintain the retiree's physical and mental health, but also produce a welcome source of needed income.

With regard to the Josephson Homes for the Elderly, few will be working, due to the income limitations set for a condition for admission, most will be at least 62 years of age, most will be on social security and desirous, therefore, of not earning over \$1,200 a year. Their greatest demand, therefore, will be, as a result, not for full-time or permanent jobs but for part-time and short-term employment.

We realize that these conditions, plus the health status of the residents, this changing attitude toward hiring older people that prevails in our area, all of these limit the job opportunities available.

Despite these factors, we believe the benefits to be derived are overriding and, therefore, we recommend job placement opportunities provided the residents through this professionally trained social worker. This is only one phase of it.

Senator RANDOLPH. You mentioned the importance of the attitude of the worker because it is not only the aptitude, but also the attitude that brings the best work into focus. For this reason, sometimes those who are older in our population are able to do a job beyond the younger person who has only the skill but perhaps does not have the proper attitude or appreciation toward the job. This is found to be true by many employers, and this combination especially can be used, and utilized, in part-time work.

Mr. FAHERTY. Well, we have a policy the mayor established when he—under the old system, for years, for the last 7 years, he would allow anyone even though our mandatory requirement age is 70, he will allow any worker, even now, under the new form of government, to stay on in the city of Trenton, over 70 years of age, if they can produce. And you would be surprised—when a certain State agency let go of, well, at least 35 to 50 people a few years ago, we picked up two at Donnelly Memorial Hospital, both of whom were our finest workers, up until they actually passed on.

Senator WILLIAMS. Those folks were displaced from their jobs as some people are displaced from their homes by highways.

Mr. FAHERTY. Right.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would you like to hear, Senator, from Mr. Britton?

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes, indeed, Mayor Holland. Let us have Mr. Britton and Mr. Taddio stay at the table, if they will, while we hear from Mrs. Parthenia Driscoll and her friends from Pitman Grove. Then they can join in the discussion.

Our thanks to you, Mayor, and to your associates for giving us the benefit of your experience in Trenton.

**STATEMENTS OF MRS. PARTHENIA DRISCOLL, MRS. MARY J. FOX,
MRS. VERNA JOHNSON, AND MRS. ETTA DUBLE, PITMAN, N.J.**

Senator WILLIAMS. Now, who from the Pitman group can describe the situation that is proposed for your community?

Mrs. Driscoll?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. I will try.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mrs. Driscoll, we are going to put in the record news accounts from the Sunday Bulletin, and they describe how the Pitman voters are considering renewal in the section called "the Wheel."

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Yes.

(The newspaper articles referred to follow:)

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Sunday Bulletin of Oct. 28, 1962]

COUNCIL IS SHARPLY DIVIDED ON PLAN TO REDEVELOP PITMAN'S GROVE AREA

PITMAN, October 27.—Borough council is sharply divided in the proposed urban renewal project for the eastern section of Pitman's Grove area.

The voters will decide November 6 whether they want a 4.7-acre section of the century-old Grove torn down and replaced with a borough-owned parking lot, and perhaps a supermarket. The project would cost \$410,000 and involve demolition of 75 homes.

The Federal Government would pay most of the cost, with Pitman's share set at \$95,000.

THREE MEN FAVOR IT

Favoring the proposal on council are Mayor John R. Robbins and Councilmen Claude G. Myers and Samuel E. Witchell. But Councilmen John R. Kelly and L. L. Preston Brooks are opposed to the project, saying the redevelopment would cost too much money for the amount of improvement received.

Councilmen Charles H. Dudichum and Harry P. Salmon have not yet said whether they favor the project or oppose it.

Solidly behind the renewal project are the nine-member planning board, the nine-member Citizens Advisory Committee, eight clergymen, and five former mayors, William B. Brown, Melvin Webb, Walter S. Gibbs, William C. Hall and Harold Thompson.

PARKING SPACE NEEDED

Frank B. Kelly, secretary of the Businessmen's Association, said, "It is not expected that a group such as ours of 160 members can be unanimous on such a question." But he said the need for more parking space has been recognized for many years.

"The parking lot is a service our citizens should have," he said.

He added, "This is Pitman's first opportunity to be progressive."

Arthur M. Holler, Democratic candidate for council, said he and his party are opposed to the urban renewal program. "Pitman has many other needs at this time, among them a new sewerage disposal plant and more school facilities," he said.

WIDOW, 81, THINKS RENEWAL WOULD "SPOIL" HISTORIC AREA

PITMAN, October 27.—Mrs. Parthenia Driscoll, 81, a widow and Grove citizen since she purchased her five-room, two-story home there 31 years ago, says she can see "no advantage at all" in the proposed renewal of the area.

She and 166 other persons would be forced to move if the voters approve the project November 6. Their homes would be torn down, to be replaced by a parking lot, and perhaps a food store.

Noting that the area is one of old homes, Mrs. Driscoll said:

"It is not where you live, but how you live. Those with pride take an interest in their homes."

OUTSIDERS LOVE IT

"Outsiders fall in love with the Grove. It is a unique and picturesque area, where many of today's prominent Pitman families first owned summer cottages. Its overall design and tree-lined, pedestrian avenues, running from the central camp meeting auditorium in 12 directions, remind one of Paris.

"If a portion of the historic Grove is torn down, it will spoil the whole effect, making it look like a jigsaw puzzle.

"For those who would renew Pitman, let them preserve this quaint, quiet area which was the town's beginning and is rich in tradition. Broken-down homes could be repaired or removed and parks put in their places, making the area a perfect artist's and writer's colony.

"As for housing for the elderly, which we hear so much about, the Grove serves a wonderful purpose for 56 of us, all over 60 years. In this closely knit community, we retain our individuality and security. In turn, we ask nothing from the borough."

BROKEN HEARTS, TOO

"My expenses here run \$8.50 a month for land rental and utilities. Where else can I live as cheaply? I paid \$500 for my house, which is tax exempt, in 1931. I have been offered \$2,500 for it.

"Others, as myself, have lived their lives here and expect to die here. If the urban renewal goes through, there will be not only a lot of welfare but broken hearts.

"I have happy memories here, and I would really hate to leave, but I will take it as it comes. Most of all, I want to be able to retain my independence."

Senator WILLIAMS. Could you tell us about it, Mrs. Driscoll?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Well, you see the grove section is laid out like a wheel, and the auditorium is the center, the hub of the wheel, and the avenues are like the spokes, North, East, South, and West Avenues are the rim.

Now, three of these avenues open up on different streets, each one. Three go to East Avenue, and three north, three west, and three south.

Now, this urban renewal only calls for taking the eastern section of this grove.

Pitman was really started, in the first place, in the Grove.

Senator WILLIAMS. I see.

How old is the section that you have described as "the Wheel"?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Well, about—well, we have had camp meetings there 92 years. I don't know just how old.

Senator WILLIAMS. How many families live in the area that is being considered for a renewal program?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Seventy-six.

Senator WILLIAMS. Seventy-six individuals or families?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Seventy-six houses will be taken down, and around 160 individuals will have to be relocated.

Senator WILLIAMS. What is the proposal for the area? What are they planning?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Well, that is what we are all objecting to. The fact is that all they want is extra parking, and what I call an unnecessary street.

We have East Avenue close by, and they want to run the street right through my home and others there, too.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is this near or part of a rather busy business center?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Very close. It is right, you might say, in the business section. Of course, they are calling it the slums there.

Now, the only reason they are calling it that is because businessmen and realtors have bought some houses where the older folks have died, and they have rented them to individuals that are not taking the proper care of them. That really has been an awful thing for the grove, because we have wonderful people there, and everyone that owns their homes really take pride in them.

It is only the ones that rent them that make up what they call the slums, and it is too bad, because I have lived in my house 31 years, and most of these elderly people are around 70—of course, the younger ones are the ones that are renting; it doesn't make so much difference about them, because they can always find homes—but what is to become of us?

Now they claim—the urban renewal ones that are the heads of it—claim that the association has 15 houses they will turn over to us. Now, the association has taken over a number of houses, very cheap, and they remodeled them, they repaired them. They rent some of them for \$45 a month, and then they put in gas heat, which runs most of them \$30 a month. We can't pay that. My house runs about \$140 a year.

Senator WILLIAMS. You own your house?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. We all do.

Senator WILLIAMS. I take it that, at that rate, you must have your mortgage paid off?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. No mortgage at all. I bought the house for \$500, and I have been offered \$2,500 for it a number of times, but I didn't want to sell it.

I have worked several years and saved up for the time when I could retire right in that little home. Now I won't be able to, and there is no place that they can get for us.

Now they say that there are 60 homes available. There are none available now. Well, they are going to have a reappraisal, and come in April, I believe, and give us a price. I guess it will be take it or leave it.

What are we going to do?

Senator WILLIAMS. How many families would you say are similarly situated, retirement years, and own their own homes?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Well, most all of them, wouldn't you say, ladies?

Mrs. JOHNSON. I would say about 50.

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Fifty out of the seventy-six. Most of the elderly ones have retired anyway.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you other ladies each own your own home?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you have people living with you?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. No, we all live alone, and they are nice homes, and they are wonderful people there. And to throw us out after all this time, when we have nowhere to go. They say they will relocate us. They say they have 60 homes in the main part of the borough. Well, Pitman is a town where most people own their own homes, and you take the ones that rent, they are not renting them for fun I understand. They rent from \$70 to \$90 a month.

We have nothing in store for us.

Senator WILLIAMS. It is hard for me in this photograph that I have, that is in the newspaper, to get the feeling of the community. It looks as though it were taken by a U-2 plane at about 100,000 feet, so you cannot tell, but the article describes it as a very picturesque, very attractive part of town.

Mrs. DRISCOLL. It is, and it has beautiful oak trees there, and in the spring and fall is a really beautiful place.

Now I am told that East Avenue will be done away with, and they will turn that into a mall, and they will have a supermarket in one section that they are going to tear apart, and they are going to put a supermarket there for the elderly people. There won't be any left by the time they get that market built.

Now, I don't know what they are going to do with these people. There is no place in Pitman that I know they can put them.

Senator WILLIAMS. You have been advised that there are 60 homes that will be available?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Yes, I have been advised that by one of the head ones of this urban renewal, and 15 homes the association would turn over, but look at the rentals.

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Now, we are all retired, and all of these people are on low social security and small pensions, and I am 81 myself, and most of them are around 70, can't get any work, and the ones who don't, have social security or pensions.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are there any apartment house developments in construction or planned?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Not for the relocation. Not yet.

I tell you, it is coming up for a vote next week, and I think it will be turned down.

To tell you the truth, we all hope it is turned down.

Senator WILLIAMS. Did you hear Mr. Taddio explain what happened to his home and his business?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. And there, the city of Trenton, you see, they have arranged for him now to go to a modern, new apartment house.

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. He looks forward to it, I take it, don't you, Mr. Taddio?

Mr. TADDIO. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. How would you ladies feel if that were true in your community? Would you look forward to it—assuming the rents were right—if there were a modern, convenient, comfortable apartment ready for you?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Well, if the rents were right, but we are told if the association puts up an apartment house, which they expect to do, why, the rents will be around \$45 a month. I can't pay \$45.

I tell you, I have four children, and I could depend on them, but I don't want to do it. I can keep my little home as it is without asking anyone, and if the borough does take over these homes, they are not only going to have a lot of heartaches, but they are going to have a lot of welfare on their hands, because so many people can't pay rents.

Anyone who has owned a home for 30 years doesn't want to start paying rent.

Mr. TADDIO. Well, the rent in the project is quite low, really. Imagine, I get an efficiency apartment, that means one room, and all the accommodations, the little kitchen, refrigeration, and all, for only \$30 a month. That means the electricity and gas are paid.

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Well, I don't know, but would you like to say anything about that, Mrs. Johnson? Have you anything to say?

Mrs. JOHNSON. I would be willing to go into an apartment, but not at \$90 rental.

Senator WILLIAMS. What?

Mrs. JOHNSON. Not at \$90 rental. Forty-five dollars and then something like \$30 for gas, which would bring it up to about \$85 a month, and that is the only thing we have heard of.

Senator WILLIAMS. What sort of rent would you all feel is realistic and within average means of people situated as you are?

Do you have a monthly figure that you would feel is realistic as a renter, if you no longer owned your home?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Well, I have around \$700 a year coming in, so you can imagine what I would pay for rent, what I would be able to pay.

Senator WILLIAMS. These are, of course, personal questions, and if there is anything you do not want to answer, why, just say so. It is very helpful to us, because this is the sort of—

Mrs. DRISCOLL. That is perfectly all right.

Senator WILLIAMS. Because this is the sort of human facts, you know, we get a lot of statistics, the averages, this, that, and the other, but this gives us really what is happening back in our home towns.

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Well, what I feel is that the owners of these properties, that are causing the Grove to be called the slums, should tell their tenants to clean up or get out. Now, the people that have such a pride in Pitman, have a right to see that something is done about the conditions that are there. They talk about them, but they don't do anything about them. And it is the ones that are renting them that are causing it, because everyone who owns a home takes pride in it, keeps it nice.

There are some people that have bought homes for retirement and they are working at the present time, the boys damage the rails, and the porches, and it can't be helped, but, anyway, it is too bad to take that, just for this parking and this unnecessary street, to throw these 76 families out of their homes for the sake of parking, and it is going to raise the taxes, too.

Senator WILLIAMS. I was going to observe in terms of public service, the automobile is the best-treated commodity in this country. A lot better than our people. An automobile is getting \$14 billion over 10 years for the interstate highway system, you know, and I was flying over Trenton today, and it struck me how much of the city has to be given over to the parking lots, which is something to consider when we lose our valuable land, so valuable for residence, commercial, industrial, and for just idle cars all day long, empty lots all night long.

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Well, the ones that are pushing this claim that business can't expand, but I can't see that it will expand in that section, no.

Mrs. Fox. Well, what I object to is they don't want to give us anything for our property, and then we are supposed to put that down on another home. I think they told me at City Hall I would get

something like \$1,750. My goodness, I paid a lot more than that, and I have spent double what I paid; and that seemed very unfair to me. I begrudge giving it to Pitman, very much so.

Mrs. DUBLE. Thank you, Mrs. Fox.

Mrs. DUBLE. Do you have anything to add to the views of your friends?

Mrs. DUBLE. Well, I own my own home, and I have been there 24 years, and I would awfully hate to have to give it up. That is the way I feel about it.

To me, I think it is all unnecessary.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is your situation similar to the others here?

Mrs. DUBLE. Yes, I am on social security. I was a worker, a good many years, and have spent a good lot of money on my home. I have a real home, where some of them, of course, they really don't, you know, but I have a real home, and I would feel very bad if I have to leave my home.

Mrs. Fox. Well, most of us, I think, have made our homes so they are convenient and comfortable. Don't you believe that? You know, for your older years, you do that; you know just where everything is.

Mrs. DUBLE. Well, that is why we bought them.

Mrs. Fox. That is exactly right.

Mrs. DUBLE. We thought that that would be the end of our working days, and now it is a different story.

Mrs. Fox. I think it is the loss of dignity that hurts worse than anything else.

This used to be a free country, but it isn't any more; it is nothing but confiscation.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are you near your churches, stores, libraries, everything?

Mrs. Fox. Everything. That is why I bought there.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Within walking distance.

Senator WILLIAMS. I was coming to that. I wondered about transportation. You have public transportation?

Mrs. JOHNSON. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. And you are also within walking distance of the day-to-day needs that you have?

Mrs. JOHNSON. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Britton, we have not heard from you.

Could you give us a little description of what lies ahead for you?

You are, I am told, soon to lose your present home, and will go to another home.

Mr. BRITTON. Well, I don't know what lies ahead, I can't say that part.

Senator WILLIAMS. Where do you live now?

Mr. BRITTON. 165 South Broad Street, Trenton.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is that in a project area?

Mr. BRITTON. That is going to be torn down.

Senator WILLIAMS. It is going to be torn down?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you rent or do you own your home?

Mr. BRITTON. I rent an apartment.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you live alone?

Mr. BRITTON. I live alone, yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. And what of the people in charge in Trenton—Mr. Mandel or the mayor—what have they suggested to you as far as a new home is concerned, after your home is torn down?

Mr. BRITTON. They have suggested to me, but I didn't want to go.

Senator WILLIAMS. Have they suggested the Josephson Homes?

Mr. BRITTON. No, to these new homes.

Senator WILLIAMS. One of the large apartment places?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. And you do not want to go there?

Mr. BRITTON. I don't want to go.

Senator WILLIAMS. You would rather have your own apartment in one of the older buildings?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you think you can find one near your present community?

Mr. BRITTON. I could find one, but they are too high.

Senator WILLIAMS. The rents?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes, sir. I could find one right across the street, for \$60. I am paying \$50 for two rooms.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, the people in Trenton are going to help you find a place, are they not?

Mr. BRITTON. Oh, yes, they are very nice people.

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes, I know them personally, and, of course, I heard them here today. It seems to me they want to do everything possible.

Mr. BRITTON. They will.

Senator WILLIAMS. It is their job to be there to help you, and I think they are helping you.

Mr. BRITTON. They will help me.

Senator WILLIAMS. Good. You are fortunate that you have that particular group of men on your side.

Now Mr. Taddio has been, as we say, relocated; he is finding a new home, and he thinks he is going to like it, but I certainly can understand the attitude of people who have their own home; they have had it for years and years, it represents an investment, and it represents a strong, long attachment to a community. It is a real problem, and that is why we are here to just get these stories and see how and where there has to be a change. Where the land use has to change for one necessary public purpose or another, and where there is this involuntary dislocation, then we want to find ways to help to the maximum ease the real pain of having to move. Of course, a lot of people who move, you realize, find better homes, because they are living in very, very poor circumstances now.

Mr. BRITTON. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. I think perhaps that was somewhat true down in the John Fitch Way area; was it not, Mr. Taddio?

Mr. TADDIO. Sir?

Senator WILLIAMS. It was an area that was pretty well run down?

Mr. TADDIO. Literally, yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. So your housing is going to be vastly improved?

Mr. TADDIO. I hope so.

Mr. BRITTON. He has me jealous.

Senator WILLIAMS. He has you jealous?

Mr. BRITTON. I still don't want to go. I think it is very nice, everyone says it is nice up there, but I don't want to go.

Senator WILLIAMS. What was your work, Mr. Britton?

Mr. BRITTON. Well, mostly, I have been a huckster all my life.

Senator WILLIAMS. A what?

Mr. BRITTON. A huckster. You know, the ones that come along, you want bananas, tomatoes, everything.

Senator WILLIAMS. Oh, I see. Did you do that before the truck and the automobile?

Mr. BRITTON. Sir?

Senator WILLIAMS. Did you do that before we used a truck and an automobile?

Mr. BRITTON. No, sir; a truck.

Senator WILLIAMS. Before that, were you in the business?

Mr. BRITTON. Oh, yes. It was a long time ago.

Senator WILLIAMS. That was about a few decades before we needed urban renewal and the great highways. We need them now.

Mr. BRITTON. Yes; we do.

Senator WILLIAMS. And I want to reiterate what we said before. We are here to make progress as painless as possible. Is that the way to put it?

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mrs. Driscoll, isn't it true that they have given up the idea of making those apartments?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. They haven't done anything about it.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, arrangements have been made for your ride home back to Pitman, I believe, and everything is all right. You have got arrangements made?

Mrs. FOX. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Good. Thank you very much.

Do you want us to send you copies of our hearings?

Mrs. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Good. We will send you copies.

Thank you, Mr. Taddio. We have got a young, spirited fellow there.

(The following letter was subsequently received from Mrs. Driscoll:)

NOVEMBER 3, 1962.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: While thinking over my report on Monday (in the Federal Building, Camden, N.J.) concerning urban renewal of Pitman, I find that I made a few mistakes that I wish to correct for the record.

In the beginning, I was told that 79 families would lose their homes, later 76, and the latest report says 73. Two residents have passed away in the last 2 weeks.

I was also informed that 300 individuals would be affected by this change which, after consideration, I think is impossible. The elderly people only have 1 and some have 2 living in 1 house, and I understand that would involve about 50 homes.

The rented houses contain parents and two to seven children, so they are the cause of the so-called congested condition, also substandard and hazardous state, most of them only having two bedrooms.

I also said that my house cost about \$100 a year, and it did until recently. That does not include heating, which will cost for the 6 months in use this year, about \$76, which will raise the annual amount to about \$140, or \$11.70 a month, and I reported \$8.50.

Another thing I wish to explain: I never visited Paris. I know nothing about it, and when the reporter suggested that our "grove" resembled Paris, I said, "Please do not quote me as saying that," but as it was written, it sounded as though I had.

I believe in progress and business expansion, and feel that something should have been done about this condition years ago when Pitman Grove started deteriorating. It is an ideal spot for elderly people; nothing like it in New Jersey or elsewhere with its cute cottages with vine-covered porches, flowerbeds, and the beautiful trees and the many Christian people enjoying life in their independence and self-sufficiency.

Why take it all away from us, just for parking, and making an unnecessary street when our homes are all we have left?

Some of us lost money during the depression and were glad to get these small houses, thinking, now we can be secure to live our days out in peace and enjoyment.

Beautifying Pitman, create more parking space to help the businessman, expansion, yes, but please don't take away our homes to fulfill the order.

I thank you for listening to me.

Yours truly,

Mrs. PARTHENIA DRISCOLL.

Senator WILLIAMS. Now we have three more witnesses, and the next is the Reverend Griesmann.

Reverend, please come forward.

STATEMENT OF REV. D. A. GRIESMANN, ST. JOHN'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH, CAMDEN, N.J.

Reverend GRIESMANN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator WILLIAMS. You are at St. John's Parish?

Reverend GREISMANN. That is right, our parish is located right in the center of South Camden, where there are some 25,000 people living. About one-fifth, I guess, of the city population, and a fair number of them—I do not have the exact statistics—are aged people. Specifically, my report to you is upon the involuntary relocation of aged business people, persons who have small shops and retail stores.

My report, basically, is maintained on a series of questions which I asked 11 business people in the neighborhood, their opinions and feelings about these questions.

The major overall plan was to ask what effect urban renewal would have on their business, what problems they would be facing, and specifically these questions:

"What would you do if you had to relocate?"

"How much time would you need?"

"Would you resettle in Camden? And specifically, within this neighborhood? And if not, what type of neighborhood?"

"What problems would you face with a changed clientele, if this were to come about?"

"What assistance would you need in relocating?" And this included two parts, first, property finding, and secondly, financial help in just moving the equipment.

Now, these are the comments that I received back from these various business shops.

Phil's Barber Shop, which is on Broadway in the place of urban renewal in the future, and according to the city of Camden, will be a shopping center, felt that he was not going to be affected, because he was going to move anyhow within the year to the suburbs.

The Ware Truss Co., next door, owns their store and the barber shop. They felt that they would like to relocate on Broadway in the shopping center. They feel that Camden still has a place for business, and they would like to rebuy, if they were given options on the property. They feel that there were no problems about color or race, and they felt that Camden is still central to their type of business.

Joseph's Carpentry Shop around the corner, again a place of urban renewal in the future, is just in business to keep busy, but he did give some comments which seemed at least to present an opinion of some aged people. They just don't know what tomorrow will bring. They don't really know what urban renewal will do to them, a little bit afraid of questions, and a little bit afraid of the reality that this kind of threat, as he calls it, will do to them, and after each question, he would say "I just wouldn't say, because I don't know what I would do."

Field's Grocery Store, she runs this business with her son. She felt that relocation would cause a serious problem. She felt that she would go out of business, and she felt that probably the Government would not be able to offer her compensation for what she would be losing. She works on a small profit, and the store presents the only income she has. She needs the store to live, she feels.

She thought she might possibly relocate in the suburbs if her son were to move there, but she wasn't sure that she was of sufficient age to do so.

She has a small stock on hand, and she felt that she would need financial help in moving things of that nature.

Gene's Drug Store which is in the site of the proposed north-south freeway, which Mayor Pierce spoke about earlier today. He felt that if urban renewal was to be presented actively to him, he would be out of business. He felt he was too old. If he were 35 years younger, he said, he would start over again, but not now.

He formerly had his drugstore across the street, but formerly it was condemned because of highway proposal, and he moved across the street, but still the highway hasn't been produced anyhow.

He had some bitter comments to make about this and felt that none of this would come about, "They just like to manipulate people."

He felt that the kind of north-south freeway that would be produced would be of benefit to him if it was at street level. If it was overhead, it would make his area blighted and he would be out of business; he felt that if it was an underpass, it would hurt his business, but he would stay.

Joe, the barber, felt that urban renewal would cancel him out of business. He would just as soon go out of business if urban renewal came in anyway.

These are just samples.

Out of the 11, 7 said that they would move out and relocate in the suburbs, 4 said they would like to relocate in Camden, and 3 felt that they would be out of business completely.

Time and time again, other persons who are not enumerated in this report felt that urban renewal is long in coming in Camden, but they also felt that the Government is a manipulator of people.

They felt that they would need time for relocation ranging from 6 months to 1 year, in order to move large equipment out, such as a printer, moving his equipment out, and so forth.

None of the people I talked to would fight urban renewal by taking it to court.

Some of the problems specifically that came out of what I heard, first, fear—fear of losing status and fear of losing income.

Secondly, there was the problem of the ghetto specialty shop, that is, the little Spanish grocer who deals mainly with the Spanish people, selling pins to beans, and so forth. They felt that because of urban renewal, if it canceled them out, they would have a hard time relocating, since the Spanish people would be affected, and perhaps not be in one locality in toto.

There was a special problem to some of the people insofar as race is concerned. If this was a Negro shopkeeper, he was fearful that the Negroes would be spread abroad, and it would hurt his business, and especially the Negro barber and the white barber would be affected by a change in racial population.

There seemed to be special problems facing those who rent their property. "Will we receive help in moving the equipment?" Where will they be able to relocate their business; will there be a relocation office for businesses?

There was also a special problem of the owners.

Would they have first option on the property after it was renewed?

Would there be places that they would have to relocate by city ordinance and law and code, or would they be free in movement into a new area?

There seemed to be the problem of finding another place to open up their business.

Would they receive some help through the urban renewal program in relocating their shops and relocating where people will be found?

Now, generally speaking, and summarizing what I had to offer just in the way of questions is: In our job-centered society, retirement from gainful employment tends to beget feelings of loss of personal worth and identity and result in a loss of status in the family and community, and this fear was exemplified by a number of people I have talked to.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, that has been a very helpful survey that you have made for us, Father. We are very grateful. It is sort of a mixed reaction of this group that you used for your test.

We recognize that it is a hardship, and they do, I mean the folks who have removal hanging over them have a hard time.

Reverend GRIESMANN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. There really is not any central agency for help and assistance and advice on moving businesses that I know of. We have heard others suggest that this would be a very helpful service, as we have location centers and agencies for people losing their homes, so, too, it is the same kind of problem when you have your little business.

Reverend GRIESMANN. Well, there seems to be within the urban renewal plans of Camden, at least, some specific means for shopping areas where stores will be placed in a shopping center, and some of the people would like to go into these areas, but they want to know what sort of option will they have on it, what sort of help will be given.

The Ware Truss Co., the woman there, is in her late sixties but she feels she would be able to exist for about 6 or 7 months without her shop's operating. She would like to come back right onto the

same block again, but she is afraid they are just going to buy her out, and then she would not have a chance to open up again. Anything further?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I have one question. We had another witness discuss this, just the other side, from the businessman. He says that these areas have a low-priced economy, I think is the phrase that he used, that is, to the people living there, the Spanish shop and other shops. They offer services at a more reasonable rate than you might find in other areas.

Reverend GRIESMANN. Yes.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. They have this importance. Do you feel that this is true in this area also?

Reverend GRIESMANN. Yes; the taxes are kind of low where they are. It is a slum neighborhood, but along Broadway there are some of these small shops, and the taxes are low, the rent is low; but if the urban renewal swept through, taxes would go up, they are afraid, and renting a nicer fronted shop would be prohibitive.

One other problem I wanted to bring up, and that was an old man who runs a junk shop down in our neighborhood; he is quite fearful that in urban renewal there will be no room for the junk shopkeeper with the dirty front window and the kind of a romantic atmosphere of shrunken heads, and so forth, inside the shop, where people can sell their junk, and he can buy it and resell it. He felt that the suburbs offered him nothing, the city was offering him nothing, and he was just lost. He was quite afraid that he would be put out of business, and would not be allowed to open up again, and he wanted to open up again. He wanted to exist.

Mr. FRANTZ. I gather that this was his primary source of income?

Reverend GREISMANN. Yes.

Mr. FRANTZ. So that it was an economic matter as well as a desire to work?

Reverend GREISMANN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I think that is all.

Reverend GREISMANN. Thank you, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. We are very grateful, really, for all of the good time that you gave to our committee today, and we certainly appreciate it.

Reverend GREISMANN. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. Now we will hear from Mr. Isadore Candeb, who is president of Candeb, Fleissig & Associates, of Newark.

STATEMENT OF ISADORE CANDEUB, PRESIDENT, CANDEUB, FLEISSIG & ASSOCIATES, NEWARK, N.J.

Mr. CANDEUB. Senator, I would like to address myself to two problems in connection with the involuntary relocation of the elderly. The first is with respect to those living in the central urban areas and the second pertains to the availability of living facilities in suburban areas.

I am sure you are aware of the very considerable need that exists for housing facilities to relocate the elderly from projects being undertaken throughout the country. I believe you will also find that there are numerous and excellent provisions being made for the con-

struction of new facilities, either directly under public auspices or through private enterprise, with various forms of Federal assistance. Nonetheless, on the basis of our experience to date, the extent of facilities needed are such that they cannot be fully met through new construction. Particularly in the older core areas where virtually no land is available for rehousing except through clearance activities, it becomes imperative to make full use of the existing housing stock.

There has been recognition given to this in recent years in terms of the entire constellation of activities required under the workable program, particularly with reference to the upgrading of housing codes and the implementation of code enforcement programs.

In 1954, the program for salvaging old existing housing stock was further implemented by the expansion of the Federal redevelopment program to encompass a broader range of urban renewal activities including structural rehabilitation and the conservation of neighborhoods.

An additional move in this same direction has been the recent exploration by housing authorities of the possibility of acquiring existing structures in older neighborhoods for renovation and use as public housing facilities.

While these various programs have been of positive value, a critical appraisal of the impact of the 1954 Federal renewal legislation in terms of neighborhood rehabilitation will show that the results have been very disappointing. Of course, one of the reasons is the tremendous problem of building up suitable local staffs and working procedures to accomplish this type of program, but with the passage of time this reason becomes less and less a factor. A far greater factor is the nature of the rehabilitation efforts that have been made to date and the relationship of such efforts to the specific problem of relocating elderly persons from areas that are to be cleared.

Rehabilitation under present procedures is basically directed toward the upgrading of an existing urban neighborhood in which there is some deterioration, to a level where the quality of housing is sufficiently high to assure the soundness of public and private investment in the area. Translated into brick and mortar terms, this means that all buildings in the area have to be improved to a high structural standard with all sanitary facilities and in compliance with all existing codes and requirements.

While this is a very worthy objective, we find in actual practice that there are relatively few of our problem neighborhood areas that qualify for this type of upgrading, and the procedures which must be followed to secure Federal aid for all neighborhood revitalization are such that the program can be undertaken only at a very slow pace.

In partial recognition of these problems, the Housing and Home Finance Agency set up a more limited category of rehabilitation which they call "reconditioning," which was intended to upgrade areas that might not qualify for the full treatment. It was felt that with limited treatment such areas might be raised to a livable standard for a period of possibly 10 years. These areas were considered to be eligible for clearance activities but because of various factors of relocation, such clearance had to be deferred for a period of years. Apparently, problems involved in making this type of program function have been so great that for all practical purposes "reconditioning"

has remained an inactive program and there is no particular emphasis given to this program at this time.

I would like to suggest that our efforts in the direction of conservation, rehabilitation, and reconditioning be reviewed at this time with respect to our larger objectives of relocating families, particularly our elderly population who are so concentrated in many of our central city areas.

In this evaluation, I think that it could be readily determined that the present objectives of bringing existing neighborhoods up to a very high standard for the sake of security on a financial investment being made in these areas is quite probably in direct conflict with the more important social objective of upgrading as much housing as we can possibly upgrade in our central areas, in the interest of providing facilities for relocation.

We need a functional program of supporting code enforcement efforts with a limited rehabilitation program consisting of:

- (1) a neighborhood plan;
- (2) specific public improvement projects;
- (3) available financing for structural renovations and rehabilitation at moderate interest rates.

I trust that this subcommittee will therefore make it one of its major recommendations that the goals and objectives of rehabilitation and reconditioning existing neighborhoods under the urban renewal program be thoroughly reviewed to more directly orient the present program to the social objectives of relocation and, particularly, relocation of the elderly.

With respect to the suburban areas, we are finding in our metropolitan regions that many of the communities are setting up rigid zoning barriers against apartment development in almost any form. While such barriers are justified locally on grounds of tax income, avoidance of blight, maintaining of neighborhood character and other apparent planning considerations, one of the net effects of this type of zoning is to bar development of housing resources for the elderly in many of the suburban portions of our metropolitan regions.

Since the central areas of some of these communities are excellently situated to provide sites for housing for the elderly by virtue of convenience to shopping, medical facilities, adequate transportation, and parks, the net effect of such zoning practice is to deprive our regions of some of the best sites usable for such facilities.

Curiously, these practices are now being justified in some cases by master plan programs undertaken with Federal financial assistance under the "701" planning program. It is rather ironic that planning funds intended to promote the proper development of our urban areas for social objectives can be, and sometimes are misused in this fashion.

I would suggest that some type of procedure be incorporated in the 701 program to require that attention be given in the master plan to the provision of sites for housing for the elderly. I feel that without such a provision, despite the ever-increasing pressure for such sites, one of the chief problems that we will be facing in the next decade will be the fact that they are not available and that, as a consequence, housing for the elderly may have to be located in areas poorly suitable for the purpose.

As a further thought, I would like to suggest to this subcommittee that in their recommendations further stress be given to the fact that the housing needs of our elderly are regional needs. With the movement of population outward in our region, it would be a very sad mistake if we made the unwarranted assumption that the only proper location for housing for the elderly was in our central core areas.

This could well create a further intensification of patterns of segregation that presently exist in one form or another. Housing for the elderly should be incorporated as part of the housing resources of every community in recognition of the housing needs of the individual and the family during the course of a life cycle.

Now, a key point that I would like to make, is that rehabilitation under the present procedures is basically oriented to taking an area that has deteriorated or is deteriorating and improving the area up to a very high standard, a standard sufficiently high so that it warrants FHA mortgage investment or improvements in that area.

This has not only been incorporated into urban renewal thinking and legislation, but also set forth in Federal requirements on rehabilitation projects. The effect of such requirements is to make rehabilitation a very major type of effort when an urban renewal project is not a straight clearance and redevelopment type of program.

I am suggesting as a recommendation to your committee that we have to reconsider where we are going today with rehabilitation.

There was some consideration given to modifying the rehabilitation to the extent of having limited rehabilitation, or a sort of deferred clearance. The term used was "reconditioning." This was enunciated a few years ago, and new requirements were specified for reconditioning by the URA agency. However, reconditioning has been a dead letter effectively, because it, too, was made too complicated to carry out.

However, we cannot rule out limited rehabilitation if we are going to take significant steps to improve the existing housing supply, and we must; we must because we are going to run out of sites for housing for the elderly.

In Elizabeth, N.J., where we did a study on sites for housing for the elderly, we could establish possible feasibility for only four or five sites, and feasibility in terms of ready availability of sites for only one or two.

Senator WILLIAMS. Were you in on the choosing of Cherry Street?

Mr. CANDEUB. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. That was an extremely wise choice.

Mr. CANDEUB. Thank you.

The Cherry Street project has 250 units. Construction is expected to be completed about February. There are presently 1,250 applications for Cherry Street.

It is doubtful in the city of Elizabeth whether we can build five or six Cherry Street projects involving major clearance. As a matter of fact, it is probably impossible to do so within any limited time period.

Senator WILLIAMS. How many acres does that require?

Mr. CANDEUB. Senator, I don't recall, but it seems to me that the project is probably 5 to 6 acres, and, of course, as you may remember, because you can see this as you pass on the Pennsylvania Railroad,

Cherry Street was uniquely located in a central location, but underdeveloped; in fact, virtually undeveloped.

Senator WILLIAMS. Was that property acquired from the railroad?

Mr. CANDEUB. I believe a good portion of it was. I think there were other parcels that were otherwise owned, but my point is that we are winding up, no matter how desirable the housing for the elderly is, we are winding up with a situation where we need to make major use of existing housing stock.

This was the point that Harvey Mandel made about an hour ago.

We are, of course, working through the workable program, trying to implement the controls incorporated in housing codes. We are trying to expand housing enforcement programs. Unfortunately, this is still on a very limited basis.

We did a study for the State of New Jersey, part of the demonstration program for urban renewal needs in the northern county areas, and one of the things that we found was that the code enforcement program as geared to operating staff was totally inadequate in almost all of the communities that we studied, and we made recommendations to the State to the effect that the existing provisions for code enforcement be expanded enormously.

However, even this will not work. It will not work because if this program is expanded, the problem still remains of getting the financing needed for private improvements. Adequate financing is impossible for most of the property owners in our older areas, except on a personal note basis, at interest rates that are prohibitive.

We cannot expect to get effective large-scale enforcement of codes if that kind of penalty is imposed upon the private individual. Assistance in the financing of improvements is a basic necessity in implementing code enforcement.

In addition, many of these areas need help in terms of public improvements, in terms of parks, street paving, sewers, and many other types of facilities.

In many of these areas—they may be 10 blocks, 15 blocks, 20 blocks—we need a plan where somebody knows that his building is not slated to be torn down for street widening in 2 years.

What I am suggesting is that there be a reevaluation of our rehabilitation efforts in terms of providing relocation resources, in terms of social housing, not in terms of upgrading these areas to a standard where they are financially sound for investment purposes.

We should possibly allow for some investment risks, allow for some improvements which may be overimprovement in respect to a specific area but capitalizing on existing housing stock. Otherwise, while we are clearing at a snail's pace, large areas of our cities are going downhill, and while we are mouthing the words of code enforcement and workable program, there is not a really effective rehabilitation program underway except in a very, very small number of cities, and even there, I am not sure as to how extensive the impact is in cities like Philadelphia and Baltimore.

I feel that unless we come to grips with this problem, we will be avoiding the fact that we need these housing resources desperately, and are not doing an adequate job of maintaining them. We are kidding ourselves on the nature of the effectiveness of the workable program. We are taking reports year after year and filing them and not recognizing that much more is needed.

The second part of my statement is with regard to the suburban areas.

We have been involved in a great many situations in the metropolitan region of New York and elsewhere where the local communities today are trying to zone out garden apartments or apartments of any type.

Now, ostensibly, this is for planning purposes, because of tax income, and possible blight, and neighborhood impact, and all of the other justifications that are discussed in the press and at public hearings.

However, if we have this kind of zoning on a uniform basis—and, incidentally, if the sanction of the master plan is used to justify this zoning, master plans done in large measure with Federal money, 701 funds, you get a very curious situation. We are further segregating housing for the elderly in the central core areas. We are turning our backs on the total need for housing in terms of life cycle, in terms of housing for young people, for family occupancy, for the elderly, and we are reinforcing this situation with the use of 701 funds.

Now I would like to suggest that somehow this situation be altered in terms of a requirement with 701 funds of evaluating the total housing needs, and making adequate provision for housing for the elderly in these communities, particularly since many of these communities are well situated for housing for the elderly.

These are my recommendations, then, Senator. I am sorry that I don't have a blueprint, something more specific to offer, but I feel that these two areas are of enormous concern. I feel that something could be done more effectively on a Federal level to further rehabilitation of existing housing resources, and I feel that the present situation restricts, cuts down, and does not make use adequately of our land resources for housing for the elderly.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, it has been very helpful, believe me.

Let me ask you one question. Have you been asked to be a consultant on any elderly housing under the 231, is it, FHA?

Mr. CANDEUB. No, I haven't, Senator, except for this study that we did as part of our continuing services in Elizabeth on sites for housing for the elderly, which we did for the city of Elizabeth.

Senator WILLIAMS. I just wondered if you were familiar with this that people of your talent can be called in initially to help plan an elderly housing program, or cannot be called in, as I understand it, under the direct loan program.

Mr. CANDEUB. We would be very much interested. We have not been so called.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I would like to talk further with you, but I can see that we are running way short of time. I know you have been here all day, have you not?

Mr. CANDEUB. Not quite. I have been cheating a little.

No, I just got here about an hour ago.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we are grateful to you for coming here for us from Newark, and you have been very helpful.

Mr. CANDEUB. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. Finally this afternoon, we are honored to have Mrs. Elizabeth Niebyl here, who is executive director of Glassboro, N.J., urban renewal program.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ELIZABETH H. NIEBYL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, GLASSBORO, N.J., URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM; ACCOMPANIED BY MRS. NADINE NEWCOMB, CHAIRMAN, URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY, GLASSBORO, N.J.

Senator WILLIAMS. Now, if you wanted to summarize, as you make your statement, we would take it that way, or any way that you would prefer.

I appreciate your being here very much, Mrs. Niebyl.

Mrs. NIEBYL. Senator Williams, I want to thank you and your committee for this opportunity to talk to you. I will try to summarize my statement since I see you are a little behind on time now, but also I would like to add something to it.

I was very sorry to have seen the headline in one of the papers with regard to this hearing, which said in the headline, "Elderly Victims of Urban Renewal." And I think one of the most important things to get clear in everybody's mind, particularly the newspaper's as well as the committee's, is that the elderly are not victims of urban renewal. The elderly are victims of very severe income limitations and housing shortage for people of such income levels. This can be ignored much of the time, but when urban renewal comes, it is called to the public's attention. But we with renewal are not creating the problems. The problems exist, and are extremely serious. If they become too serious in urban renewal, it is because the right urban renewal answer has not been found, rather than that urban renewal is creating the problem.

I wish that we could get this distinction across to people as much as possible.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, you will never get the newspapers to give everything a fine distinction treatment. So just get used to the newspapers' shortcuts to misinformation.

They are not here, you see, that is why I am talking.

Mrs. NIEBYL. Well, I am sorry they are not here to hear my objection.

I don't believe there could be much more different problems than the ones that Mr. Candeub has just been aiming at, and the one that I am particularly directing my attention to here.

Senator WILLIAMS. Were you here when the ladies from Pitman testified?

Mrs. NIEBYL. Yes; I was.

Senator WILLIAMS. How did that impress you, their particular situation?

Mrs. NIEBYL. I think their problem ties extremely close to the problem that I am concerned with; that is, the actual homeownership of substandard buildings by elderly people.

Have you been to Pitman and seen the Grove area?

Senator WILLIAMS. I have been through there, but it was on a rainy day in March, I was running for office, and I was worn and weary. It was the day after that awful storm in 1958, and all I can remember is standing with Alex Feinberg, who was running for Congress, for about 40 minutes, shaking hands in a diner for 30 yellow-jacketed men who were working on the lines that were down, and asking the last one, "By the way, where are you fellows from?" and getting the answer, "Ohio."

Mrs. NIEBYL. The Grove is a fascinating place. But I can see why renewal is required.

There are very interesting, but very small, houses which are not properly kept up. Many are heated by kerosene stoves, but between them one could not possibly run a fire engine. It is an extremely hazardous kind of an area to have right in the middle of a town. Whether the perfect answer is now being proposed, I am not here to discuss at the moment, but the problem of elderly homeowners like these is an extremely severe one. In Pitman, in Glassboro, and in many other communities, the houses that these elderly people own may be a very severe hazard to the rest of the population, in addition to not being a safe and suitable place for them to live in, and yet they are at the present time able to live as independent people in their own homes, even though these are run down. It is not possible to buy them out at a price which will enable them to buy a standard house, and if they did have a standard house, usually, their incomes are not such that they could keep up that standard house. Therefore, you have a really insurmountable problem to try to get them into private homeownership again.

In the situation that we have in Glassboro, I have made a study of the data which is available on the basis of the tax exemption for elderly homeowners, and we find that of the 805 elderly in Glassboro, 300 elderly people were in this group which were getting exemptions, with incomes less than \$5,000 required in order to get an exemption.

Of the tax exempt elderly single-person families, slightly over a third had incomes of less than a thousand dollars a year, and almost two-thirds had incomes less than \$2,000 a year.

Of the couples, over a quarter had incomes less than \$2,000 a year. and over half have incomes less than \$3,000 a year.

The answer for these people is not to buy their house and give them a new homeownership situation, because they cannot possibly maintain it. Nor, for the same reason, can rehabilitation be the answer for them. Actually, many of the houses they live in are rundown, not because the house is essentially bad, but because the elderly person in it has neither the money nor the time nor the energy to do the repair and renovation which is needed to keep any house up.

These people, many of them, do not even have the kind of income with which they can pay the low-rent public housing rents.

We have in low-rent housing the limitation that rents must cover costs of operation, therefore an average rental has to be established, and in the present day and age, this is around \$40 a month for an average for your entire project. The minimum rents are \$25 to \$30 in many of the housing authorities in New Jersey. These amounts are necessary in order to keep the project earnings up. Even with the \$10 allowance for the elderly, these people making \$1,000 or \$2,000 a year, cannot, in any number, come into our low-rent housing for elderly.

We think in our particular community we have been able to work out a solution, but the fact is that some of these people are for the first time going to have to go on welfare, in order to meet the rents of low-rent housing.

And yet, this need to relocate them is an important community need. Code enforcement would entitle the municipal government, in many cases, to get rid of these houses. Without urban renewal this would

be getting rid of the houses with no return whatever to the elderly people, so that renewal is far better than that procedure.

On the other hand, they can't go into the low-rent housing for the elderly without either welfare or a greater contribution on the Federal part than the present allowance of \$10.

Two things I would like to suggest are: One is that I think there is a valuable resource of data in the municipal files in New Jersey on this aged exemption for elderly homeowners, and I think it would be extremely valuable if that could be tapped as a resource for information. The value of the houses can also be obtained from the tax rolls, and many of these elderly in our community are living in houses valued below \$5,000, and some considerably less than that.

My other and main point is that we really need more assistance in the rental situation in the low-rent housing for elderly, as well as much more such housing.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, that is most useful, and obviously from a very knowledgeable source.

You are the executive director for Glassboro.

Mrs. NIEBYL. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. How long has Glassboro been a participant in the urban renewal program?

Mrs. NEWCOMB. We started in 1959, but we didn't get our first survey and planning grant until 1960.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are you in construction now?

Mrs. NIEBYL. We are in construction on a low-rent project for families, and in planning on one for the elderly. On the urban renewal program we have our approval, but we have not yet finally gone into execution. We are just about there.

Senator WILLIAMS. I see.

Now, you are the chairman of the urban renewal authority here?

Mrs. NEWCOMB. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you give the men a chance to do any of the work over here, or do you girls run the show?

Mrs. NIEBYL. We have five men on the authority, but they have elected Mrs. Newcomb the chairman.

Senator WILLIAMS. Who is the mayor?

Mrs. NIEBYL. Mr. Joseph Bowe.

Senator WILLIAMS. Oh, of course, I was with him at the College Independence Day for Uganda.

Mrs. NIEBYL. That is right, and his daughter was the U.S. representative to Uganda.

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes. He is a friend of ours in other activities.

Mrs. NIEBYL. Well, he has been very strongly in favor of this program, and a tremendous help in getting it going.

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes, a fine gentleman. I was particularly impressed with the college community. Just beautiful.

Mrs. NIEBYL. It is growing fast, and it also is participating in borough activities as well as providing their facilities for our enjoyment.

Mrs. NEWCOMB. We hope that perhaps you will be able to come down for the dedication of our 60 units which we hope will be in June or July of next year.

Senator WILLIAMS. Fine, June or July.

Mrs. NEWCOMB. Only don't bring rain.

Senator WILLIAMS. No. June or July of 1963?

Mrs. NIEBYL. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would be delighted to accept. Maybe about then you will want some rain.

Mrs. NEWCOMB. I know what you did at Bridgeton. I wouldn't want that to happen to us.

Mrs. NIEBYL. Thank you very much.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, this is a fine note to end on, and we are very grateful to you people for Glassboro's contribution to our effort here. We will now adjourn.

The next time we meet will be in Portland, Oreg., December 3.

Is that right, Mr. Frantz?

Mr. FRANTZ. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4:30 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene December 3, 1962, in Portland, Oreg.)

