

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 4.—Portland, Oreg.

DECEMBER 3, 1962

Printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

91888

WASHINGTON : 1963

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C. - Price 20 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 ¹	

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*

¹ Senator Smith of Massachusetts was a member of the committee until Nov. 6, 1962.

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
Neuberger, Hon. Maurine, U.S. Senator from the State of Oregon.....	324
Schrunk, Hon. Terry D., mayor, Portland, Ore.....	325
Weinstein, Mrs. Tillie.....	332
Scott, Mr. and Mrs. C. A.....	334
Petrich, Sr., and Petrich, Jr., Messrs. B.....	335
Whitney, Miss Palma.....	338
Wright, Walter T., chief, Right-of-Way Division, Oregon State Highway Commission.....	342
Sorodka, Mrs. Mildred, administrative assistant, Housing Authority of Portland, Ore.....	350
Gordon, William, program director, Portland Jewish Community Center, Portland, Ore.....	353
Hyman, Mrs. Morris.....	356
Ostrander, Mrs. W. L.....	358
Felvarg, Mrs. Dasha.....	360
Rosen, Mrs. Nathan.....	361
England, Richard L., assistant director, Portland Development Commission and Easley, Mrs. Mildred, site manager, South Auditorium project.....	364
Jaeger, Harry, technical director, Housing Authority of Portland, Ore.....	368
Dondero, Charles A., executive director, Housing Authority of Douglas County, Ore.....	374
Anderson, Mrs. Olga, staff nurse, Visiting Nurse Association.....	376
Supove, Lawrence.....	377
Norman, A. M.....	381

STATEMENTS

Anderson, Mrs. Olga, staff nurse, Visiting Nurse Association.....	376
Dondero, Charles A., executive director, Housing Authority, Douglas County, Ore.....	374
Easley, Mrs. Mildred, site manager, South Auditorium project.....	365
England, Richard L., assistant director, Portland Development Commis- sion.....	364
Felvarg, Mrs. Dasha.....	360
Gordon, William, program director, Portland Jewish Community Center.....	353
Green, Hon. Edith, a U.S. Representative from the State of Oregon, pre- pared statement.....	331
Hyman, Mrs. Morris.....	356
Jaeger, Harry, technical director Housing Authority, Portland, Ore.....	368
Neuberger, Hon. Maurine, a Senator from the State of Oregon.....	324
Norman, A. M.....	381
Ostrander, Mrs. W. L.....	358
Petrich, B., Sr., and Jr.....	335
Renoud, Roy, chairman, Housing Authority, Portland, Ore., statement read by Mrs. Sorodka.....	350
Rosen, Mrs. Nathan.....	361
Rossmann, Gene W., executive director, Housing Authority, Portland, Ore., statement, presented by Mr. Jaeger.....	368
Schrunk, Hon. Terry D., mayor, Portland, Ore.....	325
Prepared statement.....	326
Scott, Mr. and Mrs. C. A.....	334

	Page
Sorodka, Mrs. Mildred, administrative assistant, Housing Authority of Portland, Oreg.....	350
Supove, Lawrence.....	377
Prepared statement.....	379
Weinstein, Mrs. Tillie.....	332
Whitney, Miss Palma.....	338
Wright, Walter T., chief, Right-of-Way Division, Oregon Highway Com- mission.....	342

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Article entitled "Minnesota Freeway Property Harmoniously Acquired," by Jim Running, staff writer, Oregon Journal of July 2, 1961.....	345
---	-----

RELOCATION OF ELDERLY PEOPLE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1962

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVOLUNTARY RELOCATION OF THE
ELDERLY OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING,
Portland, Oreg.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, in the Pacific suite, Sheraton-Portland Hotel, Portland, Oreg., Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Williams and Neuberger.

Committee staff members present: William G. Reidy, staff director; Frank C. Frantz, professional staff member; John Guy Miller, minority counsel; James Sundquist, assistant to Senator Clark; Thomas Hayes, assistant to Senator Prouty; and William Oriol, assistant to Senator Williams.

Senator WILLIAMS. I think it is time that we can now begin the deliberations here in Portland of the Subcommittee on Involuntary Relocation of the Elderly. I will say that while I, unfortunately, couldn't arrive in Portland until last night, our staff has been here for 2 or 3 days, and reports that the traditional hospitality and graciousness of the people of Portland has been shown to our staff members. I am particularly pleased that Senator Neuberger could join us for this morning's discussion here and for a field trip which we plan to take shortly to several places within the city.

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.

This hearing in Portland is one of a series which the subcommittee is holding throughout the country to gather more detailed information on this problem. We want to learn how well the relocation provisions of present programs are meeting the needs of the elderly people affected and what steps should be taken to do a better job of protecting the interests of our senior citizens in the future.

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 those of us in Congress. Everything that is said here will be taken down by an

official reporter and will be considered by the subcommittee when it makes its report to the Senate.

The land uses in our cities are changing whether we like it or not. The residential fringe of the urban core of 20 or 30 years ago has since been enveloped by an outer city, and the older areas are now subject to redevelopment. These changes are for the most part beneficial to our cities, but the older, retired citizens who still live in these areas must be given proper consideration.

Highway building is changing greatly, too. It was only a few years ago that highways were built across open country and fed into the local street pattern at the edge of the city. Now the freeways sweep across the city with access ramps at a number of points throughout the urban area. Of course, whether such freeways are good or bad, in any given city, is not for our subcommittee to judge. Our concern is that they take a great deal of urban land, much of which is now occupied by apartment buildings and residences in the community's older neighborhoods.

The problems of displacement and relocation of elderly people are already with us. In some communities they are severe. The greatest amount of urban change, of the kind I have described, is yet to come. I believe that unless we deliberately seek solutions to these problems now, before many years they will become intolerable to the public conscience. I am sure that the visits and the interviews which we will have with Portland citizens this morning, and the testimony of witnesses who have agreed to come and speak to the subcommittee here will be of great value in furtherance of our study.

Now, it is indeed a great privilege for me to introduce one who certainly needs no introduction in Portland, Senator Maurine Neuberger, who is most respected and most loved back in the U.S. Senate.

I hope this won't be embarrassing to you, Maurine, but I would like to congratulate your friends for making you a part of the institution we know is so important to the Government of this country. Would you say hello to your friends.

STATEMENT OF HON. MAURINE NEUBERGER, A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

Senator NEUBERGER. Well, thank you, Pete, my colleague, Senator Williams, for those nice words.

I feel that I should tell you a bit of personal information about Senator Williams that you might not otherwise know. He is considered the expert in the U.S. Senate on urban problems and urban affairs. He and I serve on a committee of the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have observed him there as he has taken a leading part and is referred to when any urban problems come up, so it is altogether fitting and proper that Senator Williams should be here in this capacity.

I am particularly interested in this situation as it affects Oregon and the Nation. I am a member of the full Committee on the Aging, and although my specialty has to do with some of the leisure-time problems of the aging, I am particularly interested in this one because some of the area that is being disrupted is right in my own front yard; that is, in the front yard, practically, of the home where I live, and the people who are going to be visited are almost neighbors of mine.

I am particularly interested, Senator Williams, in this folder about the income level of our aging population. A great deal of publicity has been given in recent weeks to a compilation of incomes of the aging, put out by the American Medical Association, and it seems to differ quite a bit from the reports that I read here and which have been given some publicity in our papers. The American Medical Association would make us think that people, aging people, are not suffering because of low incomes. In fact, they say that the income level is very high. I decided that they must take the aging Mr. Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury, and average his income with those of the people whom we are going to visit today. You would only have to go to somebody who is retired on, say, a \$15,000 average income and average it with someone who is on a \$1,500 average income, and you have a very good average income, something like \$3,250. It reminds me when I used to teach in the old Lincoln High School, now right in the area of the urban development. My room didn't heat very well and the children would come in in the morning and we would have to put on coats and sweaters. The fellow down the hall had a room that was overheated, so we called the maintenance department of the school department and they came over and they looked at the thermometer in my room and it said 65, and in Mr. Sage's room it said 80, and they said, "Well, the average temperature in the building is around 70, and that is what it should be." That is something like what is being done with this aging population.

I think that Portland can be thankful that we have been selected to have the senatorial committee come to look into this situation here, and I can promise you that you have an expert in this area. Thank you very much.

Senator WILLIAMS. I wonder if Senator Neuberger would introduce the first citizen of Portland, who will be our first witness.

Senator NEUBERGER. I am delighted to again introduce to this audience our mayor, Terry Schrunk, who has taken such a lead in the urban development and is known to all of us as Mr. First Citizen.

Terry Schrunk.

**STATEMENT OF HON. TERRY D. SCHRUNK, MAYOR, PORTLAND,
OREG.**

Mayor SCHRUNK. Senator Williams, gentlemen, certainly I first would like to welcome you officially to the city of Portland. We are extremely proud and happy to have you here. Unfortunately, your schedule is not going to give you time enough to see enough of our city. I would hope that you would have the opportunity to move about the city and see some of the things that are happening. We would especially like to call your attention to our waterfront. I am not sure, I know Senator Neuberger is very conscious of the trade and commerce through that port, but Senator Williams, I do not know if you know that the city of Portland leads all the cities in the United States on the west coast in the import and export of dry cargoes.

Senator WILLIAMS. It is the largest fresh-water port.

Mayor SCHRUNK. That is correct, but it is also in total volume of dry cargoes—that is, everything but the liquid cargoes—it is in excess of our neighbors to the north, Seattle, and to the south, San Fran-

cisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego. These are Department of Commerce statistics and we are very proud of them. It is a very important part of our economy.

Across the street, of course, is the world's largest retail shopping center. I hope that you have an opportunity to walk through that while you are here, if you have not already. I am sorry that you didn't get a chance to see our new Memorial Coliseum where the Portland Buckaroos defeated Spokane last night in a shutout game.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would like to say, in that connection, that our staff wanted to go and couldn't get tickets.

Is this the shopping center described to Premier Khrushchev at one point?

Mayor SCHRUNK. That is correct. Well, I know your schedule is very busy, sir. I have prepared a statement, copies of which have been filed with your committee staff members. I shall read the statement so as to conserve time.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. TERRY D. SCHRUNK, MAYOR, PORTLAND, OREG.

Gentlemen, I am very pleased with your selection of Portland as a location for one of your hearings, for I am deeply concerned with the welfare of the elderly citizens who are being displaced by such necessary public projects as highway construction and urban renewal. At one time our planning commission estimated that in Portland alone 5,000 households would be displaced by the State highway program, of which 2,575 households were in the path of approved interstate freeways.

The dislocation of any family, individual, or business firm is not a pleasant thing, either for those who are being displaced or for the public agencies which must displace them.

An uprooting of home or business creates some form of crisis for every displacee. He must find a new place of residence or business, and this usually takes a substantial amount of effort, time and money. Besides these obvious inconveniences, dislocation may require readjustments of internal business or family problems that had previously been stabilized.

We cannot, of course, afford to shrug off the difficulties that are caused to those who must be displaced by public action and simply hope that somehow everything will turn out all right without public complaint. Nor can we afford to abandon the plans which are so important to improving the living and working conditions of the majority of our citizens.

The only answer to this problem, in my judgment, is to provide maximum, not minimum, assistance to the persons who are dislocated.

Now, it may be worthwhile to note here that a very large percentage of persons displaced by public programs merely ask that they be paid the fair value of their property and be left alone to find new locations on their own. Many of these persons—to their credit—understand the necessity of building new highways, constructing new schools and other public buildings, and clearing slums and providing new areas through urban renewal for new investment within the heart of the city.

We who are in public life are grateful to these farsighted citizens, and they need not think that their personal sacrifices in the public interest have gone unnoticed. However, it stands to reason that in any area scheduled for extensive clearance there will always be a substantial number of persons who will be unable to take this forced displacement in stride, no matter how good their personal intentions.

This is not a matter of noncooperation—although of course we will find some uncooperative people in every undertaking—but a matter of circumstances. People with their backs to a financial wall, or those with emotional problems, or those in their twilight years, are likely to find the uprooting of their homes or businesses a very traumatic experience.

In my opinion, it is therefore the duty of the public bodies causing the dislocation to alleviate difficult situations caused by them and cushion the hardships that result. We possess this responsibility with respect to all displaced persons, but it becomes especially imperative in the case of the elderly.

The youthful and even the middle aged become accustomed to occasional setbacks as they proceed through life. They are consoled by the realization that whatever problem they face, they still have a number of years ahead in which to adjust and make up for what seems, at the time, to be a wrenching experience. Moreover, they can usually look forward to increased earning power to cover whatever losses they may suffer.

Not so with our older citizens. A person in the golden age group, as it is called, has either achieved the situation he had once aspired to or has pretty much made his peace with the circumstances in which he finds himself at retirement age. In either case, compared to the rest of us, he is settled where he is, and he has faith that he can go on living in the same location and under the same circumstances without fear of radical change. Psychologically this is reassuring to the older person. But more than that, it is financially reassuring. In a great many instances the older person today is barely making ends meet. His income may be a pension, social security, a private insurance plan, stock dividends, or perhaps contributions from the children, or a combination of some of these. Or it may be public welfare assistance. Yet, even if his income is meager, the older person probably has adjusted to it. He has some measure of confidence in what the future may bring, barring illness or other unforeseen emergencies. He has arranged his circumstances so that at least he is living within his means.

Then a public agency comes along and requires him to move. We can all appreciate what happens in many cases. The dislocated person may find it difficult to find a place for the same or slightly higher rent; the new neighborhood may seem strange and perhaps even hostile; or old friendships, which mean so much to older people, may be severed; or, worst of all, financial uncertainty may rear its head. Internal strains may exert themselves within a family and increased loneliness may be in prospect for the individual living alone.

Small businesses in particular may find it difficult to start over in a new location. A person forced to move may have operated for many years a small grocery store, a bakery, a barbershop, or a drugstore in a single location. Sometimes such operatives have continued in one place for two or three generations. Their customers are friends and neighbors of long standing who continue to patronize them because they have known the proprietor for years and perhaps his entire family.

Or, in other instances, an extra flat or apartment in the family home may provide much of the family income. Generally this economic environment cannot be duplicated in any other location.

Unfortunately, we have not yet discovered how to deal adequately with all of these problems that arise when we dislocate people, especially elderly people, in order to carry out public improvements. But after looking at our experience here in Portland, I think we are making substantial progress in the right direction under the Federal urban renewal program.

Our South Auditorium project was a case in point. This 83½-acre project, just south of our central business district, contained 325 families, 693 individuals, and 230 businesses. This project area has been cleared and everyone relocated successfully, except for one business. Incidentally, almost all of the land has been sold, and we hope that this one business establishment will relocate within the renewal area.

As you are well aware, the Housing and Home Finance Agency for several years has been liberalizing the relocation payments and staff assistance available to persons displaced by an urban renewal project. At present our local public agency, the Portland Development Commission, is able to pay up to \$200 for moving a family and up to \$25,000 for moving a business establishment, with all costs over \$10,000 subject to HHFA approval. All relocation payments are 100 percent grants of the Federal Government.

At the same time that HHFA has been increasing the amount of these payments, it also has been tightening up on its requirements for good advance relocation planning. A very comprehensive relocation program is necessary before an urban renewal project is approved by the Federal Government today. Yet it is not facts or figures alone that make a relocation program successful, but rather the efforts of the people actually assigned to work with the people who must take an interest in them, listen to their problems and complaints, and, on some occasions, help them personally to pack and move. We have been most fortunate here in Portland to have such a heartening experience with our urban renewal relocation program. There is no telling how many potential

problems were headed off by having sympathetic administration of relocation.

Not only have I supported each year since 1958 resolutions by the U.S. Conference of Mayors calling for relocation payments to highway displacees, but I also fought hard to have our State legislature adopt a new law passed in 1959, authorizing the highway commission to gather information about displacees and to disseminate information about vacancies and financing that would be helpful to these displacees in finding new locations. Copies of the resolution on freeway relocation service, sponsored by myself and adopted at the 1961 U.S. Conference of Mayors, are being left with your staff, along with a copy of the State law referred to.

In addition, I have for 2 successive years urged our State highway commission to adopt some of the aspects of the urban renewal relocation program. Until late this year under the Interstate Highway program, our highway commission was unable to pay moving costs. But it has been able—and indeed required by our State law, ORS 366.323 and 324—to give out information on available housing for relocation purposes.

Recently the highway commission inaugurated what I consider to be a very minimal information program. I appreciate this gesture in the right direction. However, it comes at a time when the Bureau of Public Roads has been instructed by Congress to pay up to \$200 in relocation costs for residences and \$3,000 for businesses, similar to earlier provisions of the urban renewal law.

I submit that the bare informational assistance program contemplated by the State highway commission at this time does not conform either to new relocation provisions of Federal law or to the relocation assistance program I have proposed. Now, let me make one point very clear. I am a staunch supporter of the new highway system being built in Oregon. We take a great deal of pride here in the work of our highway commission and its staff, for Oregon is one of the leading States in the Nation in its rate of completion under the Interstate Highway program and in the quality of work being done. We need these highways in promoting the industrial development of Oregon.

I am certain that our highway administrators are now showing more concern for the people being displaced by their tremendous public works. They are beginning to realize, too, that unless people are taken into consideration, it will be increasingly difficult in the future to get our needed highways built.

Recognizing the potential relocation problems that might arise with the construction of the Stadium Freeway, now under construction to the west of our central business district, I urged our State highway commission to undertake a comprehensive information program for the benefit of the tenants to be displaced in the right-of-way of this freeway. By the highway department's own estimates, approximately 1,000 families were believed to be living in the section of this freeway to be acquired between 1961 and 1963. Many of these were tenants and there are indications that many are elderly persons.

I directed the Portland Development Commission to prepare a prospectus in which the cost of various services to displacees would be detailed. The development commission, incidentally, is legally prohibited from spending any of its funds voted for urban renewal and civic promotion for any other purposes.

My intention was to urge the highway commission to contract for these informational and referral services with the Portland Development Commission which, at that time, had an experienced relocation staff. In its prospectus, the development commission offered to do the following for \$24,000 a year:

(1) Inform site occupants of relocation services available through personal visits to each household and business establishment, whether an owner or tenant. Let me emphasize here the importance of personal visits. At the same time information would be collected with regard to the needs of the displacees.

(2) Make referrals to known vacant housing and business locations. A continuing citywide inventory would be maintained as a result of contacts with brokers, property managers, apartment owners, social agencies, and actual canvasses of certain sections of the city. Information on different types of business and residential financing would be provided, also. In cases of handicap or age, the relocation workers actually would transport the displacee to apartment vacancies available in the desired rental range. These apartments, of course, would have to meet at least the minimum standards for habitation as established in our new city housing code.

(3) It is anticipated that there would be a certain amount of counseling in the event of physical handicaps, family difficulties, or financial distress, and in these cases relocation workers would refer the family to the proper social agency.

Frankly, I felt we were giving the State highway commission a bargain. But the highway department in essence denied that there was a problem at the present time, and pointed out that by not carrying out such a relocation program, it was saving \$24,000 annually in road-user funds.

This attitude, in my opinion, was most unfortunate. Solely as a guarantee of good public relations on a \$75 million highway construction job, the amount of \$24,000 annually would not seem to be an exorbitant figure. But more important, that amount would have gone a long way in easing the relocation problems of many of the families in the Stadium Freeway right-of-way.

The exchange of letters and documents connected with my proposal are a matter of record and were included in Portland's workable program recertification request in 1962, a copy of which I leave with your staff.

As an illustration of how this has worked out elsewhere, I understand that the Illinois Division of Highways contracts with the Tenants' Relocation Bureau of the City of Chicago to assist persons displaced by its activities and pays the actual costs of the service provided, plus a proportion of office overhead.

In fairness to our highway commission, it is obvious that in the past there have been restrictions placed on it by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, which provides 92 percent of the funds for our interstate highways.

Now, apparently, the Bureau of Public Roads, at the direction of Congress, has authorized the payment of residential and business moving costs by State highway bodies. I understand, however, that the Oregon State Highway Commission does not expect to begin making these payments at the present time because of their belief that there is some legal roadblock. Representatives of the highway commission may be able to explain this to you in more detail.

But I can assure you of this fact: our city will make every effort to have removed, through legislation, any legal roadblock that may exist to improve the relocation assistance available to persons displaced by freeway construction.

The chairman of our public housing authority will tell you some of the other things we in this community, both through private enterprise and public housing, are doing to provide better living conditions for our senior citizens, so I will not cover that field.

I sincerely hope that your committee also will make every effort to assure that relocation assistance similar to that available under urban renewal is adopted for all federally assisted construction programs, including these new highways which are so much needed, but which can cause difficulty to many people unless we all begin to think in terms of people.

I want to thank you very kindly for your attention, and again thank you for being here in our city.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we are most grateful to you, Mayor. A very helpful statement. It is a little shocking, to hear that highway folks couldn't find \$24,000 for this very important and very humane service of helping people relocate—\$24,000 won't build much highway, as you know. With average costs in the city running up to \$30 million for a mile of highway, why, \$24,000 would probably give you about 10 feet of shoulder somewhere. I hope this hearing will be helpful to you in persuading the other department of government of the wisdom of your position. We have found that the best services for relocation has been in those areas where one agency has been used, whatever the dislocating program is, and I believe that is what you are trying to do, center this work in one area within the development commission.

Mayor SCHRUNK. That is right, sir. We have had the cooperation, fortunately, of our apartment owners, our realtor boards, our various business groups, working together to provide us this good backlog of information, and it would not seem very appropriate to try to duplicate that in two or three different agencies.

I might say in all fairness to our highway commission that the new director has taken a great deal more interest in this problem. We have discussed it many times, and I feel that we are making some definite progress.

Senator WILLIAMS. Fine. I just have one further question. You estimate 5,000 households will face relocation because of the highway program. Do you have any estimate of your total problem of relocation, including urban renewal and other programs in Portland?

Mayor SCHRUNK. Well, the figure that I quoted, this 5,000, was one developed by the planning commission. This includes the South Auditorium urban renewal site, which is the one where people actually have been displaced, the interstate highway coming from the south with the stadium loop, and the east bank or Minnesota Freeway route. Now we have not determined any additional urban renewal projects at this time. We have some rehabilitation projects underway but this will not involve tearing out other than just a few substandard buildings, and will be upgrading the entire neighborhood. This is a residential area that is older, but there are some good, sound houses in it, and by upgrading it and taking out a few old ones, we will be able to do a great deal there, we think. We are making some good progress on that now.

Senator WILLIAMS. Could I ask you, on your rehabilitation program, what are the incentives, and what methods are you using to upgrade through rehabilitation?

Mayor SCHRUNK. We have set up very fine neighborhood committees. The leadership has been developed in the community concerned, this particular neighborhood. From that, we started working together with coordinating committees of the city agencies to see where we could help. The financial agencies have come in and studied these properties for making loans; whether it is rewiring to bring the house up to code, whether it is plumbing, or whether it is a serious remodeling, and financing is now being made available for that.

We have favorable rates, or actually they are guaranteed loans, is what they amount to. So this group, working together, is doing the job. We are just helping them upgrade their own neighborhood. They have cleanup programs, everything from cleaning up alleys to streets. We are now working on a tree-planting program in the area. The city has put in some extra street lights, and there is a program for improving some of the streets that are not up to standard. These will be financed by the people in the area. All we are doing, actually, is providing staff work.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we have discussed this rehabilitation program many times in these hearings, and one of our objectives is to make it a more vital program. I am delighted to hear that in Portland you have found it useful. In many areas it has not been found to be useful, and many improvements in the program have been suggested to us.

Mayor SCHRUNK. I might say that, in addition to this particular program, in our planning we have discovered through credits that accrued to the local communities from schools and public recreational facilities, we will be able in this area to develop a badly needed play park. We think an open space, a park, also, will tend to upgrade the area. We will take out two or three blocks, and this will become a park right in the center of this area.

Senator WILLIAMS. In this connection, we are also discussing the practicability, the possibility, of making a reservation of open space a 100 percent Federal grant in the urban renewal program. That will be under discussion this coming year.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Yes. This is a very interesting subject; this open space. In our urban renewal plan, the use plan, we have provided for open space, malls, landscaping. I am very proud of the use plan that has been developed.

Senator WILLIAMS. You are making Portland sound to be a very exciting, wholesome city. If my folks relieve me of my duties, I would like to come out here.

Mayor SCHRUNK. We would be pleased to have you come out here on vacation, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Maurine, do you have any comments?

Senator NEUBERGER. I am interested in the subject of open space, Senator Williams. When we were discussing this in connection with the housing bill, you would be surprised what a problem we have in the Senate to put across the idea of the importance of open spaces. I think the Oregonians were sort of skeptical about it because we seem to have more open space than you do in New Jersey. The very fact that this planning is going on—the appreciation and realization of it—I think is important. We can still do it, and do it pretty reasonably. In Senator Williams' State, there is a problem, but the very fact that you are buying property and doing tree planting and that sort of thing is very encouraging. I wish to congratulate the mayor for this fine presentation. It is important to our community. Thank you.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mayor.

Do our members of the staff have any questions? The committee, left to right or right to left. We have got everybody on the right side of the aisle here, I see. This is the minority wing, with the exception that the flanker here who is on the wrong side of the line. This is all majority here; right over to the door, I might say. That is another thing you folks have done for me personally in the Senate, given me Mary Jane Cox, from Portland, who is my personal secretary, thank goodness.

Senator NEUBERGER. I had her first, though.

Senator WILLIAMS. Anything further?

Well, I guess we will now begin our tour, Mayor. We look forward to that with great interest. Our time to reconvene here—and we are delighted there are so many folks with us—is 2 o'clock, when we have what promises to be a very productive afternoon ahead of us.

Your representative in Congress, Representative Edith Green, has filed a statement with us, and we are pleased to have it in the record at this point.

(The prepared statement of Representative Green follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EDITH GREEN

I regret that hearings of my own special Subcommittee on Education in Washington keep me from appearing personally today in support of the commendable efforts of Senator Williams and his subcommittee. I welcome the subcommittee members and their staff to Portland, which I have the honor to represent.

The Federal Government through a wide variety of programs, including the vital urban renewal one, is assisting in changing the blighted cores of American cities. This is all to the good. In the process, however, many older persons, both pensioners and others near retirement age and their families, have been displaced from substandard housing. It is important that decent, safe, and

sanitary housing be found for the displaced persons. This is the valuable purpose of this subcommittee's endeavors—to determine the degree to which senior citizens in this area are being displaced by public works and the extent to which the community is meeting its responsibility to help relocate them.

I again commend the Senator Williams subcommittee and assure them and my constituents here in Portland and adjoining Multnomah County that I will give my wholehearted support to practicable and feasible avenues to assure adequate housing for our senior citizens. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 10:50 a.m., the committee left the hearing room at the Sheraton-Portland Hotel and proceeded to 2231 Southwest Fifth Street, Portland, Oreg., the residence of Mrs. Tillie Weinstein, where the following occurred:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. TILLIE WEINSTEIN

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. It will be so lonesome. I have lived here for so many years.

Senator NEUBERGER. How long have you lived here, Mrs. Weinstein?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Oh, 35 years.

Senator NEUBERGER. Did you have some children go to Lincoln High School?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Yes, Mary Weinstein, Selma, and Jack.

Senator NEUBERGER. Yes. I was teaching there at that time.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Sophie.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Who lives with you in your house?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Just my husband.

Mayor SCHRUNK. I see.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. We had two boys downstairs, and it was really beautiful in there, but——

Senator NEUBERGER (interrupting). Oh, was this an apartment, you mean?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Yes. We had two rentals.

Senator NEUBERGER. Oh, I see.

Senator WILLIAMS. Did you have trouble finding a new home?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Oh, yes; I looked all over. It is an older home. We are going to be comfortable there.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Your children are not living with you now, are they, Mrs. Weinstein?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. No; they are all grown and married.

Senator NEUBERGER. How does it compare in cost for you?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Well, I have to fix a lot of things there. I was more comfortable here.

Senator NEUBERGER. Well, I bet you will make it comfortable there.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. We put in everything here, the plumbing, and we redecorated, and made it very comfortable.

Senator NEUBERGER. You made the building into income property, is that right?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Yes; two rentals. You see, some of the shakes are gone, but my son said not to do anything, that they were going to take the buildings away.

Mayor SCHRUNK. No; there is not much incentive to go ahead and paint or shake or do anything like that when——

Mrs. WEINSTEIN (interrupting). No. I should have had the apartment fixed up and a clean dress on and fix my hair.

Senator WILLIAMS. Tell me, is it pretty expensive to move from here over there?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Very expensive.

Senator WILLIAMS. Did you get any help for that?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. No. We have to pay \$13.75 to Bekins, but all the small stuff the kids helped me and I had a man with a station wagon. That cost me another \$35, that small stuff. Now, this stuff that I have will cost me close to \$100.

Senator WILLIAMS. That's where you should get some help, and that is one of the things we hope to——

Mrs. WEINSTEIN (interrupting). Yes. We have a lot of things; we have a good television and good living room furniture and other things. I have to sell some stuff. You see, I can't use it. I got a wonderful gas stove and refrigerator, and I bought a house there with that stuff, a refrigerator and stove.

Mayor SCHRUNK. It was already in?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Yes.

Senator NEUBERGER. Well, probably somebody will probably want that.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Well, if I can't sell it, I will have to take it with me.

Senator WILLIAMS. Does your husband work?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Yes; my husband is a tailor.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, you have been very kind to us, and it helps us.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Thank you, thank you. Won't you come in?

Senator WILLIAMS. No, thank you. We have people waiting at other places along the road.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. All right.

Senator WILLIAMS. You have been very nice.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. I try to be. At first I was hurt a little. I was hurt because they take my place away from me, but now if everybody goes, I have to go, too.

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes. Well, I have a feeling that you will be welcomed into your new neighborhood and I am sure that you will find a lot of good neighbors.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Thank you.

Senator NEUBERGER. Where is your husband's shop and work?

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Southwest Washington.

Senator NEUBERGER. And so he will have to travel farther.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Yes. He is kicking now a little bit. He is sure kicking. He wanted to get an apartment near the shop, and I said I wanted to get a house. What would I do with myself? I like to work outside. We kept our place pretty nice, especially in the summertime. So I thought it would be better to get a house. So that's where we ended up. But we will have to get used to it.

Mayor SCHRUNK. We are getting some new buses, now, too, so——

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Yes.

Mayor SCHRUNK. It will be better.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mrs. Weinstein.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Thank you.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. It was very nice to see you. How do you feel?

Senator NEUBERGER. I feel wonderful. Thank you.

Mrs. WEINSTEIN. Come see me again.

Senator NEUBERGER. I will.

(Whereupon, the committee left the residence of Mrs. Tillie Weinstein and proceeded to 1222 Southwest Montgomery Street, Portland, Oreg., the residence of Mr. and Mrs. C. A. Scott, where the following occurred:)

Mayor SCHRUNK. I am Mayor Schrunk.

STATEMENT OF MR. AND MRS. C. A. SCOTT

Mr. SCOTT. How do you do.

Mayor SCHRUNK. This is Senator Neuberger.

Senator NEUBERGER. I am Senator Neuberger.

Mayor SCHRUNK. This is Senator Williams back here.

Mr. SCOTT. How do you do, sir. When is this coming down?

Mayor SCHRUNK. I don't know. Maybe the highway commission does. Can you tell when this will be done?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, this will be out of our first project. It won't be scheduled for about 2 years. We are trying to get the possession of them and trying to get the people homes.

Senator WILLIAMS. How long have you known that this would be part of the project?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, about a year ago.

Mayor SCHRUNK. I understand that you are tenants and you rent from Mr. Harris.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; that's right.

Senator WILLIAMS. So you have had a long period of wondering just where you were going to move?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, I'm still wondering.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are you looking for another place?

Mr. SCOTT. Not yet.

Senator WILLIAMS. What do you hear, are there quite a few places available for the right price?

Mr. SCOTT. No, they are awfully high.

Senator NEUBERGER. Is Mrs. Scott here?

Mr. SCOTT. Just a moment; I will call her.

Mrs. SCOTT. Oh, Mayor Schrunk. It is an honor meeting you.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Thank you.

Mrs. SCOTT. I always thought you were a nice-looking fellow.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Thank you. I would like to present the Senator from New Jersey, Senator Williams.

Mrs. SCOTT. How do you do.

Senator WILLIAMS. It is very nice to meet you.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Senator Neuberger, our own Senator from Oregon.

Senator NEUBERGER. Hello, Mrs. Scott.

Mrs. SCOTT. How do you do.

Senator WILLIAMS. We know you have to move because of this highway program and we want to be as helpful as we can. I know the mayor wants to, too.

Mrs. SCOTT. We don't get much help any more.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we might have some moving allowances by the time this one comes along.

Mrs. SCOTT. That's fine.

Mayor SCHRUNK. This is one of the problems of the Senator's committee. They are studying in preparation for some additional legislation in Congress to help people who are being displaced by public works, such as you, whether you own your home or rent or lease, and the same with businesses.

Mrs. SCOTT. Well, the house will have to go if the highway comes through.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Yes; it will have to come down.

Mrs. SCOTT. Well, it is an old house, so there isn't really much you can do about it.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Where do you think you possibly will move to? Do you have any favorite neighborhood?

Mrs. SCOTT. Yes; the West Side, and that is all coming down. We can't do anything about it.

Senator WILLIAMS. The West Side; where are we now?

Mayor SCHRUNK. We are on the West Side.

Mrs. SCOTT. You are on the good side now.

Senator WILLIAMS. The West Side is the Democratic side of town.

Mrs. SCOTT. Yes; I think so.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, you are very nice to see us.

Mrs. SCOTT. Well, we are old people and they aren't too much concerned about us.

Senator WILLIAMS. We are interested in all ages, whether they are little fellows or big fellows.

Mrs. SCOTT. Well, our younger people should be helped.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, our senior citizens, too. We want to make sure that you get some help in this.

Mrs. SCOTT. Well, we don't need quite as much as the younger people do.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Well, I tell you, I don't either. My 10-year-old boy does. He eats like a horse.

Mrs. SCOTT. You're just a baby.

Senator WILLIAMS. Good luck to you.

Senator NEUBERGER. Goodby. Thank you so much.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Mrs. SCOTT. It's been very nice to see you, Mayor Schrunk.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Thank you. It's been good to see you.

(Whereupon, the committee left the residence of Mr. and Mrs. C. A. Scott and proceeded to 1704 Southwest 14th Street, Portland, Oreg., the Better Grocery & Market, owned by Mr. B. Petrich, where the following occurred:)

Senator WILLIAMS. It is nice to meet you. Boy, you've got a nice store here. That reminds me, I'm getting hungry.

STATEMENT OF B. PETRICH, SR. AND JR.

Mr. PETRICH. It's not the best, but I am thankful for it.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, the food is good and the beer is cold and you can't improve on that menu.

Mr. PETRICH. You used to come in here.

Senator NEUBERGER. Yes, I did. We used to go by here and we would come in and see you.

Mr. PETRICH. There are so many of you.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, some of these are press people.

Mr. PETRICH. I see.

Mayor SCHRUNK. We would just like to ask some questions about the freeway program and what problems you are having.

Senator WILLIAMS. How long have you been in this store?

Mr. PETRICH. A little over 30 years. It has been since 1932.

Senator WILLIAMS. Your home is above the store?

Mr. PETRICH. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. It is pretty much of a jolt, isn't it, having to pick up and move?

Mr. PETRICH. Yes, it is.

Senator NEUBERGER. Are you going to continue in business?

Mr. PETRICH. Well, we hope so. I have been in this game practically all my life except for a few years when I was in the construction work, railroad, and so on.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Your son is with you.

Mr. PETRICH. Yes; my son is with me. My son has been with me since 9 years old. My life is gone. I hate to throw him out on the street.

Senator NEUBERGER. Didn't you used to go to school with me?

Mr. PETRICH, Junior. I think so.

Senator NEUBERGER. Yes, you did. Out at Lincoln?

Mr. PETRICH, Junior. Yes.

Senator NEUBERGER. They never know who I am since I changed my name.

Mr. PETRICH. So you see, it's a whole life devoted to it. He has children. He has a large family and he must have something to do, and I always thought I would provide a little future for him, not so great that he could make himself rich. I would never expect that, but just an honest living; that's all anyone can ask for.

Senator WILLIAMS. Have you been looking for another neighborhood store?

Mr. PETRICH. I tell you, I haven't been looking for another neighborhood store because when I realized that they were going to take it was just a short time ago. Before that people would say it would go one way and then another and some said it would pass by, and then, of course, they contacted me and they told me it was going to go through here.

Senator WILLIAMS. Where would you go and look, what part of town?

Mr. PETRICH. Well, that remains to be seen. I always, according to myself, thank the good God that He gave me vision, so I was always able to pick the place, the spot, and I never was a failure in my life, regardless of the job or the business, which I have got the good God to thank for.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Plus your own good, hard work.

Mr. PETRICH. That's right. It is much more important for him to look for his future. I would like to have him pick out his own place and then I will help him with it financially and with my help and assistance, whatever I can do, and I'm an old man but I don't think I'm quite yet dead.

Senator NEUBERGER. How old are you, Mr. Petrich?

Mr. PETRICH. Well, I am 73 years old.

Senator NEUBERGER. What nationality are you?

Mr. PETRICH. I was born in Austria, now considered Yugoslavia. I was on my own since I was 7 years old. I went out working in the neighborhood. When I was 13 years, I went to Trieste. I haven't seen my folks since I was 13 years of age. I came here at the age of 20. I had a hard struggle; and I am here today, which I thank the good God for.

Senator WILLIAMS. Woudn't it be awfully expensive to move all of your supplies?

Mr. PETRICH. I think so.

Senator WILLIAMS. What do you estimate it would cost you to move?

Mr. PETRICH. Well, I tell you, I was in a place for 23 years and I moved once. From a house out on 52d.

Senator WILLIAMS. That was how long ago?

Mr. PETRICH. About 27 years ago.

Senator WILLIAMS. Moving costs are a lot higher now then they were then.

Mr. PETRICH. Yes. So I have no idea at all.

Senator WILLIAMS. I wonder if your son could estimate that for us? I just wondered how much you thought it would cost to move your stock to another store?

Mr. PETRICH, Junior. Gosh, I wouldn't have any idea, but it's been a problem because we haven't had anything definite when we would be leaving.

Senator NEUBERGER. Now, where do you live with your family?

Mr. PETRICH, Junior. I live out in the Southeast.

Mr. PETRICH. He lives in the house he was born in, thank the good God for that.

Senator WILLIAMS. You folks like to put your roots pretty deep, don't you?

Mr. PETRICH. Well, I tell you. I never had any close connection with my father or mother or my brothers or sisters, but I dealt with the world and I saw a lot of different things which most of you couldn't see it. I saw a lot of things and I have done everything I possibly could for my children.

Senator WILLIAMS. You have certainly created a nice life for yourself and your children. It is easy to see that. You have been good to have us over here.

Mr. PETRICH. Yes; thank you very much. I am glad to have met you.

Senator WILLIAMS. One immediate thing we hope to do away with is the cost of moving, when, through no fault of your own, you have to move. Thank you very much.

Senator NEUBERGER. Goodby.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Goodby, Mr. Petrich.

(Whereupon, the committee left the Better Grocery & Market and proceeded to the Carleton Hotel, 140 Southwest Washington Street, Portland, Oreg., managed by Miss Palma Whitney, where the following occurred:)

Senator WILLIAMS. Miss Whitney, we have heard many good things about your hotel here.

STATEMENT OF MISS PALMA WHITNEY

Miss WHITNEY. Thank you.

Mayor SCHRUNK. The Senators would like to ask you a few questions about your operation.

Miss WHITNEY. I would be happy to tell them.

Senator WILLIAMS. I understand you have 140 tenants, and all but 2 are over 65.

Miss WHITNEY. That's right.

Senator WILLIAMS. You have a very interesting plan here.

Miss WHITNEY. I think that we started the hotel, you know, for elderly people, and it spread clear across the United States, and we were the originators.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is that right? When was that?

Miss WHITNEY. In March of 1958; and it was Mayor Schrunk who made it possible.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Well—

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you have much turnover?

Miss WHITNEY. Well, this is the last stand before the nursing home or the hospital or whatever it might be, so we try to have them live as graciously as possible, and independently. They each have a private room. They don't have to share a room with anyone, and we like them to have dignity.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you have any couples?

Miss WHITNEY. Oh, yes; because he can't mow the lawn, and she can't cook anymore, so they live together and come down in the dining room and hold hands.

Mayor SCHRUNK. You are still operating another hotel, too, aren't you?

Miss WHITNEY. I have jurisdiction over it, but—here is something for you to read sometime in your leisure.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Miss WHITNEY. It's just my version of elderly people.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are you now looking for another location?

Miss WHITNEY. I have to, and I have to have help. Everybody knows that we have this group of elderly people here, and there are just two or three comparable hotels available in the city of Portland, but they raised the rents so high. They knew we had to have these hotels, but with the rates the legislature set of \$101 a month for these people, it is impossible, and in the 5 years I have been in this business, labor has increased, and the price of commodities has increased, but our rates have not increased. We save the State of Oregon between \$900 and \$1,000 a month by putting a clinic car on here and taking these people to and from the clinics, where the State of Oregon, it would cost them \$3 a roundtrip, and we give that service gratis. This is part of our plan.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you own this building?

Miss WHITNEY. No, I don't own it. I had a 20-year lease on it.

Senator WILLIAMS. So your problem is made more acute, because you don't collect the condemnation.

Miss WHITNEY. That's right, I don't; and I just got it paid off.

Mayor SCHRUNK. What about the leasehold? Will you recover something from that?

Miss WHITNEY. No; no, not a thing, because it says in my lease that in case of a bona fide sale of the building, you see, and to the highway department, I couldn't fight. It would be impossible.

Senator WILLIAMS. To make it even worse, there is no mandatory allowance for moving.

Miss WHITNEY. No. There is nothing.

Senator WILLIAMS. That's one of the reasons—

Miss WHITNEY (interrupting). We can't stand in the way of progress, but these are our people.

Senator WILLIAMS. That's why we feel there should be a moving allowance at a minimum to a new location.

Miss WHITNEY. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. That's quite a move here, with the beds and all. There is a lot of furniture.

Miss WHITNEY. I don't own the furniture.

Senator WILLIAMS. Oh, I see.

Miss WHITNEY. I lease the building, complete.

Senator WILLIAMS. Oh, I see.

Mayor SCHRUNK. Miss Whitney has rendered a really important service. We went out and made a survey sometime ago to see just what was happening to our older people in the area. I think you will get some of those statistics from Mr. Renoud when he appears before your body this afternoon, but we found so many older people who were living in substandard conditions that were deplorable. We moved ahead and started building this unique home for these people. You will remember the high-rise home under our public housing, but this just barely scratches the surface. We need two, three, or four operations like this—like Miss Whitney's—so she has rendered a very important service.

Senator WILLIAMS. How much time is there left to run on your lease here?

Miss WHITNEY. Well, I have 17 more years.

Senator WILLIAMS. Under your lease?

Miss WHITNEY. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. There is a technical point there. This is an economic loss comparable to losing a building, when you lose your lease.

Miss WHITNEY. Isn't there someone that we can get together here now and find who has the money who can build a building, a 200-room building? I can pay \$4,000 a month rent, \$20 per month per room.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, there are two or three programs for guaranteed loans or low-interest loans. I imagine the hotel idea could fit within one of them.

Miss WHITNEY. I want a lease, though.

Senator WILLIAMS. What you want to do is get—

Miss WHITNEY (interrupting). Financial aid.

Senator WILLIAMS. You want a financial institution to do this.

Miss WHITNEY. Yes.

Senator NEUBERGER. What are the costs of these loans?

Miss WHITNEY. They are terribly high. Everybody wants a quick turnover on their money, and, my golly, if they would just stop and think that these elderly men and women here, these old men out here paved these streets and put these sewerlines in and the electric wires

and so on and so forth that are our pipelines of comfort, and here is what we do. We bat them here and we bat them there. Of course, I'm not going to get all humanitarian now, but honest to God, you just don't throw them back into substandard housing. It costs you money when you do, because they go into malnutrition and from malnutrition into senility, and back into the hospital they go.

Mayor SCHRUNK. A nation such as ours, with such a gross national product, should be able to do much better than that.

Miss WHITNEY. We are far behind them in Europe in their old-age operations.

Senator WILLIAMS. Oh, yes. I was over in Denmark a couple of weeks ago.

Miss WHITNEY. It's marvelous what they do, isn't it?

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes.

Senator NEUBERGER. You can't take these people way out of the center of town, because their recreation is here.

Miss WHITNEY. Well, not only that, but look: you have lived in Portland a great number of years; what does Portland mean to you? It means downtown. Does Lloyd Center mean Portland to you? That's a foreign country to me. I went to St. Mary's up here when I was 12 years old, and Portland is Broadway and Washington.

Mayor SCHRUNK. And the library and—

Miss WHITNEY. And the park, and you are not going to take them away from that. You can't put them out in the sticks. I know you are interested. Is there anything that will come of this that could help us to relocate and find someone that would help us finance the building?

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, the relocation agency I feel would be useful in this way, to search around and find financial institutions and insurance companies, someone who could get a building and then rent it to someone like you.

Mayor SCHRUNK. This is something that has to be put together one way or another. This is why the Senators are holding hearings and taking testimony, but they wanted to get out and see some of the things that are happening in the area as it affects the older citizens.

Miss WHITNEY. Now, does he understand this, that on the rates that the legislature sets, the \$101 a month, you cannot afford to buy, because every time you make a payment on that building, that money is taxable. Do you understand what I mean? So on the \$101 a month rate that you get from the legislature, you can't afford to buy. You have to lease. And when I make a lease payment of \$4,000, it is not taxable. It is an operating expense. If I had to dig up the taxes with it, I couldn't operate.

Mayor SCHRUNK. I see.

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes. For this system to work, you've got to be a lessee, not an owner.

Miss WHITNEY. That's right, or you've got to be very greedy.

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes, and the legislature won't let you be greedy.

Miss WHITNEY. No.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I think for our purposes we have certainly been greatly helped by this visit with you.

Miss WHITNEY. Well, thank you very much.

Senator WILLIAMS. We will keep our nose at this particular grindstone and see if something happens.

Miss WHITNEY. Well, you let me know.

Senator WILLIAMS. We will be working on it back in Washington.

Miss WHITNEY. Mayor, I will come down and heckle you a little bit. I'll put everybody here out in the street with a suitcase in their hands, and then I will get the Journal and the Oregonian men down here. Then I will ask them: "What will we do with them?" Wouldn't that be horrible?

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you very much.

Miss WHITNEY. Oh, you are welcome. Thank you for coming in. You wouldn't have time to go upstairs, would you?

Senator WILLIAMS. No, I'm sorry.

(Whereupon, the visit with Miss Palma Whitney, was concluded and the committee recessed to reconvene at 2:15 p.m. in the Pacific suite, Sheraton-Portland Hotel, Portland, Oreg.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator WILLIAMS. I apologize for our delay in beginning. This has attracted a great deal of attention from television people, and the radio and newspaper people, and we certainly want to explain for the communications media just why we are here.

I had prepared an opening afternoon statement, but I am altering the plan because it has been brought to my attention by the members of the staff who happened to hear, on television the other night, a prayer offered by Rev. William Lavelly of Portland, and it impressed me that in this prayer much of the feeling and sense of obligation that we feel is expressed. This prayer that is built on portions of I Corinthians. I would like to read just parts of Reverend Lavelly's prayer:

If I can create wealth beyond the dream of past ages and increase not my love, my success will deal death. Though I have foresight to locate the fountain of riches, power to preempt them and still have no vision for humanity, I am blind. Love is just and kind. It is not greedy and covetous. It exploits no one. It takes no unearned gain, gives more than it gets. It does not break down the lives of others to make wealth for itself. It makes wealth, building the life of all.

That is all of the prayer that I am going to read, but I think it certainly expresses in noble words the motivation that brings us as a subcommittee to an area of life where we are perhaps creating great new wealth but in the process want to be sure that we don't inflict pain on individuals. The question is, how can we build for our children without destroying the lives and livelihoods of our parents, and that, in general terms, is why we are here.

Now, I would like to call on Mr. L. I. Lindas, who is the chief counsel of the Oregon State Highway Commission; Mr. Walter T. Wright, chief of the Right-of-Way Division of the Oregon Highway Commission, and Dr. Wesley G. Nicholson, chairman of the Oregon Council on Aging. These gentlemen all come to us from the State level of government and I believe we would like to have them at the table as a panel at this time.

**STATEMENT OF WALTER T. WRIGHT, CHIEF, RIGHT-OF-WAY
DIVISION, OREGON HIGHWAY COMMISSION**

Senator WILLIAMS. Where are the absent brothers, Mr. Lindas and Dr. Nicholson?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Lindas, Senator, is in Miami today at the annual Council of the American Association of State Highway Officials. He asked me to stand in for him.

Senator WILLIAMS. We wanted to ask him a little about a \$24,000 item.

Mr. WRIGHT. I shall attempt to answer a question on that subject.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you have any idea if Dr. Nicholson is going to be here this afternoon?

Mr. WRIGHT. No, sir, I don't.

Senator WILLIAMS. He is chairman of the Oregon Council on Aging, and he might want to say something about that, too.

Now, you have been with us on our tour, which was indeed, I think, the most illuminating field trip this subcommittee has had. It was a very useful visit to four or five places where relocation is a great problem because of highway development. I know that you, as right-of-way division chief, are very familiar with the problems of highway progress, and you can proceed in any way you would desire, sir.

Mr. WRIGHT. Would it be appropriate, sir, to read a statement?

Senator WILLIAMS. All right. Maybe that would be the most efficient way of proceeding.

Mr. WRIGHT. Until last Thursday, we were uncertain that we would be called upon for testimony at this hearing. As a result, the statement I have prepared is a rather hasty compilation. I hope that you will bear with me through any errors of syntax or the like. You will observe that the first two paragraphs are somewhat outmoded as of this moment.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Wright follows:)

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF WALTER T. WRIGHT, CHIEF, RIGHT-OF-WAY DIVISION,
OREGON HIGHWAY COMMISSION**

On November 29, the right-of-way division of the State highway department was informed by city of Portland officials that today's hearing was scheduled. We were asked to provide a listing of elderly people that remained in occupancy of property improvements within the boundaries of the right-of-way for the Foothill section of the Stadium Freeway in southwest Portland. It is our understanding that upon conclusion of an hour of formal testimony this morning, this committee proposes to conduct grassroots interviews with certain individuals selected from these lists.

Since we are the public agency currently engaged in displacement of the largest number of persons in Portland metropolitan area, it seems likely that this committee would desire testimony relative to our views of the problem of relocation of these displaced persons and businesses. We anticipate that the testimony of persons who have not yet accomplished relocation will necessarily contain a compound of fears and anticipation of difficulties which may not, in practice, arise.

I digress to say I was very surprised to find little of that anticipation of difficulty. I propose, therefore, to present testimony of a historic nature, that is to say, our own observations from experience and certain research which we have made into the nature of relocation.

Our negotiation processes have always recognized the necessity of relocation. Although we have never taken an active part in assisting an owner with relocation, we have given, insofar as contracting and demolition schedules will

permit, recognition of the necessity of an adequate time for relocation. In some instances, we have been able to extend dates of possession sufficiently, for example, to enable children to finish the school year prior to moving. I believe that an adequate time for reestablishment has been given to every individual involved in right-of-way acquisition in the Portland vicinity. We have rendered considerable assistance to displacees by conveying information known to us, relative to substitute properties. We have, as a regular procedure, made those who are displaced aware of the possibilities and availability of financing through HHFA section 221 and through the Small Business Administration.

At the outset, I will state that until November of this year, we have not been intimately involved with the relocation of tenants and lessees. We have not been, nor are we now able to pay for the cost of moving personal property. Until the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, which made the provision of a relocation advisory service mandatory, no Federal financial participation has been available to assist in the problems of relocation occasioned by highway department activity.

Oregon courts have held that it is not necessary for the acquiring public agency to deal directly with tenants and lessees. We have not attempted to usurp the functions of the courts in intruding ourselves into the relationships between owners and tenants or lessees. The protection of the court is available to both parties, should they be unable to equitably resolve any disagreement relative to disposition of the proceeds of the property sale, or the terms and conditions of occupancy. We have looked to the owner of the property to bring about such an equitable agreement or to cause us to institute a legal proceeding under which, as a separate matter, such a controversy can be brought within the purview of a court. To our best knowledge and belief, this system has resulted in equitable and just solutions of many such controversies and has prevented hardship from arising therefrom.

On the Eastbank Freeway in Portland, a substantial number of large businesses were displaced. It has been our observation that these businesses were able immediately to restore themselves in more favorable locations, in newer and more efficient plants, without hardship or distress.

In general, our acquisition took physical plants which were suffering economic and physical obsolescence, and the owners and tenants have been able to restore themselves in more favorable competitive positions.

Turning to tenants and lessees of residential units, it is obvious that the cost of a move is an uncompensated burden to the person who is dispossessed. In areas such as those being acquired for highway rights-of-way in Portland, such moves are frequent and commonplace on a voluntary basis. In mid-July 1962, our analysis of the Foothills section of the Stadium Freeway route showed that this route encompassed some 158 occupied dwelling units of all types, of which 80 were single-family residences. A total of 338 apartment units lay within the right-of-way, together with 29 light housekeeping rooms. It was observed that five of the buildings involved bore "for rent" signs and one "for sale" sign. On the same date, within a stone's throw of the right-of-way, apartments and rooms were available and advertised by sign on 50 buildings comparable to those within the area of the taking.

There appears to be no dearth of suitable accommodations for those who are displaced. As evidence of the frequency of voluntary moves in this category of accommodations, it is observed that the vacancy and for-rent signs are affixed to a large number of these properties as a permanent attachment, thus indicating that a voluntary movement of occupants is a virtually continuous thing.

Our most intimate knowledge and research of the problems of relocation covers the area of single- and multiple-family residences and small businesses. The largest single right-of-way project ever undertaken by the State highway department, measured in terms of displacement of individuals, was the Minnesota Freeway project in northeast Portland.

On this project and the adjacent northerly end of the East Bank Freeway in the years 1959 to 1961, inclusive, this department acquired some 597 residences, 30 multiple-dwelling units and 70 business units. Relocation difficulties were no serious element of discussion or dispute. Virtually all controversy arose over the monetary consideration offered. As evidence of this fact, the record shows that acquisition was made by option or legal settlement on 98 percent of the residential properties, on 83 percent of the multiple dwellings, and on 91 percent of the business units. The remaining acquisition was made by trial and judgment, an indication of diversity of opinion. This facet of work was well reported

in an article appearing in the Oregon Journal under the date of July 2, 1961, a copy of which is appended hereto.

Upon undertaking the acquisition of this route, we found a typical situation. Hundreds of property owners were suddenly confronted with relocation. All were upset, confused, and extremely apprehensive of the consequences of this displacement. Many sincerely believed that no public authority should be empowered by law to acquire property from an unwilling owner for a public use. In some instances many months, even more than 2 years, failed to overcome this basic belief.

With most owners, after a few months of thought, the individual became reconciled to the necessity of relocation, engaged with us in a spirited effort to procure as much money as possible for the property, signed an option, and proceeded with dispatch to relocate himself. I recall only one negotiation which hinged upon relocation. This 89-year-old spinster insisted that she had every right to die in the home in which she had spent 60 years of her life. She steadfastly maintained this contention through an exchange of courtly correspondence, telephone communications, and personal interviews, numbering at least 100. I use the term "courtly" advisedly. She was a fine lady. Eventually the city of Portland reluctantly permitted some variance to existing regulations and codes. The lady repurchased her property at public auction, moved it to a lot of her selection, and is now happily ensconced for the twilight of her life.

It is our general observation that most elderly persons take a somewhat longer time to recognize the inevitability of a relocation, but having once acknowledged this reality, they move with more decision and dispatch to the solution of the problem than many younger property owners.

In an effort to follow the Minnesota Freeway project to a logical conclusion, we decided to make a random selection of file numbers on this project, continuing to draw numbers until we had a coverage that would embrace at least one property in every block of the entire route, and then to determine what had happened to the owner. In order to get the random coverage desired, it was necessary to study 103 files. These are our findings.

The State purchased 83 residential properties from persons who have since relocated in substitute properties. The owners have distinctly improved their position in each instance. The average State purchase from these owners was valued at \$11,550. The owners have reestablished themselves in properties averaging in value some \$13,600. Of the owners thus reestablished, we estimate 49 to be over 60 years of age.

Twenty owners have not reestablished themselves in substitute properties. These owners were paid by the State a total of \$442,000 for the properties acquired by us. This figure, however, includes one single acquisition valued at \$255,000. Ten of the owners sold income properties and have not reinvested while waiting a favorable market for purchase. Two other residential property owners are renting while waiting for a favorable opportunity to purchase. One elderly lady is renting for convenience because she does not want to keep up a house. Another has not repurchased property because she found a position as an apartment house manager and an apartment is included in her remuneration. Two elderly persons did not repurchase but chose at the behest of their children to make their homes with these children. Four of the persons who did not reinvest in property could not be found at home for interview. We estimate that 13 of the persons who did not reinvest are over 60 years of age.

As a part of the interviews of this survey, these owners were asked if they were satisfied with the handling of the transaction by the State and if they were satisfied with their current situation. All of the persons who had reinvested seemed to be pleased with their new properties. Twenty-six persons volunteered an expression of appreciation and gratitude for the handling of their transaction before our question could be asked. A total of 18 persons expressed dissatisfaction with the handling of the transaction. This dissatisfaction found its expression in two rather generalized complaints:

(1) I was not paid enough for my property, even though I signed an option and deed and agreed to the price.

(2) I just don't believe it is right and never will for any governmental agency to take property from a person who is not willing to sell and I don't like any part of a system that permits this.

In conclusion, it is my opinion that right-of-way operations of the State highway department to this date have not created serious problems of relocation for any of the individuals affected. I do not believe that to this date a need has

been evident for relocation service. Oregonians have shown themselves to be a rather self-sufficient people. I do not believe that relocation has had a more lasting or serious impact upon elderly people than on any other category of displacee. I believe that the consideration paid to the owners of the property has been sufficiently generous that the financial impact of a move has not been serious. Losses have been suffered by tenants and lessees in residential properties because of moving costs, and these have not been compensated.

The policies of the State highway department have always been oriented toward helping in the solution of local problems insofar as it is feasible or legally possible. Certainly the antithesis of all of our desires and intent is to add to a local problem or create a new one. We approach relocation advisory assistance with no mental reservation. We intend to do a thorough and complete job for any qualified person who asks for assistance or advice in relocation.

(The article referred to previously follows:)

[From the Oregon Journal of July 2, 1961]

MINNESOTA FREEWAY PROPERTY HARMONIOUSLY ACQUIRED

(By Jim Running, Journal staffwriter)

An unusually litigation-free record is being made by the Oregon Highway Department in acquiring property for what will be the Minnesota Freeway through north Portland.

Thus far, the department has negotiated for and purchased more than 500 parcels through the neighborhood, most of the tracts containing homes or small businesses.

In only 12 of the more than 500 cases has negotiation failed and it has become necessary for the State to go to court with a condemnation suit.

"Measured in terms of the number of acquisitions, this is the largest single right-of-way project in State highway department history," according to W. C. (Dutch) Williams, the department's engineer.

The \$5 million freeway will begin near North Russell and Failing Streets at the junction of the Eastbank and Stadium Freeways. From this point, the Minnesota Freeway will proceed north for 5 miles to the Interstate Bridge.

Construction of the Minnesota Freeway is expected to begin next year with completion in 1964. About three-fourths of the right-of-way has been purchased at a cost of \$6 million, with an estimated \$2 million worth of property yet to buy.

The magnitude of the number of houses and business being acquired for the right-of-way and the not entirely unexpected opposition from the homeowners resulted in an innovation by the highway department.

To answer questions of worried families about to be dispossessed, the department established a field office in the neighborhood for its right-of-way agents, five of whom are still at work in the property acquisition task.

"This field office serves as a base of local operations," Williams explained, "and provides a convenient place within walking distance of local residents where questions can be answered and problems resolved.

"As buying has progressed from north to south, the office moved to keep pace."

It was 2 years ago that the department began right-of-way studies in the North Minnesota Avenue area, learning that "many of the residents were persons of modest income who had lived in their homes for many years," Williams said.

"The bulk of the residences," he continued, "were 40 to 45 years old, but well maintained and surrounded by well-kept yards which bespoke pride of ownership.

"One common denominator was shared by most of the persons affected—they didn't want to move."

The result was formation by several hundred homeowners of the Minnesota Property Owners Association.

"When existence of the association came to the attention of the highway department," Williams said, "steps were immediately initiated to arrange a public meeting with the group.

"At the meeting, a full disclosure was made of the status of planning and design on the freeway project, together with an explanation of the principles and procedures governing right-of-way acquisition by the department."

So successful was this and a second meeting of department officials with the worried residents that, Williams said, "The Minnesota Property Owners Association dissolved apparently for lack of necessity for a common cause."

Appraisal and acquisition methods used by the department which have proved so successful were explained by the engineer: "Department staff appraisers carefully accumulate records of real estate sales within the area under negotiations, including every transaction of record in reasonable proximity for a period of 5 years.

"These men work to exacting and recognized professional standards. They are under instruction to resolve any legitimate doubt in favor of the property owner.

"The accuracy of their work is further verified by comparison with valuation figures determined by independent professional appraisers.

"All valuations thus derived are examined and carefully reviewed by a special staff within the right-of-way organization in an effort to establish fairness and consistency and to avoid errors of oversight or omission.

"This same staff is authorized to examine and consider, along with all other evidences of value, any appraisal reports prepared by men who are hired by the property owner.

"As a result of the review, a single fair cash value is determined and is used thereafter in negotiation or legal proceedings, should such be necessary."

Normally, the homeowner is allowed only 30 days, occupancy of his house after the check for his property has been delivered.

But tenderheartedly, the department has in some instances extended it as much as 6 months "to allow children to complete the year in a certain school, or for some other extenuating reason," Williams explained.

The engineer has high praise for the hundreds of families who have been dispossessed or will be shortly.

"Minnesota Freeway area residents seem to typify some of the dominant characteristics of the American pioneer," he said.

"The State, of necessity, has requested them to move from their homes.

"These people are victims of progress, but few complain.

"They have solved their own problems and have steadfastly maintained their dignity and their rights as citizens.

"Refusing to be coddled by government, they have found and established new homes.

"Evidence exists that the temporarily displaced homeowners are absorbed readily into other homes through the workings of free enterprise."

Senator WILLIAMS. I am frankly a little confused here at the last, the concluding paragraph of your statement, Mr. Wright.

Mr. WRIGHT. This was a rather hasty effort. I am afraid my girl left out one sentence that was dictated.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, could you give us the amended version as you dictated it, because up above you say:

I do not believe to this date that need has been evident for relocation service—and down below here you say:

We approach relocation advisory assistance with no mental reservation.

Now, is there a conflict there, or am I—

Mr. WRIGHT. I don't intend one, sir. This is what I intended to say. We—

Senator WILLIAMS (interrupting). Let's have it in your words and not your secretary's words. How is that?

Mr. WRIGHT. Good enough. I am uncertain as to the amount of demand that will be placed upon this service. I doubt that there will be a substantial demand placed upon it if our past experience is any criterion. However, we do not approach it with our tongue in cheek, or with any mental reservations. If a demand is placed upon us, we certainly will do everything possible to do a workmanlike job of fulfilling the need that is evidenced.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, now, let me ask you, are you familiar with what relocation advisory service is available through the highway department?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you have a division of people who apply themselves to this objective of relocation service advisory counsel?

Mr. WRIGHT. We have created one in response to the 1962 Federal-aid highway legislation.

Senator WILLIAMS. Could you describe just what the highway department relocation advisory group is made up of and what they are doing?

Mr. WRIGHT. We have in each of our highway districts a single individual who is responsible for relocation activity in his district. He, in turn, is responsible to me for satisfactory performance of this work. We have accumulated and are continuing to accumulate in these district offices listings of available rentals, housing, listings of public and private agencies which have services available to a displacee.

Senator WILLIAMS. Does that individual in each district have the staff and resources to go to every individual or business to be displaced and tell him what agencies have inventoried available housing or business opportunities, and where the individual might go to seek a home or a business opportunity?

Mr. WRIGHT. We propose to handle it on this basis, sir. Our appraiser, who is the first person on the property we seek to acquire, will hand to each property owner, to each tenant and lessee, a copy of a booklet which I have placed before you, an informational brochure.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is that "You and Your Highway Right-of-Way?"

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir. As you observe, we printed a card to insert in each of these books in which we advise the owner, tenant, or lessee of the availability of a relocation service, and tell him that our negotiator, who appears in due course upon the scene, will take his application for assistance and guide him into the channels and the procedures.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are you familiar with the Portland Development Commission's program for service to those who need relocation?

Mr. WRIGHT. I profess to be no expert, but I have a certain familiarity; yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are there substantial differences between their program and yours?

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe that in many instances they sought to go afield with an individual and actually travel around through areas and look over available housing or whatever was needed by the individual. That is perhaps a step further than we had anticipated going at this time.

Senator WILLIAMS. Why don't you relieve yourself—you are highway people, engineering people, construction people—of this particular burden of relocation services, contribute your just share of money and centralize it in the hands of people whose background and training and life is in terms of human, say, engineering, working with people and their human problems. You fellows have got to tear down the buildings and build the roadways and do the surveys, the physical. It seems to me it would make a lot more sense to get these relocation services centralized in an agency with a professional staff properly motivated to do it humanely and efficiently.

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe that we probably can adequately do it. Our problem is this: I believe that in the city of Portland we could contract for the service and have it handled properly and efficiently. However, our problems are not all concentrated in the city of Portland. We must be responsible for this thing on a statewide basis. I don't believe there is another agency in the State that would be equipped as the Portland Development Commission to handle this work and we must think in terms of handling it on a statewide basis.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would say most of your relocation is in the urban areas. What other cities besides Portland?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, for example, the cities of Medford, Klamath Falls, La Grande, Pendleton, Astoria, they are all currently or have very recently been affected by highway rights-of-ways.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, now, you were with us today when we, this morning, went to the Carleton Hotel where Miss Palma Whitney, who is a lessee of the hotel, has 140 tenants all but two of whom are over 65. I talked to several, I think it is fair to say, several who are over 80. Now, her hotel gives homes to these folks at \$101 a month. She is now faced with this situation, and her 138 elderly tenants are faced with this situation. She obviously doesn't have the money or the opportunity to go out and borrow the money to build a relocation hotel. There are programs in the Federal structure that are designed to stimulate those entrepreneurs who can do it to build housing for elderly and a hotel would fit, I believe, at least one of the programs.

Are your folks in a position to advise Miss Whitney how to use that program? Are you equipped to go out and maybe get one of your finance companies to recognize an opportunity to make a little money and do a great thing by developing substitute hotel housing of the nature of Miss Whitney's? Do you have any one who is an expert on these housing programs?

Mr. WRIGHT. We have had detailed instructions in that matter from the local district office of the FHA. I think that we have a general understanding of the subject.

Senator WILLIAMS. Who would you tell Miss Whitney to go to—her hotel is being taken by the Stadium Freeway—to help her find someone who would be interested as a landlord in creating a comparable hotel that she, in turn, can lease? For economic reasons, she has to be a lessee.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that we have, among other consultants available to us, the Portland Realty Board, who is the coordinating board for the realty boards in the three metropolitan counties. I believe that that would be the logical place to begin.

Senator WILLIAMS. There is no one within the governmental structure that you would advise her to go see?

Mr. WRIGHT. We would—

Senator WILLIAMS (interrupting). This is not an academic question.

Mr. WRIGHT. Believe me, I understood that after we went through the hotel. It is not our intent to try to be experts, but we do think that we can consult with a world of expert talent in private industry.

Senator WILLIAMS. Certainly we need the talent and response of the private areas of our economy, but someone has got to bring it all together. That is the situation. We have got to have someone bringing Federal, State, city, private programs together with the need,

and that is why it seems, perhaps superficially, but it seems to me that this ought to be centered in people who are specialists in this. I certainly agree with you where you talk about the resourcefulness of Oregonians. We talked with some people who were just magnificent in their philosophical acceptance that they must give up their home on the West Side and probably get uprooted to a part of the city they don't know, and that it all has to be done in the nature of development and progress. Mrs. Weinstein and Mr. and Mrs. Scott and Mr. Petrich, these were examples of fine people losing a lifetime of rooted community living, and they took it, I will say, with just a magnificence that amazed me.

But that is only part of it. I think there are serious problems. You say there are not. You say that you don't believe that to this day the need has been evident for relocation service. I couldn't more strongly disagree with you. I agree with you that Oregonians have shown themselves to be a self-sufficient people, but I can't agree with you that when you say "I do not believe that relocation has had a more lasting or serious effect upon elderly people than on any other category of displaced." I just don't know what those folks are going to do over at the Carleton Hotel.

Mr. WRIGHT. That I have tried to make clear, that our experience has been primarily with the owners of property, persons of financial resources sufficient to their needs.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, and they are, I would suggest, without the detailed statistical analysis that you have used on certain aspects of the problem, are in the minority.

Mr. WRIGHT. No, up to this juncture—

Senator WILLIAMS (interrupting). Well, now, here you have Miss Whitney. She isn't an owner, you know.

Mr. WRIGHT. I understand.

Senator WILLIAMS. She has 140 tenants in the one category, and they are in one building. You have 141 real problems, Miss Whitney and her tenants.

Mr. WRIGHT. My statement only implied that up to this time our work has not hit anything of the magnitude of this West Side project.

Senator WILLIAMS. I see.

Mr. WRIGHT. In Portland or of the displacement of tenants.

Senator WILLIAMS. We could see, in our rather hurried trip, that there is to be a major displacement of tenants and homeowners, of small business men, of this residential hotel, synagogues, churches. This project is a real taker. I don't know what we can do, through this committee, to relieve the community pain of losing a synagogue or a church, but I sure hope we can find some ways to alleviate some of the pain of lost homes and businesses.

I want to say this, that I guess there was some confusion at the outset here. We wanted you at the State level of government to be with us, and in order to properly invite you, we wrote on November 15 to the Honorable Mark Hatfield. Or don't you and Mr. Hatfield talk?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir. Was the date originally set for this coming Friday?

Senator WILLIAMS. Our letter was dated November 15 and we gave as the time for your hoped-for appearance as December 3 at 10 a.m. We hit it pretty close, too.

Mr. WRIGHT. We had a communication from the Governor's office. It wasn't clear, however, that we would be asked to testify formally in any way, and the date was originally set for December 7, it was our understanding.

Senator WILLIAMS. The copy of the letter I have says December 3. I wonder if you get more reliable information from the mayor of Portland than from the Governor of Oregon?

Mr. WRIGHT. No, sir, I wouldn't say that.

Senator WILLIAMS. Okay. We will let you off the hook.

Does anybody else have any questions here? I am monopolizing the opportunity of discussion with you, Mr. Wright. I do appreciate your being with us today and your showing us the area where the problem, as we see it, is going to be more acute.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you, sir, for the opportunity.

Senator WILLIAMS. All right.

We have a statement that is to be offered on behalf of the chairman of the Portland Housing Authority, Mr. Roy Renoud, and who is the bearer of that statement? Is he or she here?

STATEMENT OF MRS. MILDRED SORODKA, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT, HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PORTLAND

Mrs. SORODKA. I am Mildred Sorodka, administrative assistant to the Housing Authority of Portland.

Senator WILLIAMS. Would you like to summarize the statement and we will put it all in the record.

Mrs. SORODKA. With your permission, I would like to read his testimony.

Senator WILLIAMS. All right; fine.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROY RENOUD, CHAIRMAN, HOUSING AUTHORITY, PORTLAND, OREG., AS READ BY MRS. SORODKA

At the request of Portland's mayor, Terry D. Schrunck, the Housing Authority of Portland 3 years ago conducted a citywide survey designed to determine the extent and intensity of the need for decent, safe, and sanitary housing for senior citizens of low income. Our survey involved a sampling of 10 percent of the some 5,000 recipients of old-age assistance, whose average monthly income was less than \$100. The survey revealed that more than 75 percent of these oldsters, or approximately 3,750, were presently housed in dwellings that were in noncompliance with from 1 to 15 city codes relating to decency, safety, and sanitation.

On the basis of the results of this survey and with the approval of the Portland City Council and of the Public Housing Administration who had set up the required approved program reservation, we started the development of Northwest Tower, first high-rise, low-rent housing project in the Far West exclusively for senior citizens of low income, now under construction at Northwest 19th and Everett in Portland.

Since this project was put under development, we have received bona fide applications from more than 500 eligible applicants. The project will provide—

Senator WILLIAMS (interrupting). We were all there. How many units are at Northwest? We went by there and I was trying to estimate, but I couldn't.

Mrs. SORODKA. There will be 180 units; 150 are exclusively for senior citizens.

Senator WILLIAMS. There are high rise, and then some lower structures?

Mrs. SORODKA. Yes.

STATEMENT BY ROY RENOUD—Continued

The project will provide 150 units for the elderly, will not be completed and in operation for nearly a year, and we are still receiving additional applications every week.

Due to the urgency of need in the instance of many of these applicants, and in an effort to provide some sort of stopgap facility for special hardship cases, earlier this year we purchased an existing structure—the 36-unit Royal Rose Court Apartments in North Portland—and immediately adapted it to the exclusive use of housing low-income senior citizens.

Of the total of 664 units of low-rent housing now under operation by the Housing Authority of Portland, 160 units are being occupied by the elderly.

We are concerned that Northwest Tower, when completed and in operation, will meet only some 3 percent of the known need involving local recipients of old-age assistance alone.

We are even more concerned with the significance of the following data relating to incomes received, age of dwellings occupied, and rentals being paid by a large segment of Portland's senior citizens, as supplied to us by the U.S. Bureau of Census, based upon its 1960 census in the Portland area: 14,170 households of persons age 60 or over were living in rented quarters built in 1939 or earlier; 27,883 households of persons age 60 or over were living in their own dwellings built in 1939 or earlier. Of the 45,271 household heads in Portland in 1959 age 60 or over, 1,699 had no income; 2,461 had an annual income of from \$1 to \$499; 7,269 had an annual income of from \$500 to \$999; 7,496 had an annual income of from \$1,000 to \$1,499; and 4,376 had an annual income of from \$1,500 to \$1,999—

Senator WILLIAMS (interrupting). Well, that dramatically bears out Mrs. Neuberger's observation this morning.

Mrs. SORODKA. Yes.

STATEMENT OF ROY RENOUD—Concluded

Of the 50,856 household units occupied by a person or persons age 60 or over, 8,402 units were occupied by households with a total annual income of less than \$1,000.

There are 3,778 households of persons age 60 or over in Portland whose income is less than \$1,000 per year and who pay less than \$20 per month rent; there are 5,357 households of persons age 60 or over in Portland whose income is between \$1,000 and \$2,000 per year and who pay less than \$30 per month rent.

These statistics represent conditions in Portland 2 years ago, and do not take into account the forthcoming needs of hundreds of low-income senior citizens who will be displaced by the construction of the Foothills-Stadium Freeway and other planned public works.

As in the case with all local housing authorities using Federal funds, the Housing Authority of Portland, Oreg., operates under Federal laws administered by the Public Housing Administration and under a State enabling act which defines, among other things, the local authority's statutory responsibility for relocating households displaced by the development of public housing projects. In extending public housing to meet the needs of low-income families and senior citizens displaced by other public works, we must work closely with the various planning, redevelopment and allied agencies involved. We are fortunate in Portland that we have a mayor and city council who understand and appreciate the purpose and function of public housing and who are cognizant of the community's moral responsibility to properly relocate low-income households displaced by public works. Whenever we are able to demonstrate a need for additional public housing, we can depend upon city government to give us a sympathetic audience, and if we can properly justify our case, to enter into the required cooperation agreement permitting us to develop additional units.

We have been equally fortunate in our relationship with the Public Housing Administration whose San Francisco regional office works closely with us in expediting the establishment of the required approved program reservation whenever our city council gives us its approval on the development of new projects. We have our share of problems in site selection and acquisition and in cutting through the maze of redtape involved in the development of a federally aided project, but we regard these problems as the usual occupational hazards and a test of our ability to get the job done as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Because of the urgency of the present need in Portland for a more adequate supply of low-rent housing for low-income senior citizens, and because we know that this need is soon to be intensified and compounded by the dislocation of low-income oldsters by the construction of the Foothills-Stadium Freeway and other public works, we regard our job in the months to come as a real challenge. We will surely need the continued support of our mayor, the city council, the Public Housing Administration, and the people of Portland.

Mr. Frank C. Frantz of your committee's professional staff has asked that we comment on provisions of S. 3712 as they may relate to relocation and the development of relocation housing.

Regarding section 7, which is entitled "Eligibility of Public Housing Agencies for Direct Loans for Housing the Elderly," we feel that in Portland there exists a demonstrable need for housing of the type built under this direct-loan program, and we believe that the Housing Authority of Portland is properly staffed to qualify as an eligible sponsor of this program if section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 is amended to so permit. Our staff is frequently asked to volunteer its services in consulting with and advising nonprofit organizations in their planning for the development of retirement homes, and we already voluntarily contribute to such interests considerable data relating to recommended design and construction details.

Regarding section 9, which is entitled "Property in Urban Renewal Areas To Be Used for Elderly Persons Housing," we are cognizant of the desirability of relocating low-income senior citizens displaced by urban renewal in the areas of the city where they have lived, and we are equally aware of the difficulty in obtaining sites in urban renewal areas because of the high cost of land and the competition of economically higher alternative uses. We regard section 9 as an extremely valuable potential assist to local housing authorities in site acquisition by authorizing the Urban Renewal Administration to add to the Federal share of the capital grant the difference between the amount a local public agency receives for land used for housing the elderly constructed by nonprofit or public agencies and the amount which would have been received from a developer who would devote the site to its highest alternative use. We feel that such an amendment would tend to more closely coordinate the activities of local housing authorities and local urban renewal agencies to the end that human needs would be better served.

Senator WILLIAMS. In addition to the public housing for the elderly in your new Northwest development, which is new housing, you have taken an older structure and devoted that to public housing?

Mrs. SORODKA. Yes. The 36-unit Royal Rose, which was acquired, I believe, in August, is filled with elderly citizens.

Senator WILLIAMS. Have any nonprofit organizations received approval of applications for housing for the elderly?

Mrs. SORODKA. Not to my knowledge.

Senator WILLIAMS. Is there any housing for the elderly in the other group, the guaranteed mortgage for entrepreneur housing? I thought someone told us that a group of teachers had combined on the nonprofit program. Are you familiar with that?

Mrs. SORODKA. I think perhaps you are referring to Terwilleger Plaza. I believe that was built primarily for retired teachers. We realize our responsibility in housing people who are displaced by public works.

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes; that's the one. Thank you very much, Mrs. Sorodka.

I believe we have Mr. William Gordon, program director of the Jewish community center. Mr. Gordon, do you have some former residents of the South Auditorium area?

**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM GORDON, PROGRAM DIRECTOR,
PORTLAND JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER**

Mr. GORDON. Yes. Would you like me to bring them up?

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes. We have listed Mrs. Morris Hyman, Mrs. Rosen, Mrs. Felvarg, and Mrs. Ostrander. Is that a proper listing?

Mr. GORDON. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I believe you have on file a statement which I have sent to you. I will not read the statement. (The prepared statement of Mr. Gordon follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM GORDON

The South Portland district was the concentrated area of settlement for a large number of Jewish people since before the turn of the century. Much of the religious, cultural, and business activity was concentrated in this area. Here are located to this very day most of the synagogues, the Jewish community center, and the specifically Jewish business establishments (kosher shops, bakery, etc.). Even though the center of Jewish population shifted first to the Northeast and, in more recent years, to the Southwest, a sizable number of the older members of the Jewish community remained in South Portland, possibly because of economic reasons; the need to be close to a synagogue, the Jewish community center, or perhaps because of emotional attachment to a home, a neighborhood, or the proximity of friends.

The dislocation caused by the Southwest urban renewal project and, more recently, by the freeway right-of-way requirements has at least in the initial stages caused much anxiety for many and a great deal of hardship for a few. Comparable housing at reasonable rentals or purchase prices was not available in the approximate same area. Many have, therefore, had to move into strange neighborhoods amid strange surroundings. Contact with synagogue, Jewish community center, and other attachments have been severed. The initial adjustment period was most traumatic. Fortunately, a good number have made fairly reasonable adjustments to their new homes and surroundings. Others are still struggling. Those who could afford to move to some of the residential hotels in the same area (Park Plaza, Ione Plaza) were especially fortunate.

We at the Jewish Community Center, for example, have noted a falloff in attendance of older adults at our regular senior citizen programs as a result of the relocation and the consequent difficulty of getting to the center. Personally, I'm aware of at least 15 older adults who were forced to move from their old homes either because of the urban renewal project or the freeway right-of-way.

The urban renewal project, at the very outset, at least established a relocation center in the area and provided much needed services to many people. This, however, was not our experience with the freeway dislocations. A comprehensive, legal, social work, and general relocation service is essential when older people are forced to move and sever lifelong ties in a given community. Many are just too bewildered and do not know where to turn for legal help or help with general family problems. Many people must also have some financial assistance during the difficult readjustment period (moving, furniture, higher rent, etc.)

Mr. GORDON. I just want to make a few informal comments. I am not an expert witness, for one thing. I have worked with the Jewish Community Center, and we serve an area which includes many of these folks. Ours is a citywide community agency, but it so happens that many of the elderly people whom we serve live in this area and have, in fact, lived in this area practically since the turn of the century.

Senator WILLIAMS. Which area are we talking about?

Mr. GORDON. This is the south Portland auditorium area we are talking about, which is affected by both the urban renewal develop-

ment program as well as the freeway right-of-way development program. I want to make just a few comments about these specific situations and I would like to make a general comment in reference to relocation and housing.

Many of our people fortunately have been able to get relocated. It was a very trying experience, I must say. You already noted, yourself, that it is very difficult for elderly people, and I must say it is more difficult for elderly people to make a readjustment than it is, perhaps, for younger people. They have a great deal invested in property, their neighborhood, and so on. Many of the people involved are widows who have owned their homes and so forth. In our situation, many of the cultural and religious institutions happened to be located in this particular area, and, for that reason many of them, of course, were reluctant to move because it is not possible to find a synagogue that you can walk to if you go across on the east side of the river. That has been one of the concerns.

I will say, however, for the record, that some of the folks that have moved are very happy. A great many are not, are still trying to adjust to the situation. I don't want to take up too much time because some of these folks, I know, want to speak, but I do want to make some reference to this matter of adequate housing.

I made a statistical survey myself, not an expert survey, but just a sort of a quick survey on the basis of the statistics which I received from the State Council on the Aging, and according to my estimate, based on the figures which I saw in the bulletins of the State Council on the Aging, only 7½ percent of those people 65 years of age and over can afford to live or to move in some of these places that you have made reference to, for example, Terwilliger Plaza. Many of the homes which are constructed with private funds, albeit they received loans from the Federal Government, are not in the rental category that most of the people that we are concerned with are able to afford, and I think this will be borne out by other witnesses here. My facts may be all wrong, but I based them on the income information which I found in the bulletin of the State Council on the Aging some while ago.

Senator WILLIAMS. What was that figure again?

Mr. GORDON. I say this is not a formal study. This is my own.

Senator WILLIAMS. What is your estimate?

Mr. GORDON. My own estimate is only about 7½ percent of the people 65 years of age and over. There are some folks here that are experts that may contradict this statement, but this is, as I said, just a personal study that I made. Only about 7½ percent of the people 65 years of age and over could afford to move in some of these high-priced places like Terwilliger Plaza and like the Methodist Housing Development south of here, and some of the other privately developed new units that are coming up. This is my estimate.

Senator WILLIAMS. Even the nonprofit?

Mr. GORDON. Well, I am not talking about public housing now.

Senator WILLIAMS. I know. How about nonprofit housing?

Mr. GORDON. Either nonprofit housing developed by private entrepreneurs, by Federal money, or I don't know if we have any interests that have been endorsed by private institutions or nonprofit organizations.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, you mentioned the Methodists.

Mr. GORDON. Yes, but that is an older one. I am talking about the more recent ones. But it seems to me those are fairly close. Certainly it is not more than 10 percent.

Now, I don't know in what order you would like to have these folks. Now, some of these people have been affected—I think most of them affected—by the freeway rather than urban renewal development.

Senator WILLIAMS. Could we just locate your part of the city?

Mr. GORDON. This is the urban renewal area essentially, which is bounded by Market Street—

Senator WILLIAMS. What is it called?

Mr. GORDON. It is called South Portland?

Senator WILLIAMS. South Portland?

Mr. GORDON. That is correct. That is the auditorium site area.

Senator WILLIAMS. We toured today only in West Portland. Right?

Mr. GORDON. This is part of West Portland.

Senator WILLIAMS. South Portland is part of West Portland?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, this is the first time the South has gotten together with the West. That is urban renewal, not freeway or highway?

Mr. GORDON. Some of it is also freeway.

Senator WILLIAMS. Now, we heard of the taking of a synagogue. Was that for the highway or urban renewal?

Mr. GORDON. The synagogue is the highway. I think there are two synagogues. Correct me if I am wrong. Yes, there are two synagogues involved, an orthodox synagogue located on Southwest Park, and there is another synagogue located across from our own facility, which is located on Southwest 13th, which is not part of the urban renewal, but it is part of this freeway development.

Senator WILLIAMS. We just talk about this as a matter of understanding some of the community problems. There certainly can be no Federal program here, although as far as the condemnation, well, that is a local matter.

Mr. GORDON. I understand that.

Senator WILLIAMS. If it is a highway, highway funds are used on condemnation for churches, too, I would imagine.

Mr. GORDON. May I just add one thing which I mentioned, I think, in the formal statement which I have submitted. If I were to make personal recommendations, I would make at least one, and that is that, as is not the case with the freeway, the urban renewal has had in existence I think a fairly efficient service to people who were forced to be relocated, and I had hoped that the highway people would also have something of the sort, but it is my understanding—I learned something new today; I didn't even know that they had contemplated establishing such a service. It has been my understanding that they have not provided this needed service, very much needed service to a good many people, because there is not only confusion, but there is also doubt, and a lack of information as to what might possibly be available in the way of legal service, services for a family, social, neighborhood kind of situation, assistance in relocation, kinds of housing, and so on, especially where the problem arises that they are not able to locate

comparable housing at approximately the same cost, the same rental, or in the case of purchase property, which is true in some cases, at approximately the same purchase price.

Now, that would be one of my recommendations, to make some effort to provide such service. I don't know where that would come from, perhaps public housing, especially where an older person is not able to swing higher rental, some sort of assistance should be made available.

In other words, if a person 65 or 75 or 85 is paying now, say \$40 or \$35 a month and there are very, very many in that category—and they cannot find anything comparable for less than \$65, some sort of assistance should be provided such an individual, and there are many who are in that kind of a situation. Now, that would just be a personal recommendation which I would like to pass on to the committee.

Senator WILLIAMS. Have you discussed that with anybody? This is your observation?

Mr. GORDON. This is my observation. I mentioned it, I believe, in the statement which I have sent in. I have not discussed it with any officials. This is just a thought that I had based on my own observations as to what happened to a good many people who are forced to move and can't afford to swing the higher rental. It actually means they have to go into substandard housing, or if they can't go into substandard housing, perhaps children and others may have to make special accommodations for them. I don't know.

Senator WILLIAMS. Very worthy suggestion. We have had other men of similar understanding who have seen these problems as you have and have made similar suggestions. We are glad to have that from you, sir.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you very much. May I introduce these folks?

Senator WILLIAMS. Yes, introduce your friends.

Mr. GORDON. Mrs. Hyman is now living at property at 2218 Southwest Sixth, which is going to be taken away by the freeway, and I don't just know what her problems are, but she will be probably able to tell you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MORRIS HYMAN

Mrs. HYMAN. I don't know if I will be able to say what I really should say. I am here in the house just a year and a half. Thirty, forty years I was in college and then they take it away, and then the freeway, I asked if I should buy this house and the freeway said they would not take it away, but I was unlucky enough that I was in the first one to be taken away, this house, too, and I was working since 40 years, not just for the Jewish organizations, a lot of times for the churches, to give my work. I should be independent when I will be my age.

Mr. GORDON. Why don't you tell them what you do?

Mrs. HYMAN. You tell for me, I think. If not, Mrs. O'Brien and the other one from the neighborhood, the neighbors of us know, and I want to continue to do my work as much as I can, not to go to the children and to bother the relief, but I don't know what to do now. Anyplace where I am going to buy a house, it comes to ten, twelve thousand dollars and I couldn't do my work. I got to have my kitchen and the kitchen was my life. When it is twelve, thirteen thousand

dollars, it is impossible to buy a house or to go pay \$100 rent for an apartment. In the first place, I don't like the apartment. I never will. I like when a man comes, a stranger that Mr. Gordon sends to ask for a meal, a dollar a meal to send to my house, for him to come in and sit down and eat it, and just not the men to come for a dollar. Jan Peerce was one time in Portland. He asked for a kosher meal in the synagogue and was sent to my house to eat a kosher meal. Now, where should I go? I really don't know what to do.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, now let us understand. You have been a businesswoman?

Mrs. HYMAN. Mr. Gordon, please explain better.

Mr. GORDON. Mrs. Hyman does a great deal of catering, kosher catering for a good many organizations, particularly Jewish organizations, and because of the location of the synagogue and similar organizations, her location is particularly important, but in addition, she has rendered an important service in terms of transients who come through who either come to our agency or to the Jewish Family and Child Service, and she has provided meals. Many of these folks stay at the "Y" or one of the places downtown and she provides a meal at a cost which is, of course, very reasonable and is paid for through our agency or one of the other United Fund-supported agencies. That is the nature of Mrs. Hyman's work.

Senator WILLIAMS. Now, have you had your notice that your present home will be taken?

Mrs. HYMAN. Yes, I got notice as of the 1st of January.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is, the first of next year?

Mrs. HYMAN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, now, this is December 3.

Mrs. HYMAN. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Have you been looking for another home?

Mrs. HYMAN. I was looking, we all are looking, but I am just losing everything that was so dear to me if I go on the East Side to live when I was 54 years around here on those two streets, and if I am going on the East Side, I can't do anything, and I am not having what I was expecting there. I would like to be independent, not to go to the children for any help. I've got five children. I don't want to go to the relief.

Senator WILLIAMS. Not to go where?

Mrs. HYMAN. The relief shouldn't help me. I should help myself. So far I was able to help myself.

Mr. GORDON. How old are you?

Mrs. HYMAN. If you don't tell anybody, 74, but don't say it to anybody.

Senator WILLIAMS. We won't tell a soul. I bet your kosher cooking compares favorably to the Concord Hotel. Have you ever heard of it?

Mrs. HYMAN. Yes. But really, I can't think, what good to people to my age? I'm not ready for the old people's home.

Senator WILLIAMS. You sure aren't.

Mrs. HYMAN. I was thinking that Mr. Gordon and—what is George Robinson? What has he got to do? Maybe we could, like two or three women together, could have a house and could take care of one another. We are not ready for the old people's home. We are not.

Naturally when the time will come, we will go, but we don't have to make an appointment. Maybe we do have to make one. It looks to me like we should make an appointment.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, now, could we meet your other friends, Mr. Gordon?

Mr. GORDON. Mrs. Ostrander, do you want to make a statement?

STATEMENT OF MRS. W. L. OSTRANDER

Mrs. OSTRANDER. I am not a property owner. I am a tenant, and I live in one of Mrs. Rosen's duplexes, but there are four of us living there, and, as I say, I am like these people that are on social security and old-age assistance, we are only allowed \$40 a month for rent, and if we go over that amount, plus our utilities, that deducts from our food and our clothing and the rest of the pleasures that we might want.

I was in the urban renewal at the time that they bought. At that time I was managing an apartment house on Second and Hall. I was also matron at the Harrison, Inc., which formerly was known as Grandma's Kitchen, and I was working part time in a grocery store. Well, on that move I lost all three of my positions, which made me eligible for employment again. The urban renewal moved us over on Jackson Street. The Government paid for our moving.

Then this August, this here highway came through. I was forced to move again. I moved into Mrs. Rosen's property, which they told me at the time that if I moved there, they would not take the building, but they probably would take just the corner of the back of her lot, and that was all the highway would want. Well, they gave us 30 days' notice to move out of our place on Jackson Street, and we had no way of moving, so my husband and I moved by hand. We wheeled it and packed it around to where we moved. And now we are faced with that problem again of having to move, with no money to move on, no place to move where we can find rent. I talked with my caseworker this morning. I spoke with her. She said they are frantic down there. They don't know what to do with people that are in our situation on this moving, because they cannot assist us to move. Then we have our winter wood all in. This morning I received my notice that I have 30 days within which to locate myself again. In the same place we have parties living in there that have children that are in school, and it is going to be awfully hard for them to pull these children out of school and to take them someplace else at such short notice.

Senator WILLIAMS. How many moves have you had because of—

Mrs. OSTRANDER. I have had two moves, one from the urban renewal and one from the State highway, and now this will make my third one.

Senator WILLIAMS. You are living from pillar to post.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. I certainly am. And, like I say, we just simply cannot walk in and pay \$60, \$70, and \$75 a month. And when I moved before, I called the State highway department to try to get them to—the only thing they could show me was houses where I could move into that ran around \$70, \$75 a month, which I couldn't afford to take. Also, if we moved, we had to take a lease on them. We had to pay

the first month and the last month's rent on it, which we could not afford to do.

Senator WILLIAMS. Have you found the realty board to be friendly and cooperative?

Mrs. OSTRANDER. I have not been able to, no. As I say, now, it is hard for me to get around without my husband going with me. We have to live where we can get close to a grocery store and where we can walk to town and back to pay our bills. We can't afford the high carfare, either. And, like I say, as a rule I have trouble. I have been very ill, and have had a nervous breakdown, and I have a great deal of trouble being able to walk by myself and go very far at any time alone without somebody to hang on to.

Senator WILLIAMS. Tell me about carfare in Portland.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. Carfare in Portland is 25 cents straight.

Senator WILLIAMS. One way.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. One way.

Senator WILLIAMS. In other words, if you are not within walking distance of your grocery store, it will cost you 50 cents just for transportation.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. Yes, and when I have to have my husband accompany me, it costs us a dollar, and, like I say, these houses that they have already put us out of are still standing. They haven't torn them down. Some of them have—I know some of them have stood now for almost a year that they haven't torn them down, although they only give us 30 days to get out. I think that we should at least have 60 days. You just can't pick up and walk out of here and try to find a place in 30 days to move into. You just can't do it.

Senator WILLIAMS. When you had to move out because of urban renewal, you were paid a certain moving allowance?

Mrs. OSTRANDER. They paid it. They paid \$80 to move me from Second and Hall over to Sixth and Jackson.

Senator WILLIAMS. On the next move, that was—

Mrs. OSTRANDER (interrupting). That was in August I moved out.

Senator WILLIAMS (continuing). The highway dislocation?

Mrs. OSTRANDER. That was the highway.

Senator WILLIAMS. And the one you are faced with now is highway?

Mrs. OSTRANDER. Yes, and that is what we are faced with again.

Senator WILLIAMS. Under the present program you are not going to receive any moving allowance, is that right?

Mrs. OSTRANDER. Not at all, and the welfare cannot give it to us, because I called her this morning. And, like I say, I have my letter here if you want the letter that the highway sent me this morning. Mrs. Rosen, I don't believe, has really sold to them yet, but then they condemned it. They came in and condemned the home and this says:

This is to advise you that the State highway commission has instituted condemnation proceedings and intends to take possession of my four-plex at 2209, 2211, 2215, and 2213 Southwest Fifth Avenue on January 1, 1963. Although I have requested it, the State will not extend the date upon which they require possession beyond January 1, 1963. Consequently, I am forced to notify you that you must vacate your apartment and my four-plex which you are presently renting by December 31. By this letter I am giving you 30 days' notice that your tenancy in my four-plex is terminated as of that date. I am sorry it will be necessary, especially during the winter months, but the matter is beyond my control.

Like I say, it is impossible, it would be absolutely impossible for us to get out within 30 days.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Gordon, do you want to introduce the others.

Mr. GORDON. Mrs. Felvarg, would you care to make a statement? I think your problem is somewhat different.

STATEMENT OF MRS. DASHA FELVARG

Mrs. FELVARG. My complaint is I moved out already from my house. My house was torn down before I even had a chance to take out my things, which it hurts terribly. I lived 40 years in my home, and my husband passed away 7 years ago, and I tried to keep it up as nice as could be, which my neighbors could verify, and I had a chance to sell 2 years ago to a private party for \$20,000 and I refused. I loved my home. I have two children, a son and a daughter. They live in Washington State. And I would like to live in the same town with them, but I love Portland. I came here from Russia after World War I, after the revolution, and we bought this home and that was my pride, especially since I am all alone. They told me I could live in my house until January but I found an apartment where I wanted to go. I have a lot of friends living there. I moved out November 4, and I still left things in my garage, while I was looking for a place to put them away until I would be able to sell them. Before I turned around, I came back to the house and they took out a window and came into the house, which I was supposed to give them a key after I got my check. I didn't get the check and I wouldn't give them the key. That was the understanding. So they broke a window and they came in. I came to the house. The hardwood floors were off. All the windows were out. The doors were out. I was afraid even to come into the house or the garage to take out my things. And here I am. I am in such a predicament. I hope they should pay me for the things that I had in my garage.

Senator WILLIAMS. Was this urban renewal or the highway?

Mrs. FELVARG. That is the highway, Southwest 6. I had a corner property and I got a beating with the price.

Senator WILLIAMS. What price did you get?

Mrs. FELVARG. I got \$11,750.

Senator WILLIAMS. How much?

Mrs. ELVARG. I got \$11,750, and I even paid my taxes. I paid my taxes, so they took off the taxes. Of course, I am sure I will get the money for the taxes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Where are you living now, in an apartment?

Mrs. FELVARG. I am living in an apartment, yes. I am paying rent, which I hope to God I could afford to pay that rent, but I will try to. I live on social security and I am moving to where I rent an apartment, which is pretty hard to pay, but I don't know how I can get along on anything less for the money that I got for the property.

Senator WILLIAMS. I imagine you were probably a little more fortunate than many because you did own your property.

Mrs. FELVARG. Yes, but, of course, I could have gotten \$20,000 2 years ago, and when the agent came to me last March, he said if I could get those people to testify, I would get that price. Well, you

know how it is. When I called up the real estate lady, she said she wouldn't go to court.

Senator WILLIAMS. She what?

Mrs. FELVARG. She wouldn't testify. And if I would have gone to court, maybe I would have gotten a couple thousand dollars more, but I am not well. My children were afraid if I should go to court, so I got less money. That is my complaint.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, you sure look charming with it all. In fact, all of you ladies do. We certainly understand the hardship and the problems, but with it all, you certainly are, as Mr. Wright said, very strong in your own character and self-efficiency.

Now, we have one more of your friends, Mr. Gordon.

Mr. GORDON. Well, Mrs. Rosen is the landlady in question. She owns some property in the area where Mrs. Ostrander lives, and I don't know whether she wants to testify.

Did you want to say something, Mrs. Rosen?

STATEMENT OF MRS. NATHAN ROSEN

Mrs. ROSEN. Yes, I could say something. I am not afraid. We had property in the urban renewal and we sold it and they really took it for very cheap, but after we lost this property, I said, "Well, thank God we bought property on Fifth Street," four flats, where this lady lives, and we got the Sixth Street. I said, "Thank God we got something left," but now it has changed and they have taken it away for the highway, and they gave me notice, and I hope maybe I find something and this lady will be with me, but I got too short a time. You know, I have only 30 days, and 30 days is not fair. I can't even move with children and all the people. I know I have to give it away just the same. I can't be better than somebody else.

The first thing, they don't give me the price that I would like, so I can't buy something else with that much that they give me, and I thought they were going to give me time. In fact, I know that they buy and then they let in new tenants. I can't understand that.

Senator WILLIAMS. I missed the point.

Mrs. ROSEN. They have got new tenants. This lady knows.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. What Mrs. Rosen is referring to, when the State does buy property, then they re-rent it. They possibly will lease it out for 1 or 2 years and that is what we were talking about. Now, just up on the corner from where I live, the State has bought this property and, as I understand, they are renting it for \$100 a month. Well, that piece of property is going to stand, but they say we are two doors away from it and they are going to tear ours down.

Senator WILLIAMS. The State is now the owner and now they are renting it?

Mrs. OSTRANDER. They are re-renting it and they do re-rent property.

Mrs. ROSEN. I think they give a lease for a year.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. They rent down in what we call the Old Goose Hollow. They are renting houses, leasing them for 2 or 3 years.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do they get that long a term lease?

Mrs. OSTRANDER. Yes. A friend of ours moved in August down there.

Senator WILLIAMS. Are you sure that the lease is of that duration?

Mrs. OSTRANDER. That is what they said, 2 years.

Mrs. ROSEN. Yes.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. They wanted to rent me the same house. They told me I could live there 2 years, but I turned it down because it was too small a house for the price they wanted.

Mr. REIDY. Just to get the record a little bit clear, our State highway representative told us two things. One is that they always gave adequate time as far as they were aware of. Now, apparently the people on the receiving end feel that they don't have, and 30 days isn't adequate time.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. I only got 30 days before, and only 30 days this time.

Mr. REIDY. Our committee interviewed a man with a heart condition who has a wife who can't climb stairs, and they advised us that there's only one housing facility in all of Portland where you can get an apartment on the ground floor without steps and with a little garden, and that is filled up and there is no opportunity to move in.

Secondly, the highway department told us that they now have a relocation service. Mr. Gordon, do you think anybody employed by the highway department would know how to run a kosher kitchen? I don't want to be unfair to the highway department, but it does seem logical that when a community has a well-developed social service with people trained in just this sort of thing, it would seem logical that the highway department and everybody else can use that service and that the highway department would give the people time to relocate.

Senator WILLIAMS. As these ladies describe it, this just doesn't make sense. Mr. Wright, do you have any knowledge of this practice?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. What is the justification for this housing being leased for 2 or 3 years?

Mr. WRIGHT. There is no such to my knowledge. We acquire, or will need to acquire, several hundred properties on this stadium route. Obviously, the demolition of these properties is a rather extended operation. We attempt to get them in our possession as soon as we are able. However, no one has been ousted on 30 days' notice, to my knowledge.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. I was, and I have this letter here today that only gives me 30 days' notice.

Senator WILLIAMS. The letter is from Mrs. Rosen, did I understand?

Mrs. ROSEN. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. How long has your property been under condemnation, Mrs. Rosen?

Mrs. ROSEN. Not very long. They give me very short time. I would like to have that they should give me time until I have a place, and I would like to have the tenants come with me.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. When I moved in August, I called into your housing department for the State highway.

Mr. WRIGHT. Our property management section?

Mrs. OSTRANDER. Yes, and they offered me a house on 11th and College for \$75 a month. They would have rented it to me for \$75 a month. They also offered me, there was two houses down in—I

don't know whether they call it Goose Hollow or not—but we used to call it that, down on Market Street. I believe the address—one of them was 2016 Southwest Market. They offered that to us and said that we could live in that, rent that and live in it for 2 years. Also, one next door to it was available for 2 years.

Mr. WRIGHT. This is probably—

Mrs. OSTRANDER (interrupting). As I say, we had to sign a lease for it and we had to pay the first and last month's rent, which we can't do.

Mr. WRIGHT. We give no long-term leases. We will guess with a person as to the length of time we think it is possible to rent a property in our possession.

Mrs. OSTRANDER. That was the information I was given.

Mr. WRIGHT. All of our leases are of a short-term nature, with a 30-day termination clause. As I have said, we make an effort to acquire this property at as early a date as an owner is going to part with it in order to better schedule demolition and the clearance of the project for construction.

Senator WILLIAMS. Wouldn't there be a way to sign the contracts and open-end the date and have a contract for taking from the original owner on 30 days' notice?

Mr. WRIGHT. We have done that in many instances.

Senator WILLIAMS. As we say, there are no legal roadblocks to that.

Mr. WRIGHT. No. As a matter of practice, that has brought us under criticism from the congressional audit arm, the GAO.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I guess you have to take them more seriously than we do.

Mr. WRIGHT. In answer to Mr. Reidy's question, I wonder if the Portland Development Commission has a kosher kitchen expert.

Mr. REIDY. I expect they do.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would think so, and I will act as a consultant.

Now, I think we have gotten a great deal, really a great deal of help from you ladies and you, Mr. Gordon.

Mrs. ROSEN. I would like to have help from you to give more time for our tenants.

Senator WILLIAMS. I think, if you folks will go to the authorities, they will give you that time. This is the highway, isn't it? Well, Mr. Wright is your man. You have him right here and he is not going to leave this room until you have had a chance to talk to him.

Mr. ROSEN. Fighting wouldn't help nothing, just talking to him.

Senator WILLIAMS. I think you are going to win him with persuasion and maybe a little corn beef.

Mrs. ROSEN. Thank you very much.

Senator WILLIAMS. Very well done.

Well, the staff has to be at the airport in time to get to Los Angeles tonight. Now, where do we stand?

Now, Mr. England, assistant director of the Portland Development Commission, and Mrs. Mildred Easley, who is the site manager of the South Auditorium project.

**STATEMENT OF RICHARD L. ENGLAND, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,
PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

Mr. ENGLAND. Senator Williams, I want to express the thanks of the Portland Development Commission for the opportunity to testify today and to convey the regrets of Mr. John Kenward, our executive director, who was going to talk to you informally this afternoon and who was taken suddenly ill. But I am going to try to talk to you informally instead, and I hope you will bear with me if my comments seem somewhat disconnected. I will do what I can with the material that we have available.

The South Auditorium project was an 83-acre, almost total clearance project just south of the central business district of Portland. It was an area of mixed residential, industrial, and commercial use, and, as I recall the figures, it was regarded as approximately 55 percent substandard. I might stand corrected on that figure. We had approximately 1,000 households in the area and 230 businesses. Of those 1,000 households, approximately 325 were families, and of the 325 families, about 35 percent were elderly, over 65. There were 693 individuals relocated, and of the 693, about 61 percent were elderly.

Senator WILLIAMS. Could I ask, do you have any idea of the proportion of the population of Greater Portland that is over 65?

Mr. ENGLAND. I wouldn't have of Portland as such; no, I'm sorry. It is probably a little bit larger than the average for the country.

Senator WILLIAMS. The average for the country runs around 10 percent. Does someone in the back have the figure for us?

Mrs. HAIGHT (executive secretary, Community Council of Portland). I have some figures based on the 1960 census. For the Portland metropolitan area, which includes the three counties, Multnomah, Clark, and Washington, 11.3 percent 65 and over, and for the city of Portland—or Multnomah County, rather—12.3 percent 65 and older, and in the State of Oregon, it is 10.4 percent 65 and older.

Senator WILLIAMS. In this particular urban renewal area, the figures for family units ran 35 percent and for individuals, 69 percent?

Mr. ENGLAND. Sixty-one percent. About 79 of the 230 businesses were what we considered small businesses—under 10 employees.

Our relocation program was not unlike that of many others. We placed a great deal of emphasis on the caliber of our relocation staff, the people who had to be, in our opinion, considerate and friendly, who were able to talk with people of all levels of understanding and all viewpoints, who are able to gain the confidence of the families and individuals and businesses whom they were going to try to assist.

These relocation people had to work truly at the grassroots. We understood, of course, that they could not hope, irrespective of their qualities and caliber, to satisfy everyone. However, we feel that there was many times a confusion of the issues in regard to the urban renewal program. On the matter of the price of the property, which is where we, quite naturally, experience the most comment, a disagreement was not at all unusual. The second point of disagreement was on the use of power of eminent domain for urban renewal purposes as such. There were some people who were concerned about this. However, we feel that there were two issues in which there was and should be very little disagreement, and this was on the fairness and the

promptness of the relocation payment which was made to the individuals, and the families and the businesses relocated, and also on the quality of the service and the quality of the people that we had assisting with the relocation program itself. At the time that we carried out most of our relocation, we were able to pay only up to, at the very beginning, up to \$100 for the relocation of families. Later this was raised to \$200 for moving costs.

Senator WILLIAMS. How did that compare with actual costs as an average for families?

Mr. ENGLAND. The second figure covered it quite adequately. I believe the first figure was somewhat inadequate and that was the reason it was raised. The \$3,000 maximum for the relocation of businesses has been raised now very recently and subsequent to the relocation of most of the business establishments in the South Auditorium area, from \$3,000 to \$25,000.

Senator WILLIAMS. Would you have any estimate of the general moving expense of what we consider an average corner grocery store?

Mr. ENGLAND. I will pass this question to Mrs. Easley and see if she has anything on it.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MILDRED EASLEY, SITE MANAGER, SOUTH AUDITORIUM PROJECT

Mrs. EASLEY. Most of the grocery stores combined business loss along with the moving costs.

Senator WILLIAMS. I meant just the moving costs.

Mrs. EASLEY. An actual moving cost would have come well within the \$3,000, but it was difficult to correlate the business loss—

Senator WILLIAMS (interrupting). Would it get close to \$3,000?

Mrs. EASLEY. No, not for moving costs.

Senator WILLIAMS. What would it be, about?

Mrs. EASLEY. I would guess approximately \$1,000 to \$1,200, depending on the amount of stock that they kept on hand. In some cases, if they had sold down and were going to have fresh merchandise, why, it would be less.

Senator WILLIAMS. A substantial amount, particularly when the store owner has to pay for items and isn't reimbursed for moving allowance.

Mrs. EASLEY. That is right, but I don't think of any case where the small businessman paid any of the cost.

Senator WILLIAMS. Under your program.

Mrs. EASLEY. That's right.

Senator WILLIAMS. But there is another program. Under the highway program in this State, as I understand it, the State has not availed itself of the legislative opportunity that we enacted this year to allow highway funds to be used for moving allowances.

Mrs. EASLEY. That is what they tell me.

Mr. ENGLAND. It might be appropriate to explain here, Senator, the procedure that we use in estimating some of these business payments.

In general, the business establishment obtains three estimates from competent moving companies as to what his cost is going to be. He may choose one of those three companies to do the actual moving and have our commission billed directly or—I believe it is correct—or he could pay it himself and then be reimbursed by us.

Mrs. EASLEY. Yes.

Mr. ENGLAND. I point out, of course, there is 100 percent reimbursement from the Federal Government.

Mrs. ELSIE R. PERRY (from the audience). Mr. Williams, they moved my tenant out after 30 years before they had a legal right and paid them to move. Now, ask them if that is true or not and you will find out what kind of people we had to deal with. They were unprincipled people and heartless and cruel. They just got through saying how much the land cost but they give us people nothing for our valuable land.

Senator WILLIAMS. We were talking about moving allowances.

Mrs. PERRY. I know, but they took a fountain that belonged to my father and dug it out of a hole and said they owned it, and it took three trucks and three men a half a day to put it back because I sued them. Now they have taken it again, and it doesn't mean anything to anybody but myself. But it is an antique and anything they can make any money out of, they will make it. We were denied the streets. We didn't even have the right to sell our own streets and our money has been in the court a year and it will rot there until I get just compensation.

Senator WILLIAMS. You have heard the comment. Now, let's get back to your statement.

Mr. ENGLAND. Thank you. There are a number of observations which have come out of our experience and which I think are in accordance in general with some of the facts which have developed during this hearing. Possibly the most obvious conclusion is that most of the people in any area like to live in the section in which they are currently residing. When they have to move, they like to move in an area which is very close by. This can be shown, I think, very clearly by the map over here. The rectangular area below the bunch of red and yellow pins is the South Auditorium urban renewal area. I believe the red pins are residential and the yellow pins are commercial and business. As you can see, a vast majority of people moved into the southwest area. The businesses moved, in most cases, into store fronts closer to the downtown area, a few went a little south and a few went over on the east side. This was a matter of great importance to the relocation department of our commission. It was a problem to find appropriate places in which to move these people and to assist them in moving themselves in many cases. Their desire to be in close proximity was more true for families than for businesses and it was more true for elderly single persons, living alone, than for families.

A second observation is that ethnic groups in an established neighborhood liked to stay together. This was particularly true in the case of the South Auditorium renewal area because there was a very large group of people of Jewish religion and several synagogues in the area, many of them orthodox, and it was a matter of religious principle to them to walk to their synagogue. It has been extremely difficult for them, we recognize, to think in terms of another part of the city in which there are no synagogues or distances where it would be extremely difficult for them to get to the synagogue of their choice.

A third observation is that if public housing is to be of assistance to an urban renewal project, it must be located in reasonable proximity to the project. For example, in the South Auditorium area, very few

people gave any serious consideration to public housing because it was located mostly in North Portland, while our project was in Southwest Portland. Those who did move, however, seemed to be happy with having made the choice.

Another point here is that the units have to be of the type and size that are appropriate for the people who are being dislocated. It doesn't do any good, for example, to have a lot of family-sized units when you have mostly single individuals. Unfortunately, the problem of relocating medical cases was a rather difficult one. Some people from the South Auditorium area went to nursing homes, a few to the county farm, and quite a number went to the Carleton Hotel, managed by Miss Whitney, whom you met this morning, and a few moved in with their own relatives.

A fifth point is the importance of coordination of public programs. You have already taken a good amount of testimony about a number of people who unfortunately moved into the path of the Stadium Freeway after moving out of our area. In most or all cases, as I understand it, these individuals were apprised of the fact that there might be a freeway locating in that area. Now, the problem was that at that time the State highway commission had not made a final determination on the route of the Stadium Freeway. Our original project plan anticipated that the freeway would take the Clay-Market route. This is between Clay and Market Streets, going east and west. It became obvious, however, that because of the uncertainty, the plan would have to be changed and we did indeed tentatively change this plan to contemplate the present Foothills route, so to speak. At no point, until very recently, until August of 1961, was it absolutely conclusive that that was going to be the route, and, in the meantime, some individuals did locate in the Foothills Freeway area. I don't think, however, that in spite of a number of difficulties in this regard, that there have been a great many glaring examples, because we were successful, I think, in getting people who moved to stay out of that freeway route. Admittedly, there should be, and all parties are desirous of achieving more coordination between these different public programs.

Sixth, deriving from our relocation experience, is the importance of the personal contact of relocation workers with the residents and with the businessmen and also the importance to the total program of a followup to determine how successful they were in locating in locations where they do better business or in standard housing. We have very strict requirements from the Housing and Home Finance Agency relative to this followup work, and we have to know why anybody has taken a standard apartment.

Seventh is the problem of financing. The price of an owner-occupied home that we can offer under our regulations does not normally compare with what an individual has to spend to get comparable space in a comparable area in the city.

We establish the market value of a property by using two independent appraisals from outside fee appraisers, none on the staff but outside fee appraisers.

Another major problem is the fact that the monthly income of a tenant very much limits what he can afford to pay for another rented apartment in a comparable area. In many cases, because of the

blighted nature of the area, rents were much lower than they would be for adequate space of standard quality in other sections in close proximity to the project. In many cases, however, we feel that if people were willing or able, or both, to move farther out from the core area, they could have obtained good quality dwellings and adequate space for comparable rents. But, as we pointed out before, people just naturally want to stay where they have been living for a long time.

We are encountering some problems with regard to financing in our rehabilitation project area, also, the Albino neighborhood improvement area. There are going to be some cases in which people are going to find it difficult to make improvements because of a limitation in their income, because of the scale of improvement that will be required to meet the project's standards or to meet the standards of the city housing code, or because of installment debt which they may have accumulated.

Mrs. Easley is with me, and she is far better informed on this than I am, really. If you have any questions, we will certainly be willing to discuss our procedures in relocation in detail, and anything else of which we might have any knowledge in the Portland area.

Mr. FRANTZ. Thank you. The Senator was called away for just a minute; but let me suggest; since we do have a serious time problem here, that rather than directing questions to you at this point, we go over the record when we get it back in Washington and address questions to you by letter on the basis of the record which has been made.

Mr. ENGLAND. I would be very happy to submit anything for the record that you wish, sir.

Mr. FRANTZ. I don't want to forestall anyone else who may have questions, though. Thank you very much.

On the program next, we have Mr. Harry Jaeger, who is substituting for Gene W. Rossman. Portland has been badly hit, apparently; both Mr. Rossman and Mr. Kenward are down with the flu today. With Mr. Jaeger is Mr. Charles Dondero, of the Douglas County Housing Authority of Roseburg.

STATEMENT OF HARRY JAEGER, TECHNICAL DIRECTOR, HOUSING AUTHORITY, PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. JAEGER. Yes. I think you have copies of the statement. I am Harry Jaeger, technical director of the housing authority, and I am presenting it in place of Mr. Rossman, because of his illness. Because of your time schedule, I will not attempt to go through the whole thing. I will read the preface and several letters which are based on the survey.

STATEMENT OF GENE W. ROSSMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PORTLAND, OREG., PRESENTED BY MR. JAEGER

A survey recently concluded by the Housing Authority of Portland, Oreg., has revealed that, at least in the view of a substantial number of local housing authority officials across the Nation, the workable program is an imposing deterrent to the extension of low-rent housing for low-income families and senior citizens.

The survey was not initiated because of any as yet serious problem with the workable program in Portland where the local public housing program is fortunately viewed with favor by incumbent officials of city government and where the workable program's annual recertification requirements have been

met efficiently and effectively through the good offices of the mayor and city council, with the cooperation of a friendly regional administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Portland Housing Authority's research on the subject of the workable program has been predicated on the effect of possible future changes in administrative personnel at all levels of government on the local housing authority's progressive development program—especially for senior citizens. Our concern, in plain talk, has been that under existing laws an HHFA administration, unfriendly to the low-rent housing program, could quickly and completely "scuttle" the further extension of needed public housing, or that a local governing body, should it become suddenly hostile to a public housing development program, could virtually terminate that program by simply refusing or neglecting to comply with the recertification requirements of the local workable program.

We have also been aware that other local housing authorities in geographical proximity to ours have experienced serious difficulty with various requirements of the workable program: In Pendleton, Oreg., a program of new, low-rent housing initiated over a year ago is not yet "off the ground"; In West Salem, Oreg., a new local housing authority was organized in November of last year, achieved its local cooperation agreement and PHA program reservation for 90 units of housing for the elderly on June 4 of this year, yet is still not "in business." In both of these instances, inability of the local governing body to establish an acceptable workable program has been the cause of the delay. Through the survey, we hoped to learn something of the nature and extent of the stifling effect of the workable program requirement on the extension of public housing, the hazards involved and the pitfalls to be avoided in long-range planning, and a possible course of action which might help safeguard our local authority's ability to meet its moral and statutory obligations to the Portland community as implicit in the State enabling act.

SCOPE OF THE SURVEY

The survey consisted solely of a questionnaire, blank copy of which is attached, which was mailed to the 1,475 local housing authorities listed in the 1961-62 issue of the "Housing and Urban Renewal Directory" published by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

Of these 1,475 local agencies, 515 (or 34.9 percent) had responded by the deadline date of September 25, 1962.

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Of these 515 responding agencies 215 or 40 percent expressed their feeling that the workable program requirement as applied to public housing should be eliminated; 126 or 25 percent expressed their feeling that the workable program requirement as applied to public housing should be given further study; 97 or 19 percent expressed their feeling that the workable program requirement as applied to public housing should be continued; and 77 or 16 percent indicated no knowledge of the workable program, or no opinion.

Breakdown as to population of communities of responding local housing authorities

[In percent]

Size of communities	Eliminated	Further study	Continued
42 percent were under 10,000 population.....	60	26	14
13 percent were from 10,000 to 20,000 population.....	50	27	23
17 percent were from 20,000 to 50,000 population.....	40	30	30
11 percent were from 50,000 to 100,000 population.....	47	23	30
7 percent were from 100,000 to 200,000 population.....	27	43	30
4 percent were from 200,000 to 300,000 population.....	50	13	37
1 percent were from 300,000 to 500,000 population.....	68	17	17
4 percent were from 500,000 to 1,000,000 population.....	33	14	53
1 percent were over 1,000,000 population.....	25	50	25

Of more useful value to us than the resultant statistics were the special comments and, in some cases, detailed cover letters attached to the completed questionnaires and returned to us.

For the benefit of this committee, we are including in this report the following excerpts from comments and cover letters from responding local housing authorities which relate to the delaying effect of the workable program on the expansion of low-rent housing for the elderly :

W. T. Bolt, executive director, regional housing authority No. 1, Laurens, S.C. :
 "This housing authority is set up on a basis to handle projects in 18 counties. Prior to the workable program requirement, we had already developed projects in 27 towns. Since this requirement became effective, we have been able to commence projects in only two towns. We have received a great many inquiries and we could develop programs in at least a dozen other towns if it were not for the workable program requirement.

"We find this to be particularly difficult to cope with in regard to needed low-rent housing for the elderly. There are a number of communities within our area of operation in which such housing is urgently required, but it is simply not practical for the town officials to comply with each and every of the requirements which are set forth in the so-called workable program. It is our conclusion that the further development of housing for the elderly will be considerably handicapped and slow down if this requirement is retained as a condition precedent. It is simply not possible for the towns where we have worked to get each and every item concerning codes, area planning, slum clearance, recreation, zoning, and other things.

"We are the first to acknowledge that the ideals set forth in the workable program are well conceived and should generally be suitable goals to work toward. However, it would appear that a gradual compliance supported by a sincere effort to achieve these goals should be all that is required. It does not make sense that approval of urgently needed housing for the elderly should be postponed or refused because some community could not accomplish in advance every jot and tittle of a complicated and idealistic formula.

"In conclusion, we report that we are now serving approximately 4,000 with low-rent housing and we have in the plans 80 apartments for the elderly. We estimate that to reach even a respectable completion of the desperately needed housing in our area would require at least 400 additional family apartments and 600 additional apartments for the elderly. It is quite evident that we cannot soon, if ever, get this amount of work done with the obstacle of the workable program holding up approval of the same."

John Ashton, executive director, Housing Authority of Willimantic, Conn. :
 "Our 48-unit low-rent project for the elderly is currently at a standstill waiting for a workable program. (This application was initiated in August of 1958.) It is an interesting fact that while at no time have we had any record of opposition to the submission of the workable program—as of this date our elderly are without a housing project and we are waiting for that workable program."

Gardner Dickinson, executive director, Housing Authority of Panama City, Fla. :

"The concept of the workable program is good but it is, to a great degree, stifling the ability of housing authorities of the Nation to keep abreast of the needs of public housing. The inability, or unwillingness, of municipalities to adopt and carry out the workable program provisions accounts for the very fact that it has not been possible to construct even the limited number of units approved by the Congress in recent years. This housing authority would seriously consider building a reasonable number of units for the elderly, but we are stymied because of the fact that the city of Panama City has failed to carry out its obligations under the workable program, cannot obtain recertification of the same, and apparently will not do so in the foreseeable future. It should be borne in mind that many municipalities do not have the funds available therefor. It is the writer's firm belief that the need for public housing should be considered solely on its merits and that side issues and/or requirements should have no part in the Federal decision to issue reservations therefor. If the need for public housing can be manifested by a community to the satisfaction of the PHA, the right to build it should be granted."

Raymond Lamkin, executive director, Housing Authority, Clinton, Ill. :

"The housing for the elderly in Clinton, Ill., has slowed down considerably because of the workable program. Also, we have other projects which we are abandoning because of the workable program."

Reuben Boswell, executive director, Housing Authority, Henderson, Ky. :

"The absence of a workable program delayed the initiation of an application for housing for the elderly in this community several years."

August Hutch, executive director, Housing Authority, Newcastle, Pa. :

"This authority lost 10 units of housing for the elderly in a small community because of the lack of a workable program."

Thomas Dyer, executive director, Housing Authority of Tampa, Fla. :

"The workable program for the city of Tampa expired on or about January 1, 1962. This authority made application for reservation and preliminary loan for low-rent housing with the Public Housing Administration on December 12, 1961, for the construction of 400 dwelling units, of which number 150 were for elderly persons. The workable program was not recertified until the latter part of May, 1962. As a result of the delays in recertifying the workable program, this authority was delayed approximately 5 months in obtaining approval of its application for reservation and preliminary loan."

Thomas F. Dorsey, executive director, Housing Authority of Norwich, Conn. :

"The workable program is not necessary for good public housing. We have experienced delay because of the annual recertification requirement in entering into an annual contribution contract for our housing for the elderly now under construction. Additional needed housing for the elderly is being delayed because of the annual recertification requirement."

Durell Whiddon, executive director, Housing Authority of Headland, Ala. :

"Early this year, we began preparation of an application for 60 additional low-rent housing units, 20 units of which were for the elderly. Our application has not been filed and we have no idea when an application may be filed because of the difficulty of getting a workable program recertified."

H. F. Ingleheart, executive director, Housing Authority of Arkadelphia, Ark. :

"We have a program reservation for 16 additional units of low-rent housing for the elderly which is being held up because of a lack of recertification of the so-called workable program."

Frank Welch, executive director, Housing Authority of Honey Grove, Tex. :

"I think the workable program is good for the community, but the delay on the part of our city has caused many months of postponement of site acquisition and other matters pertaining to our program of housing for the elderly. As this housing is badly needed before winter for tenants living in substandard housing, it is not right that there should be this delay."

Oscar J. Crepeau, executive director, Housing Authority of Woonsocket, R.I. :

"The annual recertification requirement has already caused our authority considerable delay in our development of new housing for the elderly—to no evident practical purpose."

G. E. Wilkins, executive director, Housing Authority of Lyons, Ga.:

"In 1960, because of the lack of the recertification of the workable program from the city, which they felt they could not afford to go into, this housing authority was refused 60 units of housing for the elderly that were, and still are, very much needed. At present, we are trying to get a recertification started, but it is dragging."

E. J. Farnsworth, executive director, Housing Authority of Alamo, Tex.:

"The workable program has held up our progress for 6 months in an application for 12 more units for the elderly. According to progress made, the old folks will all have passed on before we begin construction."

Roy Young, executive director, Phoenix Housing Authority, Arizona:

"It is the considered opinion of the management of this authority that the city of Phoenix can and should embark on a development program of low-rent public housing for the elderly which should consist of not less than 1,000 units. However * * * until such time as the city adopts a housing code and workable program, the housing authority will have to neglect the growing needs that are discussed above."

Kurt Schnellenboch, executive director, Housing Authority of Halton City, Tex.:

"A little over 2 years ago, it became apparent that we urgently needed additional housing, particularly for the elderly. We asked for, and received from the city council a resolution for application for additional housing—20 regular units, and 40 for the elderly. We made application to the Public Housing Administration and received a reservation. When the workable program was presented to the city council, the council refused to go along—giving, as the reason, that the city was not prepared for the commitments required by the workable program and the recertification needed thereafter. At this stage, it appears that we will not be able to proceed under the current requirements and it seems sure that, unless the workable program is eliminated from the Housing Act, our situation as far as additional housing is concerned is hopeless."

C. W. Sherlock, executive director, Housing Authority of Monroe, Ga.:

"A check of the records of the Atlanta regional office of the Public Housing Administration reveals that there are 17 cases outstanding in the 8 Southern States where program reservations have been approved by the Public Housing Administration but no development funds have been made available to the local authorities because they do not have a currently approved workable program in force. Of the 17 cases, practically all have some of their units reserved for the elderly."

Walter B. Mills, executive director, Housing Authority of Greater Gadsden, Ala. (Walter Mills is a former national president and present member of the Board of Governors of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials):

"I was president of NAHRO when the workable program was first instituted under the Eisenhower administration. The record of my testimony before the Senate and the House of Representatives is quite plain, in that I do not think the workable program should be related to the low-rent public housing program—to urban renewal, yes. I have always felt that the workable program was a political gimmick to slow down and retard the low-rent public housing program, and that the yearly recertification is a means by which the program can be stopped at the desire of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It is unfortunate, but the workable program has become somewhat of a 'sacred cow,' and the Members of Congress are reluctant to vote against it. They take the position that while we say on the one hand we are for building better cities and better housing, at the same time we say that we are against the workable program which in theory is attempting to build better cities. A vote against the workable program seems to be a vote for sin."

CONCLUSION

A thorough review of the results of the survey has revealed to us conclusively that the workable program is in fact succeeding in discouraging the needed extension of low-rent public housing, including housing for the elderly, throughout the Nation. No arguments to the contrary or in favor of the workable program can possibly deny that fact.

On July 26 of this year, we received a letter from Marie McGuire, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, which stated in part:

"Of course, the (workable program) requirement has in certain conditions the effect of delaying or stopping the (public housing) programs. At the fiscal yearend, June 30, 1962, some 894 units of public housing could not be put under annual contributions contract because of the absence of a workable program."

On November 14 of this year, we received a letter from Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which contained the following statement:

"Since local housing authorities may from time to time be restricted in their individual operations in the interests of the workable program requirements, I am not surprised that a number of these should have expressed dissatisfaction with the (workable program) requirement in responding to your survey."

Recently we were handed a booklet by a public housing commissioner. It was entitled the "Temple Law Quarterly" (vol. 35. No. 2, winter, 1962). It featured an article entitled "Problems in the Management of Public Housing" by Roger Mulvihill (B.S. Georgetown University; LL.B., Yale Law School; member of the New York bar). On page 168 of the publication, a footnote stated:

"103 Congressional Record 8008 (1957): Of 425 cities desiring public housing in 1957, 370 were ineligible because of inability to provide a workable program."

It seems to us that there is such a preponderance of evidence as to the delaying effect of the workable program on the extension of public housing that no final conclusion could possibly be drawn other than the urgent need for a complete separation of public housing from the workable program requirement.

We are further mindful that this "delay" occasioned by the workable program not only adversely affects the lives and well-being of countless thousands of low-income families and senior citizens presently living in slum dwellings but also decelerates the progress of public works construction programs that provide jobs, reduce unemployment, and boost the country's economy.

We hope that the Congress will give thought to these considerations when it reconvenes in 1963.

Thank you.

Mr. FRANTZ. Mr. Jaeger, I wonder if you would comment on the pin map here. Would you comment on the distribution of your responses as shown there?

Mr. JAEGER. Yes. There is a legend on the board, but the red pins are those local authorities who feel that the workable program on the extension of public housing should not be continued. The yellow pins represent those local authorities who feel that the workable program should be given further study. The black pins represent the local housing authorities that feel that the workable program should be continued as is, and the green pins represent those who have no opinion.

Mr. FRANTZ. There seems to be a concentration of those who would like to see it eliminated in the South and Southwest.

Mr. JAEGER. That's right.

Mr. FRANTZ. Would that indicate that it is perhaps pretty difficult for a small community to meet the requirements?

Mr. JAEGER. Even the larger cities now are finding the same problem.

Mr. DONDERO. I think there is another answer, the fact that in the South you have more housing authorities, for the concentration is greater where the greater number of authorities are located.

Mr. FRANTZ. Mr. Dondero, would you give your statement, please.

**STATEMENT OF CHARLES A. DONDERO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
HOUSING AUTHORITY, DOUGLAS COUNTY, OREG.**

Mr. DONDERO. I am pleased to appear before you to discuss the effects of the workable program on public low-income housing for the elderly.

The opinions which I express are based on experiences in my community as well as others in Oregon.

In presenting this testimony, I want to make it clear that I am opposed to the subversion of low-income housing to any other program, and, specifically, to the workable program concept. I feel definitely that if the workable programs continued in its present form, we will gradually sacrifice low-rent public housing.

The workable program requirements should not be applied to housing for our low-income elderly families. The purpose of the workable program is not compatible with the needs of this group. Actually, the workable program requirements will halt the relocation of this segment of our population, and this group is one of the largest that needs housing assistance.

My statement is supported by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, which has reported that:

Seventy-one percent of the elderly with family heads 65 or over had annual incomes of less than \$3,000, or about 9.3 million such units; 4.5 million had incomes of less than \$2,000. Forty percent of these had practically no assets.

These figures do not clearly reveal the entire need since they do not take into consideration the elderly under 65. If they did, they would show that the number of elderly who are in need of housing assistance is even greater.

The application of the workable program has inflicted hardship on our low-income elderly families because it has kept low-income housing from being built for them. The fact is that many of our cities have been unwilling or unable to meet its requirements.

Actually, in our communities this has forced some of the low-income elderly to accept housing that is unfit for human habitation. And in other instances, they have had to move into expensive rental units, thus draining away their meager savings. This condition has been found to exist over the entire Nation.

Also, because of this legislation, many communities desiring to build public housing are unable to do so. This is clearly demonstrated by an article appearing in the 1962 winter edition of the Temple Law Quarterly by Roger Mulvihill, New York attorney, entitled: "Problems in the Management of Public Housing," when he said:

Of 425 cities desiring public housing in 1957, 370 were ineligible because of their inability to provide a workable program.

Therefore, our needy citizens are being penalized for something over which they have no control.

At the local level, the workable program requirements have caused the cities of Florence, Coos Bay, Springfield, and Roseburg, Oreg., to halt all consideration for low-rent housing.

The Springfield reversal was based on the action of the voters who rejected the housing code requirement. Thus, the workable program cannot be recertified, and additional public housing units for the elderly in this community cannot be programmed.

At Florence, the urban renewal plan was turned down when the voters refused to accept the workable program requirements. Thus, further public housing considerations are stymied.

A number of years ago I attended a meeting to discuss low-rent housing with the mayor, members of the city council, and city manager of Coos Bay. The discussion went along very well until the workable program was reviewed. At this point, the city representatives indicated that they were not interested in going any further with a low-rent housing program. They felt that the requirements were not germane and that it would create dissension in the community. Later, when the community became involved in urban renewal, the voters turned the plan down because of the requirements of the workable program. Thus, in Coos Bay, low-rent housing has been dealt a severe blow by a requirement not of its own making.

The Roseburg refusal to program additional low-rent housing was partially due to the council's unwillingness to consider the preparation and approval of a workable program.

The displacement and relocation of elderly persons in our communities is caused by many federally assisted programs such as the construction of highways, airports, hospitals, schools, Federal buildings, military installations, bridge approaches, street widening and condemnation through local health and sanitary laws. Yet, nothing can be done to provide housing for families displaced by these programs when the community is not able to adopt a workable program.

I am sure the committee recognizes the fact that generally our highway programs are built through the poorer sections of our cities. Therefore, they displace large numbers of low-income elderly. To assist these families, it is necessary to build low-rent housing prior to the eviction date. At this time, it is impossible to do so.

We can no longer ignore evidence that the workable program is a serious deterrent to the housing of low-income elderly. This segment of our population is very definitely being discriminated against. To ignore the fact is to condone it.

Need is the only criteria by which we should judge housing for the low income. The application of any other requirement will only result in the strangulation of the program.

The high-sounding statement that extension of Federal financial assistance be conditioned upon the submission by the local community of a workable program is laudatory. But, in actual practice, it is something else. It has shown itself to be very restrictive as to low-income housing.

All that is needed to overcome the effects of the workable program on low-rent housing is an amendment to the Housing Act removing or deleting the section in question.

It is my hope that your committee will continue to study the impact of the workable program on low-income housing because I am sure you will pile up evidence that will convince you that low-income housing should not be made subservient to the workable program. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Dondero. You can have our assurance we will certainly consider this thoroughly. We have the results of the survey and they are rather strong evidence of support for the position you have taken here.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes. I am glad to hear that.

Senator WILLIAMS. Now, are there any questions here?

All right. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mrs. Olga Anderson, who is a staff nurse with the Visiting Nurse Association, is with us. We have your statement, Mrs. Anderson, which we will put in the record.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Anderson follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MRS. OLGA ANDERSON

The public health nurses employed by the Visiting Nurse Association have found the following problems which older persons are facing:

Most of these people have been independent and hard working. They have provided for their old age by owning their own homes. This security is suddenly disrupted by the idea that their homes will be moved or destroyed. The realization that their friends and familiar neighborhood would be scattered leaves an emotional impact which hampers them in making adequate adjustments, as well as finding suitable housing or living quarters.

They depend on bus transportation and do not own cars. The problem of searching for new residences that would be near a shopping area, churches, and public transportation poses a major obstacle.

The financial burden is more than they can handle. In many cases the homes are paid for, but the amount of money obtained from the sale of their home is insufficient to provide similar type housing under the present money value, plus the added expense of moving.

Feelings of frustration, loneliness, and inadequacy, plus facing the aging process, magnify these insurmountable problems of moving.

STATEMENT OF MRS. OLGA ANDERSON, STAFF NURSE, VISITING NURSE ASSOCIATION

Mrs. ANDERSON. I just want to make one additional comment. Some of the statements made sort of overwhelm me because we deal with individuals on an individual basis, and we have gotten a different basis than most of the statements show. We are more interested in the emotional impact on these individuals who have to move, and it is greater than what is put down in the statements.

Senator WILLIAMS. I sure know what you mean. I agree with you completely.

Now, these hearings have been designed to be just as comprehensive as possible. We started with the mayor and then we went to areas and talked with people, individuals who are feeling the impact of dislocation, and then we came back here and combined the statements of public officials with individuals who have been displaced, not once, but twice—one lady, three times. I feel that this has been one of the most productive days, if not the most productive day, of this subcommittee.

Now, I know that there are others here who would like to express their views on specific aspects of how different programs that have developed in Portland have affected them. As I say, we have time problems. I have to make a train and others have to make a plane. I did suggest to Mr. Lawrence Supove, who is a consulting engineer, that maybe he could be sort of spokesman for others who wanted to speak and, just in the exigencies of lack of time, can't. I have got to leave but these men are the men in depth on our committee, the staff members, the representative of Senator Clark of Pennsylvania, Mr. Oriol of New Jersey, the representative of Senator Prouty, and the others.

Mr. SUPOVE. I am Larry Supove. I would like to say a few words.

Mrs. PERRY. He represents some of us who still want to remain self-sufficient. We know he can't get in all the things he should, as you don't have time for the rest of us, but in the short time he should be able to tell you some of the things of urban renewal. I remodeled my place according to the city code. That was utterly disregarded.

Mr. CONNOR. I have the same situation, and I have heard the generalities of Mr. Wright's prepared statement there and it is totally untrue of what they are offering. People here all remodeled our homes and we don't get credit for it. We can't go out and buy comparable property.

Senator WILLIAMS. Mr. Supove, are you going to summarize your statement?

Mr. SUPOVE. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. I want to express our appreciation for all who have participated.

STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE SUPOVE

Mr. SUPOVE. I will try to be as brief as possible. I want to introduce myself. I am Lawrence Supove. I am an engineer and have practiced in town 28 years. This urban renewal and all the rest doesn't affect me in any other way except my pride in my town. I have come from the East. I was educated at one of the greatest universities in the world.

Senator WILLIAMS. Which one is that? I would like to know.

Mr. SUPOVE. Yale, not Harvard. I get around as much as I can with my limited means. If you want to know what sort of engineering I do, I design plywood mills.

I want to be the first to wish you a Merry Christmas.

Senator WILLIAMS. You are the first one.

Mr. SUPOVE. I wish I could go into the bickering that is going on about these very things that you have seen here, this very building, the Glass Palace, the Lloyd Center, the urban renewal, and the freeways that have gone in. This town has been rife with quarrels about these things and justifiably so. The city of Portland government is a hodgepodge of commissions and groups and committees, and it is pretty hard to get at the people who are really doing the governing of this town, but I might say that I am running for mayor. I was the first one to put in my hat, and it will be 2 years before they vote, but I am not here for that purpose. I am here to try to tell you things that you have not heard.

These people that you have heard are very few. The silent ones are the ones you should hear, the ones that can't get here, the ones who are inarticulate, and they are by the hundreds. I don't know if you have seen anything as bad as it is in Portland, but if you have, it is time to put a stop to it all. And I can't leave anything with you that I think is more important than you go back to Washington and contact the people on the highway committee, commission, and tell them to investigate this so-called Stadium Freeway. I would just like to have you see—I know you saw it today, but just glance through these pictures. You will find the Carleton Hotel here. I took these with a little camera. They are some of the buildings in the wake of this

freeway, not all of them by any means. You would have to take hundreds of pictures. I want to compliment you on having seen the Carleton Hotel today. I think you saw a significant thing. Only half the story is told when you find a home for elderly people that is reasonable. They have learned to live so cheaply that you cannot duplicate it. They are working together in these places. Their ability to get to town without having to use trolley cars, their meager way of living is impossible to replace, usually.

Now, you know the answer that Johnny gave when the teacher asked him what the best way to prevent milk from getting sour was. He said to leave it in the cow. Now, that story is significant.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, now, I don't think that is right. Being an old farmer, you know what happens if that cow doesn't get milked.

Mr. SUPOVE. Well, I think the story has a little bit of a sour note to it.

Senator WILLIAMS. I know, but I don't think that is very accurate.

Mr. SUPOVE. Let me tell you another story then.

Senator WILLIAMS. All right. We had to milk them every morning and every night or there were problems, I'll tell you.

Mr. SUPOVE. I would say the best way to cure a malady is not to get sick.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, you heard my opening prayer.

Mr. SUPOVE. Yes, I remember it very well, and I thought it was very appropriate.

As far as the urban renewal, it is done. We can do a lot to alleviate the trouble, but this big freeway, the Stadium Freeway, I want to say right now that there are far superior ways of putting that road in and cheaper ways without any of the problems of displacing people. As an engineer I can make that statement and back it up with the facts.

Senator WILLIAMS. And still have a freeway?

Mr. SUPOVE. Still have the freeway. Now, I have gone to the trouble of reading the law on this, the 1956 law which has been amended, I will admit, but the primary purpose of that highway system is national defense. Now, I would like to have anybody show me how the road they are putting through has anything whatsoever to do with national defense. The mayor of Portland this morning said that we badly need the road for industrial development. That is an illegal road they have planned.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I will tell you this, that I would like to see—and I don't know if it applies in Oregon, in Portland—but I agree, as a general proposition, that you should find the most efficient way of transportation, and the most efficient way is a combination, and total highway reliance is going to kill a lot of cities, I will tell you that.

Mr. SUPOVE. Senator, they put through what they called the Harbor Drive about 20 years ago. Right across the river from it, which was within 1,200 feet of it, now they are putting in another one with Government money. Now, the next planned one is the Stadium Freeway, which is only 14 blocks away from the Harbor Drive, and now they are already planning one that will be 30 blocks away from the East Side Drive. Now, I say they are killing this town off. I know something about what they did.

Senator WILLIAMS. You will need a few parking lots to take care of the cars that go over those freeways, too.

Mr. SUPOVE. I should say we do.

Senator WILLIAMS. You know that the city of Los Angeles is 60 percent given over to the automobile right now—streets, throughways, parking lots.

Mr. SUPOVE. I didn't realize that proportion was that big. I go to Los Angeles once in a while.

I wonder if you wonder why we bothered you people. We have bothered the mayor. I have gone to the Governor with these things. All I have to do to infuriate the chief of the highway department is to call his attention to a better way of doing this. I would say when a man gets mad at you, generally speaking, there is a reason for doing so, and nobody likes to get attention called to their mistakes. You heard a statement here not any more than an hour ago from your highway representative, and what he said, his exact words were, "It is not our intent to be experts." Now, he could just as well say that about his engineers, too, because there is a lot of evidence of some terrible mistakes that the highway department has made. We have got a big State here and they could well spend a lot of their money down through the State to disperse the population possibly in case of a national emergency, but to build these roads in town is unethical and it is going to complicate your problems as a committee, and I say that the country cannot afford them.

Well, I do want to call your attention to the quality of the people that I am representing. These are the salt of the earth. These are people that have lived in an area of Portland for 60 years, some of them. They have sent their boys to college. They have sent their daughters to school, and their children have paid for their homes, and now they face eviction.

With that, I would like to wish you also a happy New Year.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, now, that is the first one, too. I did worry about some of our friends who have to be evicted, have to leave their homes by December 31.

Mr. SUPOVE. Isn't that something?

Senator WILLIAMS. I think that date ought to be changed, quite frankly. The first day of the year isn't a day for moving.

Mr. WRIGHT, can't that be worked on?

Mr. WRIGHT. We can amend that a few days.

Senator WILLIAMS. I am sure you can.

Mrs. PERRY. Can I inject something?

Senator WILLIAMS. I am going to leave you in the hands of men far wiser than I.

(The following statement subsequently was received from Mr. Supove:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE SUPOVE, CONSULTING ENGINEER,
PORTLAND, OREG.

I respectfully request that this statement be entered into the log of the proceedings of your Portland hearing.

There is a lot of discontent because of the wholesale destruction of residences and businesses within the city of Portland. Most of it stems from the fact that the projects responsible, even if necessary or desirable, are built in the wrong places.

Though I respect your opening remarks in which you say: "Whether such freeways are good or bad in any given city is not for our subcommittee to consider," I still wish to call attention to the fact that in Portland, at least, due

investigation should be made by some branch of the Federal Government to determine the causes for the choice of cite and route. This might be equally bad anywhere; but, if true, then it is high time to call an immediate halt to this squandering of Federal money on the Interstate Highway System and urban renewal not only to salvage as much of the taxpayers' dollars, but for many other reasons—not the least important of which is to allow our young and elderly to live and die in peace still believing in the land of the free and the sanctity of the home.

Since your Portland hearing had little advance publicity, very few were there to tell the sordid side. The few victims who were in attendance had grievances, but they, at least, could get there and voice them. Many could not because their grievances had hastened their deaths; others by remote displacement, impoverishment, and shame would not appear. Significantly, you must have noted that several key persons scheduled to address you did not appear due to "illness" but sent underlings instead. At least one of these, I know, made a lightning recovery.

From Mayor Schrunk's remarks at the meeting one gets the impression that the city is taking good care of its displacees while the big villain in this regard is the State highway department. If so, I feel that this was unfortunate, since, as I view it, there's little difference between the two. This beautiful city has been plagued in the past decade with one project after another paid for by public money. None fulfill the original promise, but all have the blessing of the same sort of vested interest which puts them over.

As a progressive engineer, I would be the last to condemn any project if it had genuine promise, and have supported a couple of these in the embryo. But as they get rolling, they have all gone the same direction—a disappointment to the community.

To name a few, we have had an exposition-recreation project, a slum clearance, and freeway construction. You should have lived in Portland these past 10 years to know what civic dirty linen is like. You probably recall some of the repercussion of our exposition-recreation project which was aired slightly at the Senator McClellan investigation of Beck, Hoffa, Crosby, Elkins' hearing in Washington, D.C., in 1958, the time when this same Mayor Schrunk at first consented and then refused a lie detector test, much to our dismay.

This exposition-recreation project produced a facility which displaced hundreds of solvent families from an unsuitable area rife with scandalous deals involving a teamster boss and cost \$8 million, while Los Angeles was building at the same time a facility for less than \$6 million, which is about twice as large.

Our slum clearance was in an area which was not really a slum area at all, but destroyed hundreds of residences, single and multiple, which were happily occupied by many elderly people. We as a nation cannot evict these patriotic citizens from their modest homes and still boast of our freedom. Not when we see a new telephone building, a union headquarters, and a luxury apartment project rising out of the ashes of these modest homes, which is exactly what is happening here, and especially so when the same thing is occurring elsewhere.

Our freeway program is getting glaringly monotonous. We have a highway department which everyone else but myself seems to think is beyond scrutiny. I feel that the Federal Government should make a thorough investigation into the latest of its projects—the \$70 million stadium freeway. Some of the buildings which must be destroyed are illustrated in the 20 or more photos you took with you. This is the project which destroys Mrs. Whitney's worthy accomplishments, the two synagogues, and scores of substantial enterprises. There are many others. A little knowledge of Portland's topography will be helpful; the downtown core area is hemmed in by two natural obstacles—the Willamette River to the east and an escarpment to the west. The stadium freeway is roughly a north-south freeway through the heart of the city. We already have two north-south freeways; this will be the third, though the second is not yet in use. With only the one in use (Harbor Drive) Portland is one of the easiest cities to traverse north-south. Now comes the fourth (the Laurelhurst) which has already received its preliminary storm of protest. Don't you believe that 3 Federal-financed parallel freeways within 1 mile and 4 within 3 miles are altogether too many for a city which once had but 400,000 population and now has less than 375,000? East-west traffic within the core area is bad and neglected; the stadium freeway will make it worse. Moreover, the grades and curvatures

are excessive and dangerous while there are substitute routes safer and far superior, especially if national defense is considered.

Displacing people for these projects as done here is ruthless because it is unnecessary. In every instance there were better sites and routes than those chosen—less expensive, more suitable, and even more important; fewer people to displace. But to the crafty scheming persons making the decisions these factors seemed anathema.

One very good way to handle the problem of involuntary relocation of the elderly is to be very careful not to displace any more than absolutely necessary. We in Portland have already seen a great deal of this; the statistics are more eloquent than words. Let's make sure that this type of ungodly and un-American activity ceases.

STATEMENT OF A. M. NORMAN

Mr. NORMAN. I am A. M. Norman. I don't want Government help. I want to remain self-sufficient. Two of the owners of property in our block and the tenants were given 60 days' notice. My place was set on fire. By who I can't point the finger. I have my own conclusions, but it was a good job from the outside right under the electric installation, so it took the main service down. This was before I had a hearing in court or anything. Naturally, my tenant had to vacate the next day. They had no heat, no light, nothing, and I wasn't given any notice. In fact, urban renewal paid for the removal of the furniture. I had to sell most of it. There was no facility for storing it. But before I could go buy another home, I had to put it in a basement, but before I could get back to my building, my carpenter came with the message that there was no use going over there. I asked him why. He said, "Your building is down." And it was down. I didn't get the things out of my storage room, my basement. My fire escape was laying on the ground and was taken, together with 2,000 or 3,000 cleaned bricks. That was taken and I've never been reimbursed for that.

Mr. REIDY. Did you take the matter to court?

Mr. NORMAN. Yes, but what was the use?

Mr. REIDY. I am sorry, but we can't readjudicate a case that has been taken in court. I do hope you are able to get it worked out.

The Senator would want me to thank you all for your patient attention and I would like to thank everybody in Portland for the great cooperation we have had.

(Whereupon, at 4:55 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.)

○