

**Baseline Assessment of Public Housing  
Desegregation Cases:  
Cross-site Report - Volume 1**

Susan J. Popkin

George Galster

Kenneth Temkin

Carla Herbig

Diane K. Levy

Elise Richer

**Baseline Assessment of Public Housing  
Desegregation Cases:  
Cross-site Draft Report  
Volume I**

January 2000

*Prepared By:*

Susan J. Popkin

George Galster

Kenneth Temkin

Carla Herbig

Diane K. Levy

Elise Richer

*Submitted To:*

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Washington, DC 20410-3000

Contract No. C-OPC-5929, Task Order 14

UI No. 06542-014-00

The nonpartisan Urban Institute publishes studies, reports, and books on timely topics worthy of public consideration. The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders.

## ***Acknowledgments***

The *Baseline Assessment of Public Housing Desegregation Cases* was a large and complex project and many people have made significant contributions to its completion. In addition to the authors of the Cross-Site report, Mary Cunningham, Malcolm Drewery, Robin Smith, Maria Rosario-Jackson, Mark Turner, and Daryl Dyer all participated in the field work and the preparation of the case-studies. Mark Rubin contributed significantly to the analysis, creating all of the maps used in the case-studies and cross-site report. Avis Vidal served as the first project director for the project, taking it through the initial design phase. Sheila O'Leary made many contributions to the early phases of the project, including an outstanding legal review of the eight consent decrees. Other current and former Urban Institute staff also contributed by assisting with data analysis and literature reviews, including: Charlene Wilson, Alona Lerman, Adam Tolin, Aaron Graham, and Evelyn Otchere-Agyei. Finally, we would like to thank Diane Hendricks for her able assistance with production and editing of the Cross-Site Report and Tim Ware for production of the Case Studies.

We want to thank Margery Turner for her consistent help and support and her thorough review of the Cross-Site Report and Case Studies. Her support and encouragement were crucial at many stages of this challenging project. Our colleagues Tom Kingsley, Marty Abravanel and Jim Gibson also provided helpful support and feedback as we worked to refine our cross-site findings. Our advisory panel, John Yinger, Xavier De Souza Briggs, Mary Davis, Michael Schill, Wilhelmina Leigh, and Douglas Massey, provided much helpful guidance during the early phases of the project.

Judson James of the Department of Housing and Urban Development has provided us with support and encouragement in carrying out this challenging project. We also want to thank Kevin Neary and the many other staff who contributed comments and assistance.

Finally, we wish to thank the many people at the eight case study sites who graciously contributed their time and expertise, including: staff of local public housing authorities, HUD offices, and mobility programs; plaintiffs' attorneys; and local government officials. We particularly want to thank the many residents who generously shared their personal experiences with us in focus groups and interviews.

## ***Preface***

### **Purpose of the Research**

The overall purpose of this Baseline Assessment of Public Housing Desegregation Cases is to produce an early assessment of the impact of using desegregation settlements to address problems of segregation and concentration in public and assisted housing. This research focused on desegregation settlements in eight sites: Allegheny County, Pennsylvania (*Sanders*); Buffalo, New York (*Comer*); Dallas, Texas (*Walker*); East Texas (*Young*); Minneapolis (*Hollman*); New Haven, Connecticut (*Christian Community Action*); New York, New York (*Davis*); and Omaha, Nebraska (*Hawkins*). This study is to serve as a baseline for a planned long-term assessment effort and has three major objectives:

- to document baseline (pre-settlement) conditions; the early desegregation program designs; implementation challenges and successes; and any adjustments in the desegregation mandates or policies since the decrees took effect;
- to assess early implementation progress, and the impact of the consent decrees on the plaintiff class and then to draw implementation lessons; and
- to advise HUD on the best methods for conducting a long-term impact evaluation in these eight sites, including identifying requisite historical and future data and procedures for data collection and tracking.

This cross-site report draws on case studies of early implementation at the eight sites. To prepare these case studies, the Urban Institute conducted site visits to the study sites between August and October of 1998. Prior to the site visits, staff reviewed background materials, including the relevant consent decrees, progress reports, and newspaper articles. During the site visit, staff conducted interviews with housing authority staff, local HUD staff, local government representatives, plaintiffs' attorneys, staff from any mobility or fair housing programs related to the decree, and tenant leaders. We also conducted focus groups with housing authority residents affected by the decrees.

Each case study includes: a historical overview of pre-settlement conditions, current economic conditions, and racial make up of the metropolitan area; a history of the desegregation litigation; an overview of the elements of the desegregation settlement; a thorough review of implementation progress to date, including factors that have facilitated and inhibited implementation; and a summary of the results of focus groups conducted with residents at each site. We have drawn on these case studies to produce a cross-site report that looks at early implementation efforts and baseline patterns of segregation across the sites.

This report is not intended to serve as an audit of compliance or a final impact analysis, but rather to highlight the early challenges and lessons of attempting to implement these ambitious desegregation decrees. All findings represent conditions at the time the case studies were conducted; we recognize that in some instances, situations have changed dramatically since the field work was completed. These changes will be reflected in the planned long-term impact assessment. However, we do include some discussion of the March 1999 Fifth Circuit Court decision in the *Walker* case in Dallas because it has major implications for the case, and potentially, for other similar desegregation efforts.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>i</b>
1.0 Background .....	i
2.0 Purpose of the Study .....	ii
3.0 Methodology .....	ii
4.0 Baseline Racial Patterns in Case Study Sites .....	ii
5.0 Elements of the Consent Decrees .....	iii
6.0 Findings Related to Early Implementation of Decrees .....	iii
6.1 Factors Affecting Implementation .....	vi
6.2 Early Implementation Impacts on Residents .....	vii
7.0 Recommendations for a Long-Term Evaluation .....	viii
8.0 Lessons and Future Challenges .....	viii
8.1 Challenges in Desegregating Public Housing .....	ix
8.2 Early Lessons for Mobility and Deconcentration Efforts .....	ix
<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.0 Introduction .....	1
1.1 The Context for the Research .....	3
1.1.1 A Brief Historical Portrait of Racial Discrimination and Segregation in the Administration of Federally Subsidized Housing Programs .....	3
1.1.2 The Evolving Federal Response to Public Housing Desegregation Suits .....	5
1.1.3 Desegregating Public Housing: Evidence From Research .....	8
1.2 Overview of the Report .....	10
<b>CHAPTER 2 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.0 Introduction .....	13
2.1 Activities Prior to the Site Visit .....	14
2.2 On-site Activities .....	14
2.3 Post-Site Visit Activities .....	18
<b>CHAPTER 3 BASELINE MEASURES OF SEGREGATION .....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.0 Introduction .....	19
3.1 Public Housing Segregation Measures at the Development Level .....	19
3.2 Public Housing Segregation Measures at the Census Tract Level .....	24
3.3 Segregation Measures for Section 8 Certificate Holders .....	26
3.4 Segregation Measures for All Assisted Tenants .....	28
3.5 Clustering Analysis of Section 8 Certificate Holders .....	29
3.6 Conclusion .....	33
<b>CHAPTER 4 ELEMENTS OF THE CONSENT DECREES AND PROGRESS TO DATE .....</b>	<b>38</b>

4.0	Overview .....	38
4.1	Elements of the Consent Decrees.....	38
4.2	Progress in Implementation.....	42
4.3	Conclusion.....	47
<b>CHAPTER 5 RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS.....</b>		<b>48</b>
5.0	Introduction.....	48
5.1	Perceived Barriers to Mobility.....	49
5.1.1	Anticipated Discrimination .....	50
5.1.2	Financial Barriers.....	51
5.1.3	Lack of Transportation and Access to Services.....	51
5.2	Challenges Encountered by Those Attempting Desegregative Moves .....	52
5.2.1	Concerns About the Housing Authority or Mobility Program .....	52
5.2.2	Lack of Affordable Units.....	53
5.2.3	Discrimination .....	53
5.2.4	Lack of Transportation .....	53
5.3	Movers' Experiences .....	54
5.3.1	Housing Quality .....	54
5.3.2	Neighborhoods .....	55
5.3.3	Opportunities .....	56
5.3.4	Social Integration .....	59
5.3.5	Discrimination and Harassment.....	61
5.4	Implications for Mobility Programs.....	63
5.4.1	Access to Information About Non-Impacted Areas.....	63
5.4.2	Search Assistance .....	64
5.4.3	Financial Assistance .....	64
5.4.4	Homeownership Opportunities .....	65
5.4.5	Long-term Stability.....	65
5.5	Conclusion.....	66
<b>CHAPTER 6 CROSS-SITE FACILITATORS AND INHIBITORS.....</b>		<b>68</b>
6.0	Introduction.....	68
6.1	Inhibitors.....	69
6.1.1	Racial Composition of the Waiting List and Current Tenant Population .....	69
6.1.2	Conflict Among Agencies Implementing the Decree .....	70
6.1.3	Coordination Among Agencies with Implementation Responsibilities .....	72
6.1.4	Organized Community Resistance .....	73
6.1.5	Reluctance to Accept Desegregative In-Movers and Make Desegregative Moves.....	75
6.1.6	Lack of Residents' Acceptance of Specific Elements of the Decree .....	77
6.1.7	Inadequate Supply of Units at the Fair Market Rent Level .....	78
6.1.8	Poor Public Transportation .....	79





---

6.1.9	Lack of HUD Monitoring and Follow-Through.....	79
6.2	Facilitators .....	79
6.2.1	Housing Authority Resources .....	80
6.2.2	Creative Diffusion of Community Resistance .....	81
6.2.3	Coordination of Local Public Services .....	83
6.2.4	Institutional Reform.....	83
<b>CHAPTER 7 LONG-TERM EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>		<b>87</b>
7.0	Introduction.....	87
7.1	Data Collection Component .....	88
7.1.1	Key Informant Interviews .....	88
7.1.2	Focus Groups with PHA Residents .....	89
7.1.3	Resident Survey .....	89
7.1.4	Collect Information about Expenditures on Decree Elements .....	89
7.1.5	Mobility Counseling Data.....	90
7.1.6	Development-level and Section 8 Locational Data .....	90
7.2	Case Study Component .....	90
7.3	Statistical Analysis of Changes to Segregation Component .....	91
7.4	Conclusion.....	92
<b>CHAPTER 8 LESSONS and FUTURE CHALLENGES .....</b>		<b>93</b>
8.0	Introduction.....	93
8.1	Lessons .....	93
8.2	Challenges in Desegregating Public Housing .....	94
8.2.1	Equalizing Housing Conditions: On-Site or Off-Site? .....	94
8.2.2	Section 8 Assistance: Desegregative or Unrestricted?.....	96
8.2.3	Pace of Implementation: Aggressive or Deliberate?.....	97
8.2.4	The Remedial Elements of Consent Decrees: Uniform or Tailor-Made Across Sites?.....	98
8.3	Early Lessons for Mobility and Deconcentration Efforts .....	98
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>		<b>101</b>
<b>APPENDIX A-D</b>		



---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1.0 Background

Over several generations, many local public housing authorities have established and perpetuated racially segregated and discriminatory systems for delivering public housing and other housing assistance. Over the past decade, the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has been working actively to undo this legacy by settling legal suits that have alleged a variety of such civil rights violations by these housing authorities.

In over a dozen court cases nationwide, HUD has voluntarily entered into consent decrees instead of contesting them in a trial. In these decrees the defendants (usually HUD, the local housing authority, and the local government) have agreed to implement specific remedial elements. These elements have been negotiated by the parties and, ultimately, designated by the Court to provide relief to plaintiff class members. Although remedies differ by site, common forms of relief have included: unified housing authority waiting lists (in a few cases, with race-conscious tenant assignment plans); demolition of some public housing developments; construction of scattered-site public housing; the provision of additional Section 8 vouchers and certificates for replacement housing; mobility counseling; and conventional public housing modernization.

HUD commissioned the Urban Institute to conduct research on the early implementation of eight of these consent decrees, originally entered into between 1987 and 1996. These sites (with case names in parentheses) were: Allegheny County, Pennsylvania (*Sanders*); Buffalo, New York (*Comer*); Dallas, Texas (*Walker*); East Texas (*Young*); Minneapolis (*Hollman*); New Haven, Connecticut (*Christian Community*



*Action*); and Omaha, Nebraska (*Hawkins*).<sup>1 2</sup> In addition, HUD included the *Davis* case against the New York City Housing Authority, even though HUD was not a defendant in that case.

HUD commissioned this research to establish a baseline of conditions at the beginning of the settlements, in order to create a basis for future research on the long-term impact of this litigation. This research was not intended to serve as an audit of compliance or a final impact analysis, but rather to create a baseline and highlight the early challenges and lessons of attempting to implement these ambitious desegregation decrees.

## 2.0 Purpose of the Study

This research had three major objectives:

- To document baseline (pre-settlement) conditions; the early desegregation program designs; implementation challenges and successes; and any adjustments in desegregation mandates or policies since the decrees took effect.
- To assess early implementation progress, and the impact of the consent decrees on the plaintiff class and then to draw implementation lessons.

---

<sup>1</sup>The original 1987 *Walker* decree in Dallas was vacated in 1992 and a final judgement and remedial orders against the defendants were issued in 1995 and 1996 (superseded by a modified decree in 1997). Most recently, the Fifth Circuit issued a ruling on replacement housing in March 1999. The *Young* case in East Texas affects 70 housing authorities in the East Texas region; the first court order in *Young* was issued in 1988, but the final judgement and decree was not issued until 1995. All the other consent decrees in this study were entered into between 1992 and 1996.

<sup>2</sup>The Housing Authority of Baltimore City was also approached to participate in this study, but declined because all parties had not yet agreed to the elements of the proposed decree.



- To advise HUD on the best methods for conducting a long-term impact evaluation in these eight sites, including identifying requisite historical and future data and procedures for data collection and tracking.

### **3.0 Methodology**

To accomplish these goals, we undertook three broad sets of activities:

- We collected qualitative implementation and process evaluation data on the desegregation settlements, making site visits to each of the eight sites between August and October 1998.<sup>3</sup>
- We collected baseline quantitative data on the location and racial occupancy patterns of public housing developments and Section 8 certificate holders for the eight case study sites.
- Through discussions with experts and reviews of the literature we devised a feasible, cost-effective, powerful method for assessing the long-term impacts of the desegregation plans both quantitatively and qualitatively.

### **4.0 Baseline Racial Patterns in Case Study Sites**

---

<sup>3</sup>See *Baseline Assessment of HUD's Public Housing Desegregation Cases: Case Studies, Volume II*.



---

To provide context for conditions at each housing authority at the time of its consent decree, we calculated various measures of racial occupancy patterns for all sites where data permitted. Our analysis reveals a multi-dimensional portrait of segregation confronting both public housing residents and Section 8 subsidy recipients.

- Overall, we found that baseline levels of segregation were high, that black residents tended to live in majority black public housing developments in census tracts that were predominantly minority and low-income.
- White public housing residents lived in almost equally low-income neighborhoods, but with comparatively few minorities.
- Both black and white Section 8 holders lived in neighborhoods with lower percentages of minority residents. Further, these neighborhoods were considerably less disadvantaged than those around public housing developments.

## **5.0 Elements of the Consent Decrees**

Although the terms of the desegregation settlements address specific conditions in each of the eight locations, the settlements share many similar features. Table 1 summarizes the main features of the settlement agreements. As is clear from this table, the scope and complexity of the eight case study decrees varies considerably. At one extreme, New York has relatively minimal requirements that are all under the direct control of the housing authority. By contrast, Allegheny County and Dallas have by far the widest range of requirements, with numerous parties involved in implementation.

## **6.0 Findings Related to Early Implementation of Decrees**



All the sites we studied have implemented at least some elements of their decree, but no site has fully implemented all of the requirements. The sites that had implemented the largest share of their required elements at the time of the case studies were: Dallas, New York, and Omaha. Those that had made the least progress across the board were: Allegheny County, Buffalo, and East Texas.

Some remedies have been easier for all housing authorities to implement than others; in particular, those remedies where the housing authority has control, there are few other actors required to cooperate, and there are few external constraints. These elements include: changes to tenant selection and assignment plans and waiting lists; demolition of selected developments; and modernization and rehabilitation of public housing developments.





Location	Changes to tenant selection and administrative procedures	Public Housing Demolition and/or replacement	Physical improvements to public housing	New Section 8 Certificates		Mobility counseling	Creating housing opportunities	Community development around public housing
				geographic restrictions	unrestricted			
East Texas	x		x	x		x	x	x
Minneapolis		x		x	x	x	x	
New Haven	x	x <sup>1</sup>		x		x		
New York	x				x			
Omaha	x	x		x		x		x





---

<b>Location</b>	<b>Changes to tenant selection and administrative procedures</b>	<b>Public Housing Demolition and/or replacement</b>	<b>Physical improvements to public housing</b>	<b>New Section 8 Certificates</b>		<b>Mobility counseling</b>	<b>Creating housing opportunities</b>	<b>Community development around public housing</b>
				geographic restrictions	unrestricted			
<sup>1</sup> New Haven includes new project-based Section 8 developments to be constructed								



---

Other remedies have clearly been more difficult for housing authorities to implement speedily and fully.

- The most challenging has been the provision of adequate scattered-site or Section 8 replacement housing. At numerous sites, local politicians and homeowners associations have objected to the acquisition or construction of scattered site units.
- Implementing mobility counseling programs has also proved extremely challenging, particularly at the six sites which were required to contract with non-profit agencies.
- Effectively using all of the Section 8 certificates and vouchers allocated by the decrees has also been very difficult. Housing authorities have been plagued by a variety of problems—more subsidies released than the local rental market can absorb (Omaha), lack of available units (New York) and long start up delays in establishing effective mobility counseling centers.
- Community development around public housing has been difficult at many sites. Although at least one site (Dallas) has demonstrated some success, others have been faced long planning processes and disagreements over control of funds (Allegheny County).
- Finally, desegregation of public housing developments has been extremely challenging, despite changes to waiting list and tenant assignment procedures. With the possible exception of New York, where the racial composition of a few targeted developments has changed substantially, there has been no measurable change at the other two sites which had this goal.

In addition to the difficulties of implementing specific elements, the evidence also indicates that the complexity of the decree clearly affects successful implementation. There are two levels of complexity each site must face: the number of tasks required to implement, and the number of external actors



involved in implementing each task. New York's and Omaha's decrees involved only a few elements that were essentially under the control of the housing authority, with few external constraints on the authority's initiative. By contrast, Allegheny County, Dallas, and Minneapolis had extremely wide-ranging sets of mandates that required cooperation from multiple agencies and local governments for effective implementation. Given this complexity, it is not surprising that these sites have encountered many challenges in attempting to implement their decrees.



---

## 6.1 Factors Affecting Implementation

Our analysis identified a number of factors that facilitated and inhibited successful implementation of the decrees across the eight study sites. Given the complex and challenging nature of the task of remedying past desegregation in public housing and the unprecedented nature of the decrees, it is not surprising that we found more inhibitors than facilitators.

The inhibitors we identified cover a range of issues, including:

- the predominantly minority composition of the waiting list and family housing population;
- conflicts among agencies implementing the decrees, including housing authorities, mobility contractors, Section 8 program contractors, local government, HUD offices, and members of task forces created as a result of the settlements;
- coordinating multiple agencies with implementation responsibilities—in most sites, the housing authority, HUD, and local city government all have significant roles;
- organized community resistance to scattered-site housing;
- reluctance to accept desegregative in-movers and to make desegregative moves;
- lack of plaintiffs' acceptance of specific elements of the decrees;



- 
- inadequate supply of vacant rental units at Fair Market Rent levels;
  - poor public transportation, which both makes desegregative moves unattractive and affects movers' access to employment opportunities; and
  - inadequate HUD monitoring and follow through to ensure that local agencies were implementing the decrees as specified.

The factors that we identified that appeared to facilitate successful implementation of the court-ordered remedies include:

- the housing authority's resources, both financial and managerial;
- creative diffusion of community resistance to replacement housing;
- coordination of local public services; and
- institutional reform of housing authorities.

The last factor was a notable, unexpected finding—at several sites it was apparent that the housing authority administration had changed in fundamental ways as a result of having to implement the requirements of the consent decree. These housing authorities have developed new, forward-thinking strategies for providing housing opportunities—and in some cases, economic opportunities—for their tenants.

## **6.2 Early Implementation Impacts on Residents**



For minority tenants who remained in public housing developments in segregated neighborhoods, a consent decree has typically meant some significant improvements in the physical quality of their developments, although rarely the surrounding neighborhoods. Many of the housing authorities have undertaken selective demolition of unsightly, dangerous, boarded-up structures and expended considerable funds on modernization to improve conditions. However, with the exception of a few targeted developments in New York, these developments remain largely segregated.

Nevertheless, as a result of the consent decrees, some African-American households have occupied new or substantially rehabilitated, scattered-site residences in non-impacted communities. Even more African-American households have moved into a desegregative housing opportunity using Section 8 certificates and vouchers. To assess the early impact of these initiatives on residents, we conducted focus groups at each site with participants in a variety of mobility and scattered-site programs. While focus groups are not statistically representative of all tenants, the findings from these groups paint a rich picture of the experiences of residents participating in these ambitious desegregation efforts.

A number of focus group participants reported that they had benefitted from implementation of their consent decree. They have been able to access decent housing in neighborhoods that are safe and well-maintained. The housing or mobility agencies provided them with support and real housing options. Some people who made desegregative moves have been able to move into single-family homes as part of their housing authority's homeownership programs. For these movers, the decree has offered them the chance to take initial steps toward fulfilling their dreams of homeownership. A substantial proportion feel that their children have benefitted from moving to better schools and by participating in activities now available to them.

However, focus group participants also reported serious problems. Many participants have been confused by what has happened, or is yet to occur; and many spoke of not being able to access services of either their housing authority or the mobility program. Some complained of staff at these agencies who have been unhelpful and rude. A substantial proportion of participants in the groups reported



wanting to make desegregative moves and not being able to, for reasons ranging from lack of assistance to lack of available housing. Others have felt they had to take a unit that they did not want, because of staff pressure or lack of time. Some participants report having made desegregative moves only to experience discrimination from neighbors and others in the community, difficulty with transportation, loss of support and sense of community, and in some instances, still poor housing and neighborhood conditions.

Even among focus group participants who made desegregative moves and said they were, for the most part, happy with where they live, some complained of being socially isolated. There are exceptions, of course. A few people from different sites spoke of the friendliness among their neighbors, of being brought gifts of food upon moving in and of people helping each other maintain yards. However, a more common experience among these participants seemed to be that in-movers keep to themselves and did not interact with their new neighbors.

## **7.0 Recommendations for a Long-Term Evaluation**

Given the findings described above, the long-term evaluation of these consent decrees should investigate the same questions addressed in this baseline assessment and build upon the information and field protocols developed during the course of this project. In particular, the research questions refined during this project comprise the foundation for a comprehensive long-term evaluation. How long did it take the main elements of the decree to be implemented? What were the main facilitators and inhibitors to implementation? Were there any unexpected outcomes? How did the decrees ultimately affect members of the plaintiff class? What programmatic lessons can be drawn from these experiences? We recommend that the combination of key informant interviews, resident focus groups, and analysis of archival documents, and a resident survey be used to gather qualitative and quantitative information related to all these questions. This evaluation should be conducted no later than 2004 to ensure that key informants with knowledge about the consent decree are still available for interviews.



---

Finally, the long-term evaluation must address the question: Did the decrees change segregation in assisted housing programs? Given the importance of this question, we have investigated at length how to conduct a rigorous, long-term assessment of changes to residential patterns among public housing and Section 8 subsidy recipients that can be attributed to the decree alone, abstracting from other causal factors. We have developed a multiple-equation econometric technique for accomplishing this, and determined the data that are needed to operationalize the model.

## **8.0 Lessons and Future Challenges**

Our analysis suggests that there are several lessons to be learned from the early implementation experiences in our eight case study sites:

- Public housing desegregation and deconcentration are very difficult to achieve, due to a host of powerful external factors, particularly historical patterns of segregation and public policies that led to objective inequalities between communities. These factors limit the willingness and ability of households of all races to move into unfamiliar neighborhoods and housing developments.
- Litigation makes the implementation environment highly contentious, making successful implementation even more difficult to achieve.
- However, our research also suggests a third, more hopeful lesson: despite such barriers, positive changes may follow litigation.

### **8.1 Challenges in Desegregating Public Housing**





---

In addition to these lessons, our research indicates that even under the best of circumstances, desegregating public housing remains extremely challenging and those implementing remedial programs confront a series of complex dilemmas. There are no easy answers; rather, any choice requires balancing competing objectives. Through our analysis, we have identified three areas that involve especially difficult choices:

- Strategies for equalizing housing conditions between minority and white tenants, including: whether to try to redistribute households among existing developments; improve existing developments with predominantly minority occupants; and/or develop new or rehabilitated housing options for minorities in predominantly white areas.
- Choosing whether or not to restrict additional Section 8 assistance provided under the consent decrees to use in non-impacted areas. Restricting assistance limits choice and may deter tenants from moving, but not restricting assistance may mean that relatively few desegregative moves will occur.
- Deciding whether to set an aggressive pace for implementation and take the risk that the quality of implementation may suffer or to set a more deliberate pace and risk creating delays.

## **8.2 Early Lessons for Mobility and Deconcentration Efforts**

In addition to lessons about the challenges of the early phases of implementation, our findings offer lessons for other types of initiatives intended to deconcentrate and disperse public and assisted housing residents. While this is only an early implementation assessment, the challenges these eight housing authorities have faced in trying to implement these ambitious decrees are similar to those faced by other agencies implementing mobility efforts such as Regional Opportunity Counseling or in relocating residents



---

from public housing. Thus, their experiences can offer valuable lessons to other housing authorities currently grappling with similar challenges.

- First, a clear lesson from this research, particularly our focus groups with tenants, is that any consent decree—or Housing authority initiative (e.g., a vacancy consolidation plan or HOPE VI relocation initiative)—intended to desegregate public housing or provide new opportunities for Section 8 holders must include effective, multi-dimensional support before, during, and after the move.
- A second lesson from this research is that any effort to desegregate conventional public housing should include an initiative to increase the number of white applicants who are willing to make desegregative moves.
- Third, the elements of any consent decree or relocation plan must be implemented in a logical, sequential order.
- Likewise, the timing and pace of the implementation of each element of a desegregation initiative or relocation plan must be consistent with the housing authority’s—and, where applicable, the mobility counseling program’s capacity—to administer it effectively.
- Fourth, housing authorities should take proactive action, if possible, to head off recipient community opposition to scattered-site public housing or Section 8 tenants and should work with local political leadership to develop support for assisted residents.
- At the same time, HUD, the Department of Justice, and local private fair housing groups must coordinate their resources and efforts to ensure that assisted tenants are not being discriminated



against in the segments of the metropolitan housing market where their demands are likely to be strongest.

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>i</b>
1.0 Background .....	i
2.0 Purpose of the Study .....	ii
3.0 Methodology .....	ii
4.0 Baseline Racial Patterns in Case Study Sites .....	ii
5.0 Elements of the Consent Decrees.....	iii
6.0 Findings Related to Early Implementation of Decrees .....	iii
6.1 Factors Affecting Implementation .....	vi
6.2 Early Implementation Impacts on Residents .....	vii
7.0 Recommendations for a Long-Term Evaluation .....	viii
8.0 Lessons and Future Challenges.....	viii
8.1 Challenges in Desegregating Public Housing .....	ix
8.2 Early Lessons for Mobility and Deconcentration Efforts .....	ix



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

#### 1.0 Introduction

Over several generations, many local public housing authorities have established and perpetuated racially segregated and discriminatory systems for delivering public housing and other housing assistance.<sup>4</sup> Over the past decade, the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has been working actively to undo this legacy by settling legal suits against it that have alleged civil rights violations by housing authorities under its supervision. In over a dozen court cases nationwide, HUD has voluntarily entered into consent decrees instead of contesting them in a trial.<sup>5</sup> In these decrees, the defendants (HUD, the local housing authority, and, in many cases, the local government) have agreed to implement an ambitious and challenging agenda of remedial elements negotiated by the affected parties.

These remedies are intended to provide relief to plaintiff class members—typically African-American, but sometimes members of other minority groups (e.g., Hispanics, Southeast Asians). Although remedies differ by site, common forms of relief have included: unified housing authority waiting lists (in a few cases, with race-conscious tenant assignment plans); demolition of some public housing

---

<sup>4</sup>For historical case studies of discriminatory policies in public housing, see Hirsch (1983) and Bauman (1987). The legacy of segregative regulations in other federal housing programs is described in Massery and Denton (1993), and Modibo Coulibaly, Rodney Green and David James (1998). The effects of this segregation and the poor quality of life experienced by minorities in large, inner-city public housing developments is documented by Rainwater (1970); Kotlowitz (1991), and Popkin et al (1996, 1999).

<sup>5</sup>It also has challenged housing authorities' practices directly. For example, in February, 1999, it was announced that HUD was for the first time in history filing charges of "systematic discrimination" against a housing authority (Goldberg, 1999). HUD charged the Boston Housing Authority with failure to protect minority public housing residents from harassment.



developments; construction of scattered-site public housing; the provision of additional Section 8 vouchers and certificates for replacement housing; mobility counseling; and conventional public housing modernization.

HUD commissioned the Urban Institute to conduct research on the early implementation of seven of these decrees, originally entered into between 1987 and 1996. These sites (with case names in parentheses) were: Allegheny County, Pennsylvania (*Sanders*); Buffalo, New York



---

(*Comer*); Dallas, Texas (*Walker*); East Texas (*Young*)<sup>6</sup>; Minneapolis (*Hollman*); New Haven, Connecticut (*Christian Community Action*); and Omaha, Nebraska (*Hawkins*).<sup>7</sup> In addition, HUD included the *Davis* case against the New York City Housing Authority, even though HUD was not a defendant in that case. This research was not intended to serve as an audit of compliance or a final impact analysis, but rather to highlight the early challenges and lessons of attempting to implement these ambitious desegregation decrees.

The research had three major objectives:

- To document baseline (pre-settlement) conditions; the early desegregation program designs; implementation challenges and successes; and any adjustments in desegregation mandates or policies since the decrees took effect.
- To assess early implementation progress, and the impact of the consent decrees on the plaintiff class and then to draw implementation lessons.
- To advise HUD on the best methods for conducting a long-term impact evaluation in these eight sites, including identifying requisite historical and future data and procedures for data collection and tracking.

---

<sup>6</sup>The original 1987 *Walker* decree in Dallas was vacated in 1992 and a final judgement and remedial orders against the defendants were issued in 1995 and 1996. The *Young* case in East Texas affects 70 housing authorities in the East Texas region; the first court order in *Young* was issued in 1988, but the final judgement and decree was not issued until 1995. All the other consent decrees in this study were entered into between 1992 and 1996.

<sup>7</sup>The Housing Authority of Baltimore City was also approached to participate in this study, but declined because all parties had not yet agreed to the elements of the proposed decree.



---

To accomplish these goals, we undertook three broad sets of activities:

- We collected qualitative implementation and process evaluation data on the desegregation settlements, making site visits to each of the eight sites between August and October 1998. We conducted extensive key informant interviews with housing authority staff, local HUD staff, local government representatives, plaintiffs' attorneys, staff from any mobility or fair housing programs related to the decree, and tenant leaders. We also conducted focus groups with housing authority residents and applicants affected by the decrees. Finally, we reviewed relevant documents, including the consent decrees and other legal documents, progress reports, and newspaper articles. We then interpreted and analyzed this information as part of the baseline assessment and prepared detailed case studies.<sup>8</sup>
- We collected baseline quantitative data on the location and racial occupancy patterns of public housing developments and Section 8 certificate holders for the eight PHA case study sites. We then calculated a variety of segregation indicators based on these data and analyzed them as part of the baseline assessment. We also mapped public housing and, data permitting, Section 8 locations overlaid on racial composition figures for neighborhoods.
- Through discussions with experts and reviews of the literature we devised a feasible, cost-effective, powerful method for assessing the long-term impacts of the desegregation plans both quantitatively and qualitatively. We also developed a scheme for the ongoing monitoring and collection of data appropriate for this long-term assessment.

### 1.1 The Context for the Research

---

<sup>8</sup>See *Baseline Assessment of HUD's Public Housing Desegregation Cases: Case Studies, Volume II*.



---

In order to provide a context for interpreting the results of this research, in this section we present a historical overview of racial discrimination in federally subsidized housing, a discussion of the federal response to these problems, and a review of earlier literature on the impact of desegregation efforts.

### **1.1.1 A Brief Historical Portrait of Racial Discrimination and Segregation in the Administration of Federally Subsidized Housing Programs**

In order to appreciate fully the challenge that HUD and local housing authorities face in desegregating public housing today, the legacy of discrimination and segregation in federally assisted housing must be understood. Race and subsidized housing have been explicitly intertwined since the inception of New Deal housing initiatives (Olion-Chandler, 1992). As summarized by Coulibaly, Green, and James (1998: 3), “during the 1932-1964 period, subsidized low-income projects were, as a matter of policy, concentrated in low-income areas and assigned to tenants on the basis of race.” For example, before World War II, 236 of the 261 developments subsidized by the United States Housing Authority and 43 of the 49 supported by the Public Works Administration (or 90 percent of the total) were completely segregated racially, usually by admitting to a given development only those of a particular race (Coulibaly, Green, and James, 1998).

Discriminatory public housing practices continued during and after the War (Rossi and Dentler, 1961; Hirsch, 1983; Goldstein and Yancey, 1986). The designation of distinct, elderly-only public housing in 1956 provided another means through which white, often suburban communities could accept public housing with the implicit understanding that the developments would be predominantly occupied by white elderly. Beginning in the 1950s, the three-decade era of explicit racial discrimination and segregation generated a potent legacy; approximately 700,000 public housing units were constructed during this period, representing well over half of the current public housing stock (Goering, Kamely, and Richardson, 1997).

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 forbade discrimination in the administration of federally assisted housing. Little desegregation followed, however. Coulibaly and his colleagues (1998) analyzed 1992 Multifamily Tenant Characteristics System (MTCS) data to give a nationally representative portrait of





segregation in public housing. They determined that 60 percent of the developments for which data were available had 80 percent or more tenants in one racial-ethnic group, and 15 percent of the total had all tenants in one group.<sup>9</sup> Though comparisons over time were necessarily inexact due to lack of historical data comparability, the authors were unable to discern any statistically significant decrease in segregation within housing authorities since 1964.

This persistence of segregation is undoubtedly due in part to the fact that some local housing authority practices did not change (Goering, 1986:198), as illustrated in the discussion of legal suits below. But another contributing cause was that, increasingly, white families chose not to remain in or apply for public housing family developments. As a result, by 1977 over half the family developments were predominantly occupied by African-Americans; in contrast, nearly half the elderly developments were predominantly occupied by whites (Coulibaly, Green, and James, 1998).<sup>10</sup>

However, Coulibaly and his colleagues (1998) also found that the concentration of public housing in low-income neighborhoods had eased somewhat between 1964 and 1992. They attributed this trend to the development of elderly public housing in higher-income areas and the participation of many suburbs in providing replacement units for those demolished under Urban Renewal programs. Goering, Kamely, and Richardson (1997) investigated this same issue with HUD's MTCS public housing occupancy data for 1993 linked with 1990 census tract data. The authors cautioned that, while public housing as a whole was becoming less geographically concentrated in low-income, minority areas, this change did not extend to black public housing residents, who continued to live disproportionately in low income, predominantly black-occupied neighborhoods. This finding echoed a theme of racial inequality within public housing sounded originally by Bickford and Massey (1991), who conducted the first multivariate, cross-site analysis of the topic using a unique HUD data set for a select group of housing authorities for 1977. Focusing on

---

<sup>9</sup>Of these homogeneous developments, 57 percent are occupied by blacks, 43 percent by whites.

<sup>10</sup>In this report we will employ the following terminology when describing different racial-ethnic groups. When quoting from a written document, informant, or focus group participant, we will replicate the terms used. When referring to Census or other data that are tabulated using particular conventions, we will use the terms "black" and "Hispanic." We will use the term "minority" to mean anyone who is not non-Hispanic white.



the nation's largest metro areas, they confirmed that black tenants were most likely to reside in centralized, high-density public housing structures that were overwhelmingly segregated.

Ironically, these findings have appeared at the point at which a consensus is emerging regarding the nature of causal interaction between neighborhood factors and personal behaviors of individuals, although the mechanisms that create these effects are not yet understood. Reviews demonstrate that, for a wide variety of behaviors like educational attainment, labor force participation, criminality, mental health, and out-of-wedlock child bearing, the neighborhood environment matters (Ellen and Turner, 1997). One aspect of neighborhoods that especially matters empirically is the proportion of households with incomes below the poverty level. For this reason, the findings discussed above regarding the continued concentration of minority-occupied, family public housing in high-poverty neighborhoods have such ethical and social importance.

In sum, when the Clinton Administration took office in 1993, it was confronted with a situation in which minority public housing residents continued to live in developments that were predominantly minority-occupied and overwhelmingly found in highly segregated, poverty-stricken neighborhoods. This combination clearly produced intensive poverty concentration and stunted life chances for minorities rarely seen in the private market (Bickford and Massey, 1991). To address this situation, the Administration developed a new strategy of voluntarily entering into consent decrees that called for the implementation an ambitious set of desegregation remedies.

### **1.1.2 The Evolving Federal Response to Public Housing Desegregation Suits**

Not surprisingly, given its social costs and unfairness, the discriminatory legacy of public housing has often been challenged in the courts. Perhaps the most famous early suit was the *Gautreaux* case, a pair of class action suits filed in 1966 against the Chicago Housing Authority and HUD.<sup>11</sup> Dorothy Gautreaux was a

---

<sup>11</sup>For a detailed history of the *Gautreaux* case, see Rubinowitz, 1992.



public housing resident who was active in the civil rights movement and headed the group filing the complaint. The class action suits on behalf of all black tenants and applicants for Chicago Housing Authority housing, alleged discrimination by the Authority and HUD in site selection and tenant assignment. As Rubinowitz (1992; Rubinowitz et al., forthcoming) states, the *Gautreaux* decisions were precedent-setting, including what he calls a “mobility assumption” that past discrimination could be remedied by moving low-income blacks to white areas. This approach to public housing desegregation served as the model for all subsequent litigation.

The case against the CHA was first settled in 1969, with the federal District Court ruling for the plaintiffs. The Court imposed remedies involving the construction of Chicago Housing Authority units in white areas of the city before any additional public housing was built in black-occupied areas. The housing authority was also ordered to adopt a non-discriminatory tenant assignment plan. The housing authority and City government resisted implementing the court-ordered remedies; by 1987, almost no new housing had been constructed and the Court appointed a receiver, the Habitat Corporation. While Habitat has constructed over 1,000 units in non-impacted areas, Rubinowitz and his colleagues (forthcoming) point out that nearly all of this housing was located in Hispanic neighborhoods, which were not considered “minority” communities under the 1969 decree.

The case against HUD was more complex; after the federal District Court dismissed the case in 1969, it was appealed all the way to the Supreme Court, which ordered HUD to devise a metropolitan-wide remedy. Working with the plaintiffs’ attorney, HUD developed a remedy that would use the new Section 8 program to help deconcentrate minority tenants. As interim relief, HUD and the plaintiffs agreed to contract with a nonprofit fair housing group in Chicago, the Leadership Council for Open Metropolitan Communities, to devise and implement an experimental program. From 1976 to 1981, this plan consisted of encouraging private landlords in the region who had received project-based subsidies to rent voluntarily to members of the plaintiff class, who, in turn would be informed and counseled about these opportunities by the Leadership Council (Rubinowitz, 1992, Rubinowitz et al, forthcoming; Davis, 1993).

A final consent decree was approved in 1981. It specified that Section 8 certificates be issued to members of the plaintiff class until 7,100 had been given relief; the agreement decreed that 75 percent of these



certificates had to be used in white, suburban areas.<sup>12</sup> The Leadership Council won consecutive contracts to administer this relief and assist and counsel members of the plaintiff class to accomplish desegregative moves (Davis, 1993).

During this period, the attention of the Reagan administration was redirected from Chicago to East Texas, by a series of lawsuits directed at rural and small-town public housing authorities in a 39-county area of East Texas. Known collectively by their umbrella label, the *Young* case, these suits alleged that these public housing authorities had purposefully selected and assigned tenants by race for the purpose of segregation and had systematically provided inferior property maintenance and improvement activities to the developments occupied by minorities. HUD was accused of “knowingly acquiescing” to these behaviors and the maintenance of a dual public housing system throughout East Texas (Goering, 1986: 197).

HUD’s response was based on four premises (Goering, 1986: 197). First, the massive and mandatory transfer of tenants within public housing should not be seen as the best or only remedy. Second, local housing authorities should have the flexibility to tailor remedies to fit their own circumstances and contexts. Third, HUD would focus attention on authorities already in alleged violation with Title VI. Finally, remedies would be instituted in conjunction with HUD’s funding of modernization of the affected public housing stock.

Then-HUD Secretary Samuel Pierce ordered the “disestablishment” of racially dual public housing systems in East Texas in February, 1984. Each housing authority was to submit a plan for the relocation of tenants aimed at achieving measurable reductions in segregation, based on available vacancies and the public housing waiting lists. An initial assessment of this plan noted wide variation among housing authorities and tenants in their enthusiasm for and effectiveness in generating desegregation (Goering, 1986: 198).

---

<sup>12</sup>This goal was finally achieved in 1998. The decree also provided a small portion of relief through rental developments financed by HUD (Davis, 1993).



With hindsight, it becomes clear that insufficient progress was made from the perspective of the plaintiffs, who continued the legal pressure until a final consent decree was entered into a decade later.

By the beginning of 1985, HUD had expanded its public housing desegregation initiatives nationwide. It first instructed its regional offices to examine individual housing authorities with the intent of identifying and developing a plan to eliminate any segregation resulting from “official actions.” Housing authorities were notified that their prospects for receiving modernization funding would be improved if they were to link their rehabilitation plans to desegregation (Goering, 1986: 198).

Despite these exhortations, several constraints operated simultaneously during the 1980s that weakened their impact. First, there was disagreement within the Reagan administration about the type and extent of desegregative activities in which the federal government should be engaged, especially in the absence of clear legal proof of discriminatory intent. Second, funding reductions for public housing modernization reduced the available desegregative incentives (Kurtz, 1985: A1). Third, many non-racial administrative rules related to local preferences and selection of households on the public housing waiting lists served to frustrate desegregation efforts (Kaplan, 1985). Fourth, HUD had no management information system capable of monitoring racial composition of individual developments and thus no vehicle for ensuring compliance with any plans promulgated by local authorities (Rodriguez, 1985). Finally, as noted above, housing authorities were confronted increasingly with more racially homogeneous waiting lists and housing developments classified by family or elderly designation, thereby limiting system-wide desegregation opportunities.

During the late 1980s, the *Walker* case in Dallas was litigated, with the court issuing a consent decree against the Dallas Housing Authority and HUD in 1987 and against the City of Dallas in 1990. The original consent decree was vacated in 1992 and separate remedial orders were issued against the housing authority in 1995 and HUD in 1996.<sup>13</sup> The *Walker* case is significant because, even in the original decree, the set of remedies ordered was much more wide ranging than the *Gautreaux* decrees, including: changes

---

<sup>13</sup>The 1996 order was superseded by a modified remedial order in 1997.



to tenant assignment and selection procedures; the demolition of a large, deteriorated public housing development; construction of replacement housing in predominantly white areas; the provision of Section 8 certificates and vouchers for replacement housing; the creation of a mobility program; the creation of new housing opportunities for low-income households in predominantly white, suburban areas; and the equalization of conditions between the housing authority's predominantly white elderly developments and predominantly African-American family developments. Thus, the *Walker* decree, with its complex set of provisions, represented the next stage of evolution for public housing desegregation cases, and became the model for all subsequent negotiations.

The Clinton administration took a different direction in responding to the persistent segregation of public housing. It departed from the previous HUD strategy of contesting the public housing lawsuits, and instead acknowledged the role HUD has played historically in neglecting segregation and discrimination in the housing programs it oversees. The administration developed a new, aggressive strategy of settling the cases by supporting solutions to ensure "fair housing" for the plaintiffs. That is, as in *Walker*, minority households were to be given expanded opportunities to live in higher quality, desegregated residential environment by: changing the character of existing public housing developments and their surrounding communities, building new developments in scattered-site settings, and expanding the use of Section 8 subsidies in non-impacted areas. The challenges faced during the early implementation of these initiatives is the primary focus of this report.

### **1.1.3 Desegregating Public Housing: Evidence From Research**

As legal counsels representing the plaintiffs and defendants met to craft settlements in the various cases, they had little empirical evidence on which to base their decisions. However, the long-standing Gautreaux program provided useful information about operating effective mobility counseling programs (Davis, 1993).

Research on the Gautreaux program comparing outcomes for participants who moved to predominantly white suburbs to those who moved to revitalizing black neighborhoods suggested that mobility programs



might have positive economic outcomes for participants. Surveys of Gautreaux participants indicated that suburban movers were somewhat more likely to report having had a job after they moved, although they did not work more hours or earn higher wages than city movers. Findings from a longitudinal study of a small sample of participants indicated that suburban movers' children were more likely to stay in school, to be employed after graduation, and to go on to four-year colleges or universities (Rosenbaum et al., 1991; Kaufman and Rosenbaum, 1992; Popkin, Rosenbaum, and Meaden 1993).<sup>14</sup> However, while these results were encouraging, they were based only on small samples of successful movers. Thus, the limitations of the research made it difficult to generalize to other public housing settings.<sup>15</sup>

Although the research on the Gautreaux program provided some encouraging evidence about the potential impacts of mobility programs on tenants, there was little systematic work available regarding public housing desegregation efforts. A substantial scholarly and practitioner literature existed on how to desegregate the private housing market (Grier and Grier, 1960; Molotch, 1972; Milgram, 1979), but little was known about what approaches worked best in the special context of public housing.

One exception was supplied by Miller et al. (1985). After their exhaustive analysis of six case studies of public housing desegregation efforts in the 1980s, they concluded that success was related to three main factors, two of which could be influenced, in principle, by policy makers. First, if conditions in the metropolitan area housing market offer many decent rental units at affordable rents, it will be harder to keep racial diversity within public housing, though it may be easier to employ tenant-based rental supplements as part of a desegregative scheme. Second, perceptions of "comfort" and "hospitality" at destinations are crucial in shaping tenants' willingness to undertake desegregative moves. Third is the political context created by housing authority staff, local political leaders, and community organizers. The authors noted in particular, "Strong leadership by the Executive Director of the PHA and the visible

---

<sup>14</sup>This study involved 69 families interviewed in 1982 and 1989 (cf Kaufman and Rosenbaum, 1992).

<sup>15</sup>The national Moving to Opportunity Demonstration was designed to address the limitations of the Gautreaux research. However, results from this demonstration will not be available for several years. For a complete discussion of these issues, see Popkin et al., 1998.



political support of the local power structure can be extremely powerful facilitators of change” (Miller et al., 1985:4-7).

Another, less optimistic commentary on the prospects for desegregating public housing was provided by Olion-Chandler (1992). She argues that public housing segregation is firmly entrenched in many major cities and that a variety of public policy attempts to dislodge it have had little effect. Although the federal government has ceased to play a major role in perpetuating segregation, Olion-Chandler claims that neither have they taken a strong, consistent stand on desegregation policy. The two most important remaining obstacles, in her view, are unwillingness of communities to accept subsidized housing and lack of funding for desegregation activities. She offers no programmatic advice as to how to overcome these barriers.

To fill some gaps in the existing body of knowledge that would prove immediately useful in formulating desegregation remedies in the mid 1990s, HUD commissioned the Urban Institute to conduct two studies of housing authorities involved in civil rights litigation: the *Young* case in East Texas and the *Sanders* case in Allegheny County, PA.<sup>16</sup> The settlement of the *Young* case required an assessment of the racial composition of public housing developments and their surrounding neighborhoods and the availability of rental units at Fair Market Rent located outside of minority-concentrated neighborhoods. The study found that neighborhood racial composition of small towns and rural areas was finely grained, and that blocks within a quarter-mile radius of each public housing site were the most appropriate scale to assess “neighborhood” (Galster et al., 1995). Given this specification of neighborhood, which developments should be destinations for desegregative moves by both black and white tenants could be ascertained and agreed upon by counsel. The study also found that, in virtually all housing authorities in the region, there was sufficient private rental stock below Fair Market Rent levels located in predominantly white neighborhoods to afford sufficient desegregative opportunities to African-American plaintiffs using Section 8 certificates.

---

<sup>16</sup>The study was mandated by the *Sanders* consent decree.



In Allegheny County, Urban Institute researchers analyzed the attitudes of white and African-American public housing residents to desegregation of public housing (Galster, Herbig and Smith, 1996). Through focus groups, they asked specifically about their current perceptions of residential alternatives and potential incentives to promote desegregative moves. Not surprisingly, respondents of both races expressed reluctance to make desegregative moves and held negative stereotypes about public housing developments in which black residents predominated and the neighborhoods in which such developments were located. Yet, these impressions were typically based on limited, second-hand often unreliable information. Moreover, few white respondents had personal experience living in integrated residential environments (Galster, Herbig, and Smith, 1996). These focus groups did uncover three themes important for policy makers who want to promote desegregated public housing: (1) Effective housing authority management related to tenant screening and monitoring, information provision about desegregative options, and mobility counseling; (2) Multi-racial community building activities in the developments that would support desegregative movers in their new residences; and (3) Improved building maintenance and creation of more “defensible spaces” in desegregating developments, to make the residents associate desegregation with enhancements to residential environment.

Thus, while there has been some research on the successful administration and effects of mobility programs, there is only scanty evidence on the process of desegregating public housing. What little prior work exists primarily sheds light on the obstacles to desegregating public housing; too little is known about effective remedies. This Baseline Assessment will greatly expand practical knowledge about the challenges of promoting desegregation in public housing, since the remedies crafted in the eight cases under study include a wide variety of approaches. Ultimately, the planned Long-Term evaluation will provide valuable information about the long-term impacts of these ambitious efforts.

## **1.2 Overview of the Report**

While all of the consent decrees allow several years for implementation, all housing authorities in our sample have made progress in implementing their consent decrees. However, all have faced significant obstacles, and most authorities have performed only a portion of what is required. Remedies over which housing authorities have direct control—changing tenant selection and assignment plans, demolition of



deteriorated developments, and modernization of others—have typically been implemented. Other remedies have proven more difficult: providing adequate scattered-site or Section 8 replacement housing; effectively using the additional Section 8 certificates provided under the decrees; developing mobility counseling programs; and community development around public housing. The remainder of this report will document these findings, and describe the powerful forces—both external and internal to public housing authorities—that make achieving public housing desegregation extremely challenging.

Despite the fact that housing authorities encountered difficulties in implementing the decrees, our analysis has identified a variety of positive developments and creative actions by housing authorities which have facilitated desegregation. Fundamental institutional changes have occurred in at least three sites. Moreover, our analysis yields several programmatic lessons that will assist housing authorities in their ongoing efforts to desegregate and enhance the quality of life for their minority tenants. We conclude that in many sites, patience and persistence have brought about positive changes for public housing residents.

This cross-site report draws heavily from and synthesizes material found in the detailed case studies of each site. The case studies are collected under separate cover in Volume Two of this report, *Baseline Assessment of Public Housing Desegregation Cases: Case Studies*. This cross-site report contains eight chapters.

Chapter 2 describes the research design and methodology used to acquire and analyze both quantitative and qualitative information for this study. In Chapter 3, we present a variety of baseline, pre-consent decree measures designed to describe, in a multi-dimensional way, racial patterns of residence within public housing, the Section 8 program, and the communities around public housing. We compute several indices of segregation, using both individual public housing developments and census tracts as the unit of analysis.

Chapter 4 describes the main elements of the consent decrees and summarizes progress to date in each of the eight sites. We present the terms of the decrees in eight categories: (1) changes to tenant



selection and assignment procedures; (2) public housing demolition and replacement; (3) project-based housing assistance; (4) physical and security improvements to the public housing stock; (5) tenant-based housing assistance; (6) mobility counseling program; (7) affirmatively creating new housing opportunities; and (8) community development surrounding the public housing stock. We provide a variety of cross-site comparisons in terms of degrees of implementation and whether certain elements of the decrees seem particularly difficult to implement.

Chapter 5 draws on the focus groups conducted at the eight sites to present the perceptions of plaintiff class members on how residents have fared during the early stages of implementation. Chapter 6 presents our synthesis experiences from the eight case studies to highlight factors that inhibit and facilitate implementation of the consent decrees.

Chapter 7 provides our recommendations for how HUD should conduct a long-term evaluation of the implementation and effects of these consent decrees. We argue that the long-term evaluation should investigate the same questions addressed in this evaluation and build upon the baseline information and field protocols developed during the course of this project. In addition, the long-term evaluation must rigorously address the question: Did the decrees change segregation patterns in assisted housing programs? Finally, Chapter 8 presents what our analysis suggests are the key lessons learned, the dilemmas that face those seeking to desegregate public housing, and the broader lessons for desegregation and mobility efforts that are not based on litigation.



---

<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 The Context for the Research .....	3
1.1.1 A Brief Historical Portrait of Racial Discrimination and Segregation in the Administration of Federally Subsidized Housing Programs.....	3
1.1.2 The Evolving Federal Response to Public Housing Desegregation Suits.....	5
1.1.3 Desegregating Public Housing: Evidence From Research.....	8
1.2 Overview of the Report.....	10



## CHAPTER 2

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

#### 2.0 Introduction

The research strategy used in this report was designed to investigate systematically new and creative remedies HUD is bringing to bear on the issue of desegregating public housing. Consequently, our research design was developed in order to allow the research team to gain a clear understanding of exactly what each site's remedies entailed, the extent to which these elements were actually implemented in each site, and the degree to which individual elements led to desegregative outcomes.

The core of our research design consisted of a case study analysis of eight different PHA sites: Allegheny County, Buffalo, Dallas, East Texas<sup>17</sup>, Minneapolis, New Haven, New York and Omaha, all visited between August and October of 1998.<sup>18</sup> We chose a case study methodology because of the complexities involved in analyzing the effects of the decree in each site. Although some of the remedies are similar across the sites, there are some with relatively unique characteristics designed to address a specific legal and social context. Indeed, Yin (1989:14) recommends case study research should be conducted "...to understand complex social phenomena..[because]...it allows an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events..."

---

<sup>17</sup>The specific PHAs chosen for analysis in East Texas were Port Arthur, Beaumont and Orange County. These were chosen in consultation with HUD because Port Arthur and Beaumont are the two largest cities in the East Texas region. Orange County, a small PHA similar to other East Texas housing authorities, was chosen because of its proximity to the two other sites.

<sup>18</sup>Baltimore was originally proposed but later dropped from the analysis because the decree covering that city's housing authority had not been finalized before the site visits were scheduled.



The Urban Institute assigned a two-person team to each site. Prior to the site visit, each research team reviewed the consent decree and other legal documents; read relevant articles about the case; and scheduled key informant interviews and focus groups.<sup>19</sup> During the site visit, the team conducted semi-structured interviews with key informants representing all major parties to the decree and others knowledgeable about a decree's implementation progress. These included: local HUD staff; PHA administrators and Section 8 program staff; mobility program staff; local government officials, representatives from fair housing organizations, plaintiffs' attorneys, and tenant leaders. In addition, each team conducted focus groups with residents affected (or to be affected) by the decree and collected statistical data needed for calculating baseline segregation indices. Upon its return, the research team prepared a detailed case study about its findings, and converted statistical data into a form needed to calculate baseline segregation measures. A more detailed discussion of each activity is presented below.

## **2.1 Activities Prior to the Site Visit**

Prior to the site visit, research team members reviewed the decree issued for its site as well as other documents that related to the case. Team members tailored interview and focus group discussion guides so that each guide prompted informants to discuss elements included in the site's decree.

Each PHA was requested by HUD to designate a staff member to act as a liaison with the research team. The liaison was contacted by the research team before the site visit in order to coordinate interviews and focus groups. In addition, research teams sent a letter to each PHA Executive Director that explained the purpose of the study, listed the PHA key informants that the team would like to interview and outlined the type of information needed to calculate baseline segregation measures.

---

<sup>19</sup>In some cases, team members also conducted preliminary reconnaissance by telephone with central actors, e.g., HUD attorneys.



---

Before making the site visit, each site team also collected contact information for focus groups. As summarized in the table in Appendix A, site teams conducted focus groups with different types of participants, with some variation in sampling and contact procedures.

## **2.2 On-site Activities**

Site visits took place over a two- to three-day period, except in East Texas. Since East Texas consists of three separate sites (Beaumont, Port Arthur and Orange County), that research team conducted a nine-day site visit. In all sites, the research teams conducted key informant interviews during the day and held focus group meetings during the evening in order to accommodate the participants' schedules.

As Table 2.1 shows, the composition of the focus groups differed for each site. For all of our focus groups, regardless of type, we attempted to select participants from a broad, but representative, range within that group. For example, we tried to ensure that all groups included a broad age range and housing type; that both genders were represented; and that participants included those with and without children. Of course, the extent to which we were able to achieve this representation in each of our groups depended on the applications we received. In a number of groups, for example, we did not have any male participants, since they make up a smaller proportion of the public housing population or because none had responded to our flyers.

Each key informant interview was conducted with a discussion guide developed to prompt respondents about specific aspects of the case, including the progress made in implementing specific remedial elements as well as the factors that contributed to delays and/or successful implementation. Separate discussion guides, presented in Appendix B, were designed for attorneys, housing authority staff, mobility counseling staff, local government officials and HUD staff. Research team members also conducted focus groups with residents and to the extent possible, focus group facilitators were chosen to match the race of participants.



---

Each focus group was conducted with discussion guides that were adapted from ones presented in Appendix C in order to match specific elements in a particular site's case.<sup>20</sup> The issues explored in a site's focus groups depended upon specific elements in the decree as well as the extent to which decree elements had been implemented. However, all groups discussed the following themes:

- Making a move, including barriers and facilitators;
- New housing situations, including quality of individual units, buildings, and neighborhood;
- Opportunities in new communities;
- Factors that help or hinder moves after they are made;
- Feelings of acceptance in the new community, including levels of integration and isolation;
- Experience with the administrative end of the move, including working with the housing authority and the mobility counseling program (if applicable); and
- Impacts on children affected by the consent decrees.<sup>21</sup>

Research team members collected statistical data needed to compute baseline segregation measures for public housing residents and Section 8 certificate holders. Most sites had this information in electronic form, while some only had such data in hard copy form. In either case, the research team collected these statistical data and brought them back for analysis. Moreover, each team asked PHA staff about the

---

<sup>20</sup>East Texas and Minnesota focus group participants did not complete demographic information forms.

<sup>21</sup>Baltimore was originally proposed but later dropped from the analysis because the decree covering that city's housing authority had not been finalized before the site visits were scheduled.





availability of data needed for our proposed long-term impact evaluation, and, where available, returned with these data as well. Finally, research team members conducted windshield surveys in order to measure the physical condition of some public housing developments as well as the neighborhood conditions surrounding public housing developments. These data have been archived by the Urban Institute for potential use in a long-term evaluation.



**Table 2.1. Demographic Characteristics of Focus Group Participants**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	Omaha	New Haven	New York
<i>Gender:</i>						
Female	66%	75%	83.3%	86%	89%	100%
Male	34%	25%	16.7%	14%	11%	0%
<i>Race/Ethnicity:</i>						
African-American	54%	70%	88.8%	86%	44%	80%
Hispanic	0%	20%	5.6%	0%	33%	20%
White	40%	0%	5.6%	14%	0%	0%



**Table 2.1. Demographic Characteristics of Focus Group Participants**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	Omaha	New Haven	New York
Other	6%	10%	0.0%	0%	23%	0%
<i>Age:</i>						
18-24	6%	9.5%	11.1%	0%	22%	0%
25-29	14%	0%	11.1%	21%	11%	10%
30-39	20%	14.3%	33.3%	50%	11%	60%
40-49	26%	14.3%	16.7%	7%	56%	20%
50-62	26%	28.6%	22.2%	21%	0%	10%
62+	9%	28.6%	5.6%	0%	0%	0%



**Table 2.1. Demographic Characteristics of Focus Group Participants**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	Omaha	New Haven	New York
<i>Educational Attainment:</i>						
Grade School Only	9%	9.5%	0.0%	0%	0%	0%
Some High School	9%	23.8%	22.2%	14%	11%	20%
High School Grad/GED	26%	9.5%	50.0%	29%	22%	30%
Some College	31%	28.6%	11.1%	50%	56%	20%
2 Year College	9%	9.5%	16.7%	0%	0%	0%
3+ years of college	18%	9.6%	0.0%	7%	11%	30%



**Table 2.1. Demographic Characteristics of Focus Group Participants**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	Omaha	New Haven	New York
<i>Average years in development</i>	2.6	11.3	N/A	17.1	N/C	1.65
<i>N</i>	35	22	18	14	12	10



### 2.3 Post-Site Visit Activities

After returning from its site visit, each research team prepared interview notes and transcribed focus group tapes. In addition, the research teams reviewed materials provided by key informants during site visits. This material was used to prepare detailed case studies<sup>22</sup> for each site that included: (1) a history of the lawsuit, (2) a discussion of the site's regional demographic trends, (3) a description of the housing authority and the racial characteristics of its tenants, (4) a discussion of the specific elements contained within the site's decree, (5) an assessment of progress made in implementing decree elements, and (6) a discussion of the effects of the decree on PHA tenants in that site.

The statistical data were cleaned and geocoded in order to compute baseline segregation measures that are presented in Chapter 6. Development-level public housing data were geocoded in order to identify a development's census tract and location-specific latitude and longitude.<sup>23</sup> Some sites did not provide development-level data. In these sites, the data were aggregated at the census tract level. A similar procedure was used for Section 8 data. Address-level Section 8 data were geocoded in order to identify a resident's census tract as well as the latitude and longitude of each certificate holder.<sup>24</sup> All geocoding was done using Mapinfo with a combination of Wessex street map files as well as 1990 census tract boundary files. The statistical data were used to generate maps containing information about the spatial distribution and racial composition of public housing developments and Section 8 certificate holders.

---

<sup>22</sup>The case studies are presented in: *Baseline Assessment of Public Housing Cases: Case Studies, Volume II*. Report prepared by the Urban Institute for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research. Washington, D.C: The Urban Institute.

<sup>23</sup>Data about public housing residents within a census tract were aggregated in order to compute segregation measures for public housing residents at the tract level contained in Table 6-2. The latitude and longitude for public housing developments were used to generate spatial autocorrelation measures for developments' racial composition presented in Table 6-1.

<sup>24</sup>The latitude and longitude of Section 8 addresses were used to conduct the Nearest Neighbor and cluster analyses presented in Chapter 6. Section 8 data were aggregated to the tract level in order to compute Section 8 indices at the tract level presented in Table 6-3.



These maps presented housing authority information along with the racial composition of census tracts within the housing authority's jurisdictional area and were included in each sites' case study.



---

<b>CHAPTER 2 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.0 Introduction.....	13
2.1 Activities Prior to the Site Visit.....	14
2.2 On-site Activities.....	14
2.3 Post-Site Visit Activities .....	18





## CHAPTER 3

### BASELINE MEASURES OF SEGREGATION

#### 3.0 Introduction

The core issue in all the court cases that led to the decrees under study is PHA maintenance of racially segregated housing. Hence a central task of the baseline assessment is to measure, as well as possible, the extent to which PHA residents were living in segregated residential environments at the time of the decrees. These measures can then be used as a comparison to updated segregation indices that will be calculated as part of a long-term impact evaluation with data collected from a post-baseline time period. If the remedies have been effective in reducing segregation, the indices' values in the future should reflect lower levels of segregation.

According to Massey and Denton (1988) segregation is a multifaceted construct that includes evenness, exposure, concentration, centralization, and clustering. As shown in Table 3.1, each dimension captures an unique aspect of residential segregation, and so requires different indices to measure all five separately.

The measures presented in this chapter capture these five different aspects of segregation. Since the decrees affected more than one type of housing authority program participant (i.e., both public housing and Section 8 tenants), we cannot simply characterize the segregation patterns among public housing



residents. As a result, we have calculated segregation indices for public housing residents and Section 8 certificate holders, as well as a combination of both types of subsidy recipients.<sup>25</sup>

### 3.1 Public Housing Segregation Measures at the Development Level

In this section we present baseline measures of evenness, exposure, and clustering for residents in public housing developments. Overall, these indices show that African-American public housing residents lived in segregated housing developments prior to the decrees taking effect. This is not too much of a surprise: a central focus of the cases included in this study was the high level of segregation within public housing at each site. Our indices provide confirmation that African-American public housing residents in Allegheny County, Buffalo, Dallas, New Haven, New York, and Omaha, at baseline periods, lived in developments that had very high proportions of black residents.

Type of Segregation	Description	Index Description	Index Interpretation
Evenness	Extent to which the distribution of two social groups is identical to that of the entire city.	Dissimilarity (D). This index expresses the proportion of the minority population that would have to move into another areal unit in order to have each census tract or development's minority proportion equal the overall city's minority population proportion.	A dissimilarity index varies from 0 to 1.0; values near 0 mean that the area is perfectly integrated—each census tract's minority population proportion is the same as the region. A value of 1.0 means that nearly all of the minorities would have to move into a different census tract or development in order for each unit's minority population proportion to be equal to the city's overall minority population proportion. Massey

<sup>25</sup>All of the indices measure the spatial distribution of white and black residents as defined by the PHA because some PHAs did not have separate data for Hispanic residents.

<b>Table 3.1. Description of Segregation Measures</b>			
Type of Segregation	Description	Index Description	Index Interpretation
			and Denton (1993) use a rule of thumb: dissimilarity scores below 30 represent low levels of segregation; between 30 and 60 are moderate levels of segregation; and scores above 60 represent high levels of segregation.
Exposure	The probability that a member of one group will come into residential contact with a member of another group.	An exposure index measures the likelihood of one type of group member sharing a neighborhood with another type of city resident. Mathematically, it represents the average population proportion of one group in a census tract or development containing minority residents.	The exposure index varies from 0 to the total proportion of the population that is made up of the other group. It measures the extent to which one group resides in an areal unit with another group. An exposure index of 0 means that one group does not live in census tracts or developments with another group; there is almost no possibility of residential contact between these groups. Exposure indices that approach 1.0 mean that members of one group are almost certain to live in neighborhoods with other group members.
Concentration	The extent to which minority group members live in neighborhoods that consist of a large share of the city's total land area.	The total area of tracts that contain minority members as a proportion of the city's total land area.	This measure varies from 0 to 1.0; lower values indicate that minorities live in census tracts that account for a small proportion of the city's total land area.
Centralization	The extent to which minority group members live in census tracts near the city center.	The weighted average distance, in miles, of group members' residential location from a central location within the city.	The measure is expressed in terms of miles from a city's central business district; smaller distances mean that group members are more likely to reside near a city's central business district.
Clustering	The extent to which minority residents either live in areal units	We use three spatial statistical measures: spatial autocorrelation,	Spatial autocorrelation measures deviate from either 1 or $n/n-1$ (depending on the measure) when a variable's value in any given census tract or development is similar

**Table 3.1. Description of Segregation Measures**

Type of Segregation	Description	Index Description	Index Interpretation
	that adjoin one another, or reside in non-random patterns.	<p>nearest neighbor index, and standard radius to assess clustering.</p> <p><i>Spatial autocorrelation:</i> measures the extent to which the value of a census tract’s variable is similar to nearby census tracts.</p> <p><i>Nearest Neighbor Index:</i> measures the extent to which group members’ location across a city differs from a random pattern.</p> <p><i>Standard Radius:</i> measures the size of spatial clusters in which a large number of group members reside.</p>	<p>to those nearby. In the absence of spatial autocorrelation, values should vary across a city, and spatial patterns would not be observed. Conversely, values of proximate census tracts and developments will be close to one another when spatial autocorrelation is present.</p> <p>The nearest neighbor measure varies from 0 to 2.149. Lower values indicate that residential patterns are different from those that would be expected if group members were randomly allocated across the city.</p> <p>The standard radius measures, in meters, the size of the ellipse that contains the highest proportion of group member residents. A relatively small standard radius mean that group members live in smaller areas; they reside in smaller enclaves.</p>

The indices included in this section were calculated using data that measured the racial composition of individual public housing developments within the case study cities that provided this type of information. The evenness measure, then, shows the proportion of African-American public housing residents that would have to move into different developments in order to make each development’s black population proportion equal to the overall proportion for all PHA developments. Similarly, the exposure indices presented later in this section measure the probability that an African-American resident in a given development resided in a development with a white resident at the baseline period. The spatial autocorrelation measures provide information about the extent to which each development’s black population proportion was similar to nearby developments, thereby measuring the extent to which



predominantly African-American developments were clustered near one another. In addition, the analysis contains information about the extent to which African-American public housing residents are likely to reside near the city center, which is a measure of centralization.

Table 3.2 presents the segregation measures for public housing residents in six of the eight case study sites, using individual developments as the unit of analysis.<sup>26</sup> Specifically, the table reports development level dissimilarity and exposure indices.<sup>27 28</sup> The dissimilarity measure, which ranges between 0 and 1, reflects the percentage of African-American residents that would have to move to make each public housing development's racial proportion equal the overall average. For example, Buffalo's dissimilarity index of 0.64 means that 64 percent of black public housing residents in Buffalo would have had to move in order to have each development within that city's housing authority's jurisdiction have the same racial composition as the black population proportion for all Buffalo public housing developments.

According to Massey and Denton (1993), while dissimilarity indices range between 0 and 1.0, dissimilarity indices over 0.6 indicate a high level of segregation; values below 0.3 represent low segregation levels; and values between 0.3 and 0.6 indicate moderate levels of segregation. Given this rule of thumb, the baseline dissimilarity index in all sites shows that public housing developments were highly segregated prior to the date of the decree: the dissimilarity index for public housing residents in all six sites with suitable data is above 0.6. This means that in each site, at least 60 percent of African-American public

---

<sup>26</sup>We were unable to calculate an entropy index because it uses the logarithm of the racial composition of a public housing development. And since some developments only have one group, it is impossible to calculate the entropy index for that site. In addition, we did not calculate the spatial differentiation index developed by Maly and Nyden (1998) because it does not provide information about segregation for more than one development or tract at a time.

<sup>27</sup>We were unable to secure baseline development-level racial composition data for Minneapolis and East Texas. In both sites, the PHAs only had data aggregated at the census tract level.

<sup>28</sup>The dissimilarity measure formula is  $\sum_{\text{for } l=1 \text{ to } N} [(b_i/B) - (w_i/W)]^2 / 2$  where  $b_i$  = the number of group B in either tract or development I; B = total group members B in all developments or tracts;  $w_i$  = number of group W in development or tract I, W = total number of group W in all developments or tracts. The exposure index =  $\sum_{\text{for } l=1 \text{ to } N} [(b_i/B) * (x_i/T_i)]$  where  $b_i$  = the number of group B in either tract or development I; B = total number of group B members in all developments or tracts,  $x_i$  = number of group x in development or tract I and  $T_i$  = total population in development or tract I.

housing residents, at the baseline period, would have to move into another development in order to have each development’s population proportion of black residents equal that of the overall African-American population proportion in public housing developments.

Exposure indices measure the probability that a member of one group will come into residential contact with a member of another group, and ranges between 0, in the case of perfect segregation and, as an upper limit that represents perfect segregation, the proportion of the total population made up of the other group. For example, a black public housing resident in Dallas, as of 1990, would have had a 5 percent chance of being exposed to a white resident within his or her development. This pattern is also reflected in the within-race exposure indices for black public housing residents. This index measures the probability that a group member living in a particular public housing development will be exposed to another group member within that development. In New Haven, for example, black public housing residents in a development had a nearly 90 percent chance of being exposed to another black resident, or equivalently, their developments are 90 percent black, on average at the baseline period. All of the within-race exposure measures for black public housing residents in the six sites indicate a high level of segregation.

**Table 3.2. Development-level Segregation Measures of Public Housing Residents**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	New Haven	New York	Omaha
BW Dissimilarity	0.60	0.64	0.61	0.66	0.74	0.71
B exposure to W	0.30	0.11	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.18
W exposure to B	0.25	0.41	0.67	0.51	0.30	0.20
B exposure to B	0.69	0.76	0.88	0.87	0.66	0.79
		*				

**Table 3.2. Development-level Segregation Measures of Public Housing Residents**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	New Haven	New York	Omaha
Moran's I for % B (p: H <sub>0</sub> =0)**	0.12 (0.30294)		0.16 (0.12470)	0.45 (0.00083)	0.05 (0.24551)	0.53 (0.0012)
Geary's C for % B (p: H <sub>0</sub> =0)**	0.81 (0.2658)	*	0.64 (0.1620)	0.54 (0.00289)	0.95 (0.3341)	0.47 (0.0036)
Baseline data year	1995	1996	1990	1991	1990	1990
Decree effective	1994	1996	1987	1995	1992	1994
* Not enough observations for computing statistic						
** Statistic shows the probability that true parameter is equal to zero						

Table 3.2 also includes two measures of the spatial autocorrelation of the percentage black of public housing developments in four sites.<sup>29</sup> The spatial autocorrelation coefficients measure the extent to which a development's racial composition is more similar to nearby developments as compared to ones farther away (Anselin 1992), and so is one measure of the extent to which minority residents are clustered

<sup>29</sup>The spatial autocorrelation measures are based on a distance weight matrix that has information on the distance between all developments. Some developments are extremely close to one another, and so were geocoded to the same latitude/longitude coordinate. Since the distance between such developments is 0, data were aggregated for developments sharing an identical latitude/longitude location. As a result, Buffalo did not have more than 20 developments in the spatial autocorrelation analysis, which is the minimum number of observations required to generate a spatial autocorrelation measure (Anselin, 1992).



near one another.<sup>30</sup> The racial composition of public housing developments in New Haven and Omaha had a high degree of spatial autocorrelation at the baseline period. This means that developments with a high proportion of black residents, in these sites, tended to be located near other developments with similar racial compositions.

### 3.2 Public Housing Segregation Measures at the Census Tract Level

In this section we analyze the extent to which African-American public housing residents lived in different neighborhood contexts, as measured by the black, low-income and lower educational attainment population proportions in census tracts containing public housing developments. While each decree was designed to reduce public housing segregation, the remedies were created to allow class members to move into better neighborhoods. As a result, we calculated exposure indices of black and white public housing residents using tract-level measures of public housing residents using measures that aggregated information about public housing developments in census tracts, rather than for each development.

Table 3.3 reports segregation measures for public housing residents using the census tract as the unit of analysis, rather than individual developments. These measures were generated by aggregating public housing development data by census tract and matching the demographic and socioeconomic conditions of neighborhoods that contain public housing. While African-American residents lived in public housing developments that had high proportions of non-white residents, the developments were generally located racially diverse census tracts. However, developments with high proportions of African-American residents tended to be located in tracts with more lower income residents who had lower educational attainment levels.

---

<sup>30</sup>Moran's I is similar to a correlation coefficient that is centered on  $-1/(N-1)$ . The mean value of Moran's I will tend to zero as the sample size increases. The mean for Geary's C is 1, where values less than 1 indicate positive spatial autocorrelation (values more proximate to one another are more similar). For a technical discussion see Anselin (1992:22-2).





---

The exposure indices indicate that the average black public housing resident in five sites: Buffalo, Dallas, East Texas, New York and Omaha lived in census tracts that had a black population proportion over 50 percent. New Haven's within-race exposure index most likely reflects the fact that so many public housing developments in that city are in tracts with a high proportion of Hispanic residents. The smallest within-race exposure index values are located in Allegheny County, a suburban PHA and Minneapolis, a city with a relatively small black population.

African-American public housing residents in seven sites lived in census tracts with a higher proportion of lower educated residents (one indication of socio-economic status) than white public housing residents in those cities. In Dallas, for example, black public housing resident lived in a census tract where an average of 51 percent of adult residents had not completed high school—compared to white public housing residents who lived in census tracts where, on average, 34 percent of the residents had not completed high school. In four sites: Buffalo, East Texas, Minneapolis and New Haven, black public housing residents were much more likely to be exposed to census tract residents with an income less than \$10,000 in 1990. This pattern was reversed, however, in Dallas and Omaha, where white public housing residents lived in tracts with a higher proportion of poorer residents.

In six sites, African-American public housing residents tended to live in developments closer to the city center.<sup>31</sup> In Dallas, for example, black public housing residents, on average, lived in developments about 4 miles from central Dallas, as compared to whites who lived in developments 6 miles from that city's center. Allegheny County residents, because they live in sites located in the suburbs surrounding Pittsburgh, are located the farthest from the city center among all eight sites.

---

<sup>31</sup>This is a variant of the centralization index presented in Massey and Denton (1988:291) that measures the degree to which a group is spatially located near the center of an urban area.

**Table 3.3. Tract-level Segregation Measures of Public Housing Residents**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	East Texas	Minneapolis <sup>1</sup>	New Haven	New York	Omaha
B exposure to tract W	0.73	0.36	0.18	0.10	0.61	0.51	0.24	0.38
W exposure to tract B	0.14	0.15	0.34	0.57	0.11	0.26	0.51	0.55
B exposure to tract B	0.19	0.57	0.71	0.86	0.21	0.42	0.56	0.59
B exposure to tract % less than high school degree	0.29	0.44	0.51	0.30	0.27	0.30	0.48	0.36
W exposure to tract % less than high school degree	0.27	0.33	0.34	0.27	0.23	0.29	0.48	0.30
B exposure to tract % income less than \$10,000	0.27	0.49	0.53	0.39	0.35	0.29	0.41	0.38
W exposure to tract % income less than \$10,000	0.25	0.32	0.69	0.35	0.29	0.23	0.40	0.44
B public housing residents average distance from city center	7.88	3.00	3.90	N/A	1.84	1.75	6.70	1.39
W public housing residents average distance from city center	9.74	3.30	6.00	N/A	2.00	1.56	7.90	1.34
Baseline data year	1994	1996	1990	1995	1994	1994	1990	1990
Decree effective	1994	1996	1987	1985	1995	1995	1992	1994

**Table 3.3. Tract-level Segregation Measures of Public Housing Residents**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	East Texas	Minneapolis <sup>1</sup>	New Haven	New York	Omaha
<sup>1</sup> The Moran's I for Minneapolis tracts with black public housing residents is 0.035; the Geary's C is 0.953. Neither statistic is significant at p=.05.								



### 3.3 Segregation Measures for Section 8 Certificate Holders

In this section we present baseline segregation measures of exposure, clustering, centralization, and concentration for Section 8 certificate holders. Each of these indices were calculated by using tract-level information: the indices provide information about the baseline neighborhood conditions for Section 8 certificate holders. In general, black assisted tenants did not live in highly segregated census tract, rather they lived in racially diverse neighborhoods which had relatively stable non-white population proportions. But, black assisted tenants tended to live in tracts with higher proportions of lower income residents than did assisted white residents.

Table 3.4 presents segregation measures for Section 8 residents in six sites.<sup>32</sup> As we did for public housing residents, we calculated exposure and spatial autocorrelation indices for Section 8 holders at the census tract level. We also calculated a concentration index for black Section 8 holders by dividing the total square miles contained within census tracts with a black Section 8 holder by the total square miles within the PHA's jurisdictional area.<sup>33</sup> This measure shows the extent to which black Section 8 certificate holders are "concentrated" in identifiable geographic areas within the larger metropolitan area.

As the table indicates, in all six sites African-American Section 8 certificate holders lived in racially diverse census tracts: black Section 8 certificate holders lived in tracts with a black population proportion ranging from 32 percent in Minneapolis to 48 percent in Dallas. While African-American Section 8 certificate holders lived in racially diverse tracts, in four sites: Allegheny County, Buffalo, Minneapolis and Omaha they lived in census tracts with higher proportions of residents with very low incomes as compared to white certificate holders. In Buffalo, for example, black Section 8 certificate holders had a 30 percent

---

<sup>32</sup>The sites in East Texas did not have data on the race of Section 8 certificate holders. New York did not provide Section 8 data because the decree only had remedial elements affecting public housing assignment procedures.

<sup>33</sup>This is a variant of the concentration index presented in Massey and Denton (1988: 289) that measures the amount of physical space occupied by a particular group.

chance of coming into residential contact with a tract resident whose income was less than \$10,000, compared to a 21 percent chance for white Section 8 certificate holders.

Although African-American Section 8 certificate holders lived in racially diverse tracts, census tracts with higher proportions of black residents tended to be located near one another, as indicated by the spatial autocorrelation measures for the number of black Section 8 certificate holders in a given census tract.<sup>34</sup> In addition to being clustered near one another, Black Section 8 certificate holders also were more likely than whites to live near the city center in Allegheny County, Buffalo, Minneapolis, New Haven and Omaha. Black Section 8 certificate holders were not only highly centralized in most sites, they also are located in census tracts that do not account for a large portion of the total area. In Allegheny County, for example, black Section 8 certificate holders live in census tracts that account for slightly more than 11 percent of that County's area. The one exception is in Buffalo, where black Section 8 certificate holders lived in census tracts that account for slightly more than half of the Erie County region. The reason for this result is that some black Section 8 certificate holders who received their subsidy from the Belmont Shelter Corporation lived in large tracts in Erie County. However, these residents account for a small proportion of total black Section 8 certificate holders in the region.

**Table 3.4. Tract-level Segregation Measures of Section 8 Certificate Holders Residents**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	Minneapolis	New Haven	Omaha
B exposure to tract W	0.61	0.55	0.40	0.55	0.48	0.57
W exposure to tract B	0.08	0.13	0.21	0.15	0.29	0.15
B exposure to tract B	0.39	0.41	0.48	0.32	0.43	0.39

<sup>34</sup>Both spatial autocorrelation measures (Moran's I and Geary's C) are statistically significant in Allegheny County, Buffalo, Minneapolis and New Haven at the .01 level.



**Table 3.4. Tract-level Segregation Measures of Section 8 Certificate Holders Residents**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	Minneapolis	New Haven	Omaha
B exposure to tract % less than high school degree	0.27	0.32	0.29	0.27	0.31	0.24
W exposure to tract % less than high school degree	0.25	0.26	0.33	0.21	0.33	0.20
B exposure to tract % income less than \$10,000	0.25	0.30	0.20	0.26	0.23	0.27
W exposure to tract % income less than \$10,000	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.22	0.23	0.21
Moran's I for # B Section 8 holders in tract (p: H <sub>0</sub> =0)	0.29 (0.00000)	0.26 (0.0000)	0.03 (0.53032)	0.34 (0.00000)	0.42 (0.0000)	0.11 (0.09894)
Geary's C for # B Section 8 holders in tract (p: H <sub>0</sub> =0)	0.76 (0.00000)	0.83 (0.0000)	0.96 (0.5274)	0.71 (0.00000)	0.72 (0.0000)	0.92 (0.30382)
Average B Section 8 certificate holders' distance from city center (in miles)	9.00	4.20	6.90	2.50	1.74	2.20
Average W Section 8 certificate holders' distance from city center (in miles)	9.50	5.90	6.70	2.60	2.07	3.65
B concentration index	0.11	0.52	0.13	0.08	0.15	0.28

**Table 3.4. Tract-level Segregation Measures of Section 8 Certificate Holders Residents**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	Minneapolis	New Haven	Omaha
W concentration index	0.40	0.78	0.05	0.08	0.15	0.57
Baseline data year	1994	1998	1990	1990	1996	1990
Decree effective	1994	1996	1987	1995	1995	1994

White Section 8 Certificate holders, with the exception of Dallas, live in areas that comprise either higher or the same proportion of the land area in a PHA's jurisdiction. The most striking difference is in Allegheny County, where white Section 8 certificate holders lived in tracts with an area almost four times that of the African-American Section 8 certificate holders.

Comparing Tables 3.3 and 3.4, black Section 8 certificate holders, on average, live in census tracts with smaller proportions of black residents in Buffalo, Dallas and Omaha compared to black public housing residents. The largest difference is in Dallas, where census tracts with black public housing residents, on average, had a black population proportion 23 percentage points higher than the average for tracts with black Section 8 certificate holders. In other words, black Section 8 certificate holders in Dallas were much more likely to live in census tracts with higher proportions of white residents. Note, however, this pattern was reversed in Allegheny County and Minneapolis, where black Section 8 certificate holders, on average, lived in census tracts with a higher proportion of black residents than black public housing residents.

In all six sites that provided Section 8 data, black Section 8 certificate holders, on average, lived in higher socioeconomic status census tracts than black public housing residents. The largest difference was in Dallas, where black public housing residents were about 75 percent more likely to live in a census tract with a resident with less than a high school degree, and more than twice as likely to live in a tract with a resident with an income less than \$10,000 as compared to black public housing residents. Moreover,



black Section 8 certificate holders, on average, lived farther away the city center than black public housing residents.

### 3.4 Segregation Measures for All Assisted Tenants

The analysis in this section combines information about public housing residents and Section 8 certificate holders: it provides baseline information about all assisted tenants in six of the case study sites. Since it combines this information, we included an exposure index that measures the extent to which assisted tenants, at baseline, lived in neighborhoods undergoing racial transition, as measured by a census tract's change in African-American population proportion between 1990 and 1980.

Table 3.5 combines public housing and Section 8 information from six sites at the tract level.<sup>35</sup> The table presents exposure indices as well as measures that indicate the average distance white and black assisted residents live from each sites' city center. In addition, the table presents a measure of assisted residents' exposure to racial transition at the census tract level, which is measured in terms of the change in a census tract's black population proportion between 1990 and 1980. For example, white assisted residents in Buffalo, on average, lived in census tracts where the proportion of black residents increased about 2 percentage points between 1980 and 1990.

As the table indicates, assisted African-American residents in four sites providing both public housing and Section 8 data, on average, live in census tracts that have a black population proportion over 50 percent. The two exceptions, Allegheny County and Minneapolis, are unusual in that Allegheny County is a suburban housing authority, and Minneapolis has the lowest black population proportion of the other urban sites, although the city's black population proportion was similar to Omaha's.

---

<sup>35</sup>We did not calculate combined measures for East Texas since that site did not provide Section 8 data with race information, nor did we calculate combined measures in New York, where Section 8 was not affected by the decree.





Black assisted residents in five sites, on average, were more likely to live in census tracts with higher proportions of residents without a high school degree as well as, in four sites, residents with incomes less than \$10,000. African-American assisted residents in Allegheny County, Buffalo, Dallas and New Haven were more likely to live in tracts with residents who did not complete high school and had incomes less than \$10,000. In Minneapolis black assisted residents were less likely to live in census tracts with residents who did not have a high school degree and incomes less than \$10,000 compared to white assisted residents. In Omaha, assisted blacks were more likely than assisted whites to live in tracts with residents who did not complete high school, but were less likely to live in census tracts with very poor residents than assisted whites.

Assisted blacks in Allegheny County and Buffalo were more likely to have lived in census tracts experiencing a higher level of racial transition than assisted whites in those two sites. On the other hand, assisted whites in Dallas lived in tracts undergoing higher levels of racial transition as compared to black residents. In Minneapolis, New Haven and Omaha, however, there were no differences in the level of census tract racial transition for assisted whites and blacks.

### **3.5 Clustering Analysis of Section 8 Certificate Holders**

Clustering is an aspect of segregation that measures the extent to which minority group members live near one another. In Sections 3.1, 3.3, and 3.4 we presented spatial autocorrelation coefficients that measure the extent to which (1) a public housing development's African-American population proportion was similar to other developments, and (2) a census tract's number of Section 8 certificate holders and assisted residents was similar in value to nearby tracts. We supplement these clustering measures with two additional measures of clustering presented in Table 3.6: nearest neighbor analysis and standard radius. Both of these measures analyze the locational patterns of individuals, rather than aggregate tract level data. Moreover, the techniques used to calculate the two measures are relatively new, and require analysts to make decisions regarding the size of the area to include in the analysis. Therefore, in this section we detail the assumptions we used in constructing the relevant analytical area so that researchers

conducting the long-term impact evaluation will be able to make similar calculations using data collected from a post-baseline time period, and will allow the long-term impact evaluation team to compare the spatial distribution of Section 8 certificate usage over time.

**Table 3.5. Tract-level Segregation Measures of All Assisted Residents**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	Minneapolis	New Haven	Omaha
B exposure to tract W	0.69	0.46	0.28	0.59	0.28	0.45
W exposure to tract B	0.11	0.14	0.28	0.12	0.50	0.41
B exposure to tract B	0.26	0.49	0.61	0.27	0.42	0.52
B exposure to tract % less than high school degree	0.29	0.37	0.39	0.23	0.31	0.31
W exposure to tract % less than high school degree	0.26	0.28	0.32	0.32	0.31	0.26
B exposure to tract % income less than \$10,000	0.26	0.38	0.38	0.27	0.25	0.34
W exposure to tract % income less than \$10,000	0.23	0.23	0.26	0.32	0.23	0.36
B exposure to racial transition	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.02
W exp to racial transition	0.03	0.02	0.09	0.02	0.05	0.02

**Table 3.5. Tract-level Segregation Measures of All Assisted Residents**

	Allegheny County	Buffalo	Dallas	Minneapolis	New Haven	Omaha
Average B assisted residents' distance from city center (in miles)	8.18	3.70	5.30	2.00	1.74	1.69
Average W assisted residents' distance from city center (in miles)	9.59	5.50	6.30	2.10	1.89	2.13

Table 3.6 presents the results of a Nearest Neighbor Analysis of black and white Section 8 certificate holders in Allegheny County, Buffalo and Omaha.<sup>36</sup> In general, African-American Section 8 holders lived in smaller geographic areas compared to whites, indicating that black Section 8 certificate holders, prior to implementing the decrees, had different residential patterns when compared to whites.

**Table 3.6. Nearest Neighbor Analysis Results**

	Allegheny County		Buffalo				New Haven	
			Rental Assistance Corporation		Belmont Shelter			
Measure	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	Blacks	Whites	Whites	Blacks

<sup>36</sup>A Nearest Neighbor Analysis is based on point files, where each observation indicates the exact location and race of individual Section 8 certificate holders. As a result, we could not conduct Nearest Neighbor Analyses for sites that did not have individual-level Section 8 data (Dallas and Minneapolis) or have information about the certificate holder's race (East Texas). In addition, the software used to conduct the Nearest Neighbor Analysis (STAC) could not analyze Omaha data because that city fell between two regions in the country that the software uses to partition the United States.

Nearest Neighbor Index R ( $p:H_0=0$ )	0.32 (0.00)	0.23 (0.00)	0.34 (0.00)	0.36 (0.00)	0.35 (0.00)	0.21 (0.00)	0.36 (0.00)	0.28 (0.00)
Standard Radius (in meters)	12,337	7,089	3,615	3,351	10,403	14,334	3,127	2,861
Percent of observations within 1 standard distance	62.8	74.9	69.4	60.7	83.4	76.2	69.6	69.4
Percent of observations within 2 standard distance	97.3	90.3	96.1	97.5	95.0	92.9	97.7	97.7

The Nearest Neighbor Analysis uses an iterative search process that identifies the extent to which an observed point pattern cluster has occurred by chance (Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1996:7). The Nearest Neighbor Index R indicates the extent to which Section 8 certificate holders are randomly scattered as compared to clustered near one another.

The R Index varies between 0, indicating a highly clustered pattern, to 2.149 indicating a perfectly random pattern. In all three sites, the R index indicates that white and black Section 8 certificate holders lived in spatial clusters, rather than in random locations scattered throughout the metropolitan area. In addition, the standard radius, which measures the extent to which observations are located away from the center of the distribution of all observations, shows that the white Section 8 certificate holders are less clustered as compared to black certificate holders. For example, the Standard Radius for African-American Section 8 certificate holders in Allegheny County is about one-half as large as for whites.

This pattern is evident in the maps presented in Figures 3.1 through 3.4. The maps in these figures show the most prevalent clusters of black and white Section 8 certificate holders in Allegheny County, Buffalo<sup>37</sup> and New Haven. The green ellipses represent clusters of white Section 8 certificate holders, while red

<sup>37</sup>Figure 3.2 shows the location of clusters for Section 8 certificates administered by the Rental Assistance Corporation for the City of Buffalo. Figure 3.3 presents identical information for Section 8 certificates administered by the Belmont Shelter Corporation for the Erie County Consortium of Towns and Villages.



ellipses indicate clusters of black Section 8 certificate holders. Ellipses identify especially dense clusters of black and white Section 8 certificate holders.



**Table 3.7. Parameters Used to Generate Cluster Ellipses**

		Buffalo <sup>1</sup>		
	Allegheny County	Rental Assistance Corporation	Belmont Shelter	New Haven
Search Radius (in meters)	800	500	1,000	500
Lower left X-coordinate <sup>2</sup>	564963.0	669819.0	655407.0	668530.0
Lower left y coordinate <sup>2</sup>	4455353.0	4743360.0	4702083.0	4566438.0
Upper right x-coordinate <sup>2</sup>	611024.0	679855.0	705673.0	680202.0
Upper right y-coordinate <sup>2</sup>	4500300.0	4759306.0	4770751.0	4584403.0
Scan Type	Rectangular	Rectangular	Rectangular	Rectangular
Minimum number of observations in a cluster	20	20	20	20

<sup>1</sup> We calculated ellipses separately for certificates administered by the Rental Assistance Corporation and Belmont Shelter because of differences in the geographic distribution of the location of residents using certificates issued by each organization. Since the Rental Assistance Corporation administers the Section 8 program for the City of Buffalo, residents using certificates issued by the Rental Assistance Corporation typically locate within the City of Buffalo, a much smaller geographic area than suburban Erie County. Belmont Shelter Section 8 certificate holders tend to locate across a broader area of Erie County.

<sup>2</sup> The coordinate system used by STAC is based on a Cartesian Bureau of Land Management grid system that is converted into longitude and latitude by the software program. The reported coordinates are Bureau of Land Management coordinates.

In order to generate ellipses, STAC requires a user to identify the overall search area—defined in terms of the area’s lower left and upper right coordinates, the search radius and number of minimum numbers of



observations per cluster. These parameters are generated in an iterative process. Table 3.7 presents the parameters used in each of the analyses conducted to identify clusters of white and black Section 8 certificate holders.<sup>38</sup> By using these parameters, the long-term impact evaluation team will be able to compare the spatial allocation of Section 8 certificate holders to the baseline period.

The maps presented in Figures 3.1 through 3.4 indicate that white and black clusters of Section 8 certificate holders in Allegheny County and the Buffalo area tend to not overlap. This pattern means that black and white Section 8 certificate holders live as a whole in separate parts of the metropolitan area. For example, the largest cluster of black Section 8 certificate holders in the City of Buffalo is in the far northeast section of the city, while the largest white cluster is located on Buffalo's westside. Similarly, clusters of black Section 8 certificate holders in Allegheny County are located in census tracts with a high proportion of black residents that border Pittsburgh on the east. Conversely, white clusters of Section 8 certificate holders in Allegheny County are in tracts with a small proportion of black residents and located farther away from Pittsburgh. The ellipses presented in Figure 3.4, which seem to indicate that black and white Section 8 certificate holders share clusters, are deceiving because most of the white Section 8 certificate holders who live in New Haven are actually Hispanic. Therefore, the map shows a pattern where black and Hispanic Section 8 certificate holders live in similar areas of New Haven, rather than racial integration of blacks and non-Hispanic whites.

### 3.6 Conclusion

---

<sup>38</sup>There are only general guidelines that relate to choosing parameters. A search area should be large enough to include most of the observations. However, too large a search area will result in too many clusters that cover a large geographic area. In addition, the search radius must be large enough to capture clusters that are meaningful. Most crime-related Nearest Neighbor Analysis uses a search radius of one-block (or about 200 meters) because analysts want to pinpoint precise locations of high levels of criminal activity. A 200 meter search radius would be too small to identify clusters of Section 8 certificate holders. Turner and Mickelson (1992) used search radii of 1.3 miles and 3.0 miles for an analysis of steering of racial minorities by real estate agents in Atlanta and Chicago, respectively. These were generated by dividing the total number of observations by the total search area. Our analysis, however, indicates that the search radii generated by such an approach were too large. Therefore, we used search radii of either one-half to three-quarters of a mile (500 to 1,000 meters) in each site.



Our baseline segregation measures indicate that public housing developments in sites that provided data were segregated. The dissimilarity and exposure measures in Allegheny County, Buffalo, Dallas, New Haven, New York and Omaha all show that black and white public housing residents lived in different developments, separated by race. Moreover, in most sites, black public housing residents lived in census tracts with higher proportions of lower educated and poor residents when compared to white public housing residents.

Baseline segregation measures of Section 8 certificate holders also show racial differences. Black Section 8 certificate holders tend to be located in census tracts with higher proportions of black residents, in tracts with a higher proportion of residents with incomes less than \$10,000 and in areas located closer to city centers when compared to white Section 8 certificate holders. In addition, African-American Section 8 certificate holders tend to reside in clusters that cover a smaller geographic area as compared to white certificate holders.





**FIGURE 3.1 ON THIS PAGE**



**FIGURE 3.2 ON THIS PAGE**



**FIGURE 3.3 ON THIS PAGE**



**FIGURE 3.4 ON THIS PAGE**



---

<b>CHAPTER 3 BASELINE MEASURES OF SEGREGATION .....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.0 Introduction.....	19
3.1 Public Housing Segregation Measures at the Development Level.....	19
3.2 Public Housing Segregation Measures at the Census Tract Level .....	24
3.3 Segregation Measures for Section 8 Certificate Holders.....	26
3.4 Segregation Measures for All Assisted Tenants.....	28
3.5 Clustering Analysis of Section 8 Certificate Holders .....	29
3.6 Conclusion.....	33



## CHAPTER 4

### ELEMENTS OF THE CONSENT DECREES AND PROGRESS TO DATE

#### 4.0 Overview

The consent decrees in the eight case study sites are intended to provide relief to plaintiff class members who have sued because of the unacceptable condition of their housing and the limitations on their housing choices. Although remedies differ by site, common forms of relief have included: unifying housing authority waiting lists (sometimes with race-conscious tenant assignment plans); demolishing, replacing, and modernizing public housing; providing Section 8 vouchers and certificates; providing mobility counseling to those using Section 8 subsidies; and building scattered-site public housing. Overall, our findings indicate that while all housing authorities in our sample have implemented some elements of the decrees, progress has been mixed and all have encountered significant obstacles. Most of the housing authorities have implemented those remedies over which they have direct control—changing tenant selection and assignment plans and demolishing or modernizing deteriorated developments. Remedies that have required more coordination or cooperation among different agencies have generally proven more difficult to implement, including: the construction of any new scattered-site housing, the provision of all the required Section 8 vouchers and certificates, the establishment of mobility counseling programs, and the improvement of neighborhoods surrounding public housing developments. In the following section we first describe the remedies required by the various decrees, and then discuss the level of implementation achieved at different sites.

#### 4.1 Elements of the Consent Decrees



Table 4.1 summarizes the main features of the settlement agreements. The settlement terms are separated into seven categories:

*Changes to tenant selection and administrative procedures:* With the exception of Minneapolis, all of the sites were required to change their procedures for selecting and assigning tenants to conventional public housing, for distributing Section 8 subsidies, or both. The most common remedy, required in six sites, is to merge the Section 8 and public housing waiting lists to increase housing opportunities for all housing assistance recipients. Other changes include revisions to transfer procedures such as race-conscious tenant selection procedures (Allegheny County) and the creation of a formal Tenant Assignment and Selection Plan (New York).







Location	Changes to tenant selection and administrative procedures	Public Housing Demolition and/or replacement	Physical improvements to public housing	New Section 8 Certificates		Mobility counseling	Creating housing opportunities	Community development around public housing
				geographic restrictions	unrestricted			
East Texas	x		x	x		x	x	x
Minneapolis		x		x	x	x	x	
New Haven	x	x <sup>1</sup>		x		x		
New York	x				x			
Omaha	x	x		x		x		x



---

<b>Location</b>	<b>Changes to tenant selection and administrative procedures</b>	<b>Public Housing Demolition and/or replacement</b>	<b>Physical improvements to public housing</b>	<b>New Section 8 Certificates</b>		<b>Mobility counseling</b>	<b>Creating housing opportunities</b>	<b>Community development around public housing</b>
				geographic restrictions	unrestricted			
<sup>1</sup> New Haven includes new project-based Section 8 developments to be constructed								



*Public housing demolition and replacement:* Frequently, the plaintiffs' main complaint in the desegregation cases is the siting of public housing developments in minority-concentrated areas, and/or the poor maintenance of predominantly minority-occupied developments. Therefore, the settlement agreements in seven of the eight sites call for the total or partial demolition of specified, developments and the provision of replacement units. New York City is the only exception. In all seven of these sites, replacement units are to include a combination of new scattered site units and the provision of tenant-based subsidies. In four of the seven sites, replacement units also involve new construction or rehabilitation of existing units at the original site.

The Dallas Housing Authority was ordered to reduce the huge West Dallas project, which originally had 3,500 units, to between 800 and 900 fully modernized units. The 2,600 demolished units were initially to be replaced one-for-one through new public housing construction, but with court approval, the housing authority ultimately planned to accomplish most of the replacements through Section 8 vouchers and certificates. At the time of the site visit, the agency was still required to construct 474 replacement units in non-impacted areas.<sup>39</sup> The Minneapolis Public Housing Authority demolished 770 public housing units in several developments in the near north side part of the city. These were also to have been replaced one-for-one through new construction, and the authority is working to develop new units in non-impacted areas. The Omaha Housing Authority demolished over seven hundred units within a two-year period; the shortage of replacement units then became an issue in the consent decree. The Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority has not yet demolished any public housing units under their consent decree. Instead, the agency was credited with the demolition performed before the decree was implemented.

*Project-based assistance:* Only one of the consent decrees calls for project-based assistance. The Housing Authority of New Haven must contract with a private owner to develop a Section 8 project in a non-impacted area to replace several demolished conventional public housing units. At the time of the site visit, the agency had been unsuccessful in interesting any private developers in constructing this housing.

---

<sup>39</sup>As will be discussed in Chapter 6, the March 1999 Fifth Circuit Court ruling in the *Walker* case appears to overturn this requirement and calls for all replacement housing to be provided through the Section 8 program. This ruling is being appealed to the United States Supreme Court.



*Physical improvements to public housing stock:* In several locations, the settlement agreements call for the equalization of housing conditions through the improvement of facilities in predominantly minority developments. For example, the Allegheny County settlement agreement requires equalization of amenities between predominantly white elderly developments and predominantly black family developments, the elimination of disparities in the quality of maintenance services, and cooperative agreements with municipalities within the Housing Authority's jurisdiction to ensure that infrastructure serving public housing units is equivalent to that in other "stable neighborhoods." The *Walker* agreement requires essentially the same outcome for public housing developments in Dallas—that all family developments should be made equivalent to the housing which is provided to the predominantly white elderly public housing tenants. In East Texas, the affected housing authorities were required to install a number of new amenities (such as central air conditioning, playgrounds, and washeterias) in public housing developments.

*Tenant-based assistance:* All of the settlement agreements provide new funds for Section 8 certificates and vouchers. The newly available vouchers and certificates are intended to promote housing mobility, or to assist public housing residents displaced because of demolition. In all sites except New York and Dallas, some certificates and vouchers were issued with restrictions that require holders to use the subsidy in non-impacted areas, defined as census tracts or blocks with a certain percentage of minority residents.<sup>40</sup> In New Haven, holders of the vouchers and certificates issued due to the demolition of the Elm Haven development were required to search for apartments in non-impacted areas for 180 days, after which time they had 90 more days to look for apartments anywhere. Omaha had a similar arrangement. In Allegheny, HUD provided 450 Section 8 certificates for use in non-impacted areas only. Buffalo had two different types of restrictions on various Section 8 vouchers and certificates: one decree mandated their use in areas which are neither racially nor economically concentrated; the other restricted their use only along economic lines. Six of the decrees also provided for some subsidies to be issued without restrictions, generally to displaced public housing residents.

---

<sup>40</sup>Some definitions also include poverty levels within the census tract.



---

*Mobility counseling program:* With the exception of the *Davis* case in New York, all of the agreements call for the establishment of a mobility counseling program to assist Section 8 subsidy holders to move to non-impacted areas. In most cases, even when the subsidies are not restricted, households that receive a Section 8 certificate or voucher as part of the settlement agreement are required to participate in the mobility counseling program. Except in Dallas, where the housing authority was mandated to run the program in-house, the decrees require that the mobility counseling programs be administered by an independent non-profit organization. At a minimum, these agencies provide individualized counseling for recipients, conduct landlord outreach and recruitment, and provide listings of available units.

*Creating housing opportunities:* Six of the settlement agreements contain conditions which call for the creation of new housing opportunities for class members, and often for a wider group of assisted housing recipients. Three of the agreements call either for the elimination of discriminatory residency preferences, or the initiation of a HUD investigation to determine if residency preferences have a discriminatory impact (and then the pursuit of enforcement action). Four of the agreements require the housing authority to request that HUD grant exception rents up to 120 percent of the Fair Market Rent (FMR) for certain subareas, if supported by market data, in order for Section 8 holders to gain access to higher priced rental markets.

Other activities designed to create new housing opportunities include: agreements with federally-assisted housing owners to grant occupancy preferences to class members; cooperation agreements with area local governments to undertake affirmative measures to further fair housing; inclusionary zoning to create affordable housing in non-impacted suburbs; and bonus payments to private landlords that provide three- and four-bedroom rental units to Section 8 holders. In Dallas, the City was ordered to create a Housing Fund for the expansion of low-income housing opportunities in the suburbs, and to use city zoning and other legislative methods to create low-income housing in non-impacted areas. A homeownership program in East Texas, which includes a rent-to-own component of single-family public housing units, has been incorporated as a desegregative housing opportunity, as the housing authorities have provided homes in non-impacted areas.



*Community development surrounding public housing stock:* In five of the sites, the defendants are required to undertake community development efforts in and around public housing. Allegheny County has the most extensive obligations, including setting aside over \$20 million in CDBG funds for housing and community economic development in seven municipalities, applying for new sources of federal, state, and local funding, and improving the quality of police protection in public housing developments. In Buffalo, the City is to develop a revitalization plan for two of the areas that were former public housing sites, and create a Housing and Economic Development Task Force to develop employment and homeownership opportunities for public housing residents.

#### **4.2 Progress in Implementation**

All sites have implemented at least some elements of their decree, but at the time of our site visits (August through October 1998), none had fully implemented all of the requirements. In some cases, the housing authorities have carried out mandated tasks, but have done so in a way that has not ultimately benefited tenants. For example, in Omaha, tenants were relocated so quickly that some ended up in substandard housing and have to be relocated a second time. In other cases, the housing authority may have objectively have made less progress, but seems to have invested more time and effort into planning to avoid the kinds of problems other sites have encountered. In Minneapolis, little new public housing has been constructed in non-impacted areas at the time of the site visit, but our analysis indicates that the long planning process had helped to overcome community opposition.

Leaving aside the issue of the comparative quality of implementation efforts, the three sites which had made the most progress toward meeting requirements of their decrees at the time of the site visits were Dallas, New York, and Omaha. The two sites which had made the least progress were Allegheny and Buffalo. Table 4.2 summarizes the level and time frame of implementation of the different elements at each site.

Our analysis indicates that some remedies appear to have been easier to implement than others, notably those where the housing authority has direct control and there are few other actors or external



---

constraints. For example, changes to the tenant selection and assignment process and the merging of waiting lists have been implemented everywhere except Buffalo (the newest of the eight cases), where the authority is awaiting HUD approval. The demolition of targeted developments has also happened everywhere except Buffalo, where the housing authority had yet to obtain sufficient financing for its redevelopment plan. Modernization and rehabilitation of developments where required has taken place relatively quickly at most sites. These kinds of remedies share the characteristic of being one-time actions largely within the housing authorities' control, and therefore relatively straightforward to accomplish. However, in Dallas, one of the oldest of the eight cases, the issue of modernization has been more complex. The housing authority modernized 842 units under its initial 1987 consent decree. Seven years later, a new administration determined that the modernization effort did not meet current standards (e.g., the buildings were still laid out "barracks" fashion and lacked amenities) and proposed demolishing them as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site. At the time of the site visit, the housing authority was in the early phases of this revitalization effort.

Other elements of the decrees clearly have proven more difficult for housing authorities to implement successfully. Often, these elements require participation or approval by other actors, such as local governments and in some cases, have provoked strong reactions in the community. For example, the construction of replacement housing has been challenging in all sites, primarily due to community resistance to new developments and lack of interest from private developers. The two homeowners' lawsuits in Dallas, and the resistance to scattered-site housing in Dallas and Allegheny County are examples of the kinds of problems housing authorities have encountered. At times, housing authorities have been able to overcome local resistance, the best example being the resolution of the first homeowners' lawsuit in Dallas. When the court ruled in favor of the housing authority, allowing it to go forward with construction of a new public housing development in the predominantly white area of North Dallas, the authority chose to bring existing homeowners into the design process. Some of the plaintiffs now serve as an advisory panel for the new development. However, as will be discussed in Chapter 6, the housing authority lost the second homeowners' lawsuit on appeal and may now be required to substitute Section 8 certificates and vouchers for building replacement public housing units. In Dallas, as in many other sites, using all the newly-allocated Section 8 certificates and vouchers has proven to be another challenge, particularly when rental markets are tight. (See Chapter 6 for a thorough discussion of these issues.)



Creating mobility counseling programs has also proved difficult for many sites. Except in Dallas, which runs its program in-house, the housing authorities have encountered serious obstacles in selecting non-profit agencies to administer the programs, particularly in obtaining the approval of local governments. Our analysis indicates that across the sites, there has been more inter-agency conflict about selecting mobility counseling contractors than about any other issue—even the siting of scattered-site housing. Designing and starting up the programs has proved challenging as well, with some sites struggling for years.

The Housing Opportunities Program in Dallas is the oldest and largest of the mobility programs. While the authority experienced severe problems during its early years, it now has a well-established program, which offers services to all of its Section 8 participants. All interested participants are offered access to the counseling services, which include tours to non-impacted areas as well as apartment listings. Project Jericho in Omaha is five years old, appears to have overcome some initial difficulties in the relationship with the Omaha Housing Authority. Minneapolis's program has been in place since mid-1996 and provides counseling primarily to the displaced residents of demolished public housing. New Haven's program has been in operation since 1997 and gives priority to Section 8 holders and those on the Section 8 waiting list. The other sites' mobility programs were still in relatively early stages of operation at the time of our site visits. The Fair Housing Services Center in Allegheny had just begun providing mobility services. In Buffalo, the non-profit contractor has only just been hired, and the program was not yet in operation. East Texas's Fair Housing Service Center, which coordinates the additional Section 8 vouchers there, was slated to begin its mobility counseling in the first quarter of 1999.

Finally, complying with requirements for community development around public housing has proved extremely challenging at most sites. This mandate requires both access to additional funds and cooperation from local governments, which has often been problematic. Implementing these requirements may require cooperation from actors not named in the desegregation decree, who may not be motivated to comply with requests they view as burdensome. For example, in Allegheny County, although the court ordered substantial amounts of CDBG funding to be spent on improving conditions around public housing developments, only a very small proportion of these funds have been spent and little activity has taken place to date. In part, the housing authority has no example to follow and no





previous expertise in such matters. Additionally, local political conflict over control over the CDBG funds has slowed implementation.



**Table 4.2 Implementation Progress**

Location	Changes to tenant selection and administrative procedures	Public Housing Demolition and/or replacement	Physical improvements to public housing	New Section 8 Certificates		Mobility counseling	Creating housing opportunities	Community development around public housing
				geographic restrictions	unrestricted			
Allegheny County	I	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Buffalo	I	N		N	N	N	P	P
Dallas: Walker (1987)	I	P	P		P	I	N	N
City of Dallas (1990)						I	P	P
Remedial Order DHA (1995)		P	P		P	N	P	I
Remedial Order HUD (1995)					P	I	P	



Location	Changes to tenant selection and administrative procedures	Public Housing Demolition and/or replacement	Physical improvements to public housing	New Section 8 Certificates		Mobility counseling	Creating housing opportunities	Community development around public housing
				geographic restrictions	unrestricted			
East Texas: Beaumont	P		P	P		P	P	P
Port Arthur	P		P	P		P	P	P
Orange County	P		P	P		P	P	
Minneapolis		P		P	P	I	I	
New Haven	I	p <sup>1</sup>	P	P	P	I		
New York	I/p <sup>2</sup>				I			
Omaha	I	I/p <sup>3</sup>		I		I		I

<sup>1</sup> New Haven includes new project-based Section 8 developments to be constructed  
<sup>2</sup> New York' s TSAP is fully implemented. The part of the consent decree that provides public housing units to claimants is partially implemented  
<sup>3</sup> Demolition has been completed. Provision of replacement housing is partially implemented.

Key:



I = Element fully implemented

N= Element not implemented

P = Element partially implemented



The complexity of the decree clearly affects successful implementation. There are two levels of complexity each site must face: the number of tasks required to implement, and the number of external actors involved in implementing each task. New York City had the fewest and most straightforward provisions, and thus implemented most of its decree relatively easily. Other cases, with greater complexity and involving more actors, have taken much longer. In Dallas, the number and complexity of required activities and the different requirements in the various decrees against the defendants (the Dallas Housing Authority, HUD, and the City) have added to the challenges of implementation. Minneapolis has also had to cope with a large number of challenging tasks to implement and a number of outside partners. The housing authority has had to invest considerable time and effort in obtaining cooperation of the suburban housing authorities affected by the decree. Allegheny was given the complex and unique task of trying to integrate public housing by moving both African-American tenants to white developments, and whites to African-American developments. This difficult endeavor has slowed down their progress considerably.

#### **4.3 Conclusion**

The eight consent decrees we examined have considerable overlap in how they attempt to address segregation in public and assisted housing. While there is no master plan which covers all sites, there are relatively few unique requirements. In most cases, similar remedies have been applied in at least three or four sites, even if the time line or actors responsible were not always exactly the same. Our analysis indicates that certain types of elements have proven more difficult to implement than others, particularly those which require the cooperation of multiple agencies and are not entirely within the control of the housing authority. The most challenging requirements appear to be implementing mobility programs and community development around housing developments, both of which are complex and challenging tasks involving multiple actors.



---

<b>CHAPTER 4 ELEMENTS OF THE CONSENT DECREES AND PROGRESS TO DATE .....</b>	<b>38</b>
4.0 Overview .....	38
4.1 Elements of the Consent Decrees .....	38
4.2 Progress in Implementation .....	42
4.3 Conclusion .....	47



---

## CHAPTER 5

### RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS

#### 5.0 Introduction

Although it is too early to determine the full impact of these consent decrees on residents' lives, tenants have already been affected by public housing demolition, new Section 8 opportunities, and mobility programs. Their perceptions of the early phases of the implementation process can offer insight into the challenges that are occurring and the issues that remain to be addressed by these desegregation efforts.

To assess resident perceptions, we conducted focus groups in each case study site with tenants who have been, or will be, affected by desegregative programs. The information from these focus groups differs from a survey in that it is not statistically representative of all tenants affected by these decrees. However, these focus groups provide qualitative data on participants' opinions, experiences, and perceptions that paints a rich picture of how these decrees have affected residents' lives. In general, focus groups are considered ideal for exploratory use, program design, and to capture the perceptions of program participants (Krueger, 1988).<sup>41</sup>

Based on our initial research design, most of the focus group questions asked tenants who had the opportunity to move, why they did or did not move, did or did not make desegregative moves,<sup>42</sup> and what

---

<sup>41</sup>Because focus groups are not statistically representative, the degree to which the experiences of other people affected by the consent decrees match the experiences discussed in the section is not known.

<sup>42</sup>A desegregative move is defined as a move by a minority household into a census tract where a majority of households are white or a move by a white household into a census tract where a majority of households are minority. Conversely, a



---

their experiences have been to date.<sup>43</sup> Focus group participants were involved in a range of programs across the sites, including mobility, homeownership, and relocation programs. At some sites, we also met with residents who have not yet moved under their consent decree, but will likely do so in the near future. Participants in two of the focus groups were white, while the remaining groups were comprised predominantly of minority tenants.

Each of the focus groups was recorded and transcribed. The data were then analyzed for key themes using Ethnograph, a qualitative database package. In this chapter, we discuss the key themes that emerged from this analysis, specifically:

- Perceived barriers to mobility for tenants who have not yet attempted a move;
- Challenges encountered in trying to make a desegregative move; and
- Movers' experiences (including the quality of their new housing, conditions in their new neighborhoods, social integration, and discrimination and harassment).

Finally, we discuss the implications of these findings for mobility programs and other types of desegregative initiatives, emphasizing the types of services that might help overcome barriers and make

---

segregative move is defined as a move by a household into a census tract where the in-mover is of the same race or ethnicity as the majority of residents.

<sup>43</sup>Because our focus is on mobility, we did not speak to residents of public housing developments, located in impacted areas, that have been renovated or otherwise improved as a result of a consent decree. Interviews with tenant leaders in some of these developments suggest that there have been positive outcomes for many of these residents.





successful moves. We also address the issue of how to help residents become stable in their new communities.

### 5.1 Perceived Barriers to Mobility

We asked focus group participants both about what they wanted in a new community and about the barriers they saw to making desegregative moves. Across the sites, their responses revealed common preferences and concerns.

Generally, participants said that they wanted to live in a community where they did not have to fear for their own or their children's safety. Many participants claimed that they preferred to live in an integrated, rather than a predominantly white, or predominantly minority, community. These comments were typical:

*"It's a mixed race, you know what I'm saying? It's not predominantly nothing." (public housing resident, Buffalo); and*

*"It's a different mixture of people...and I like to live in a mixed environment. It's better that way." (desegregative mover, New York).*

Many residents—both those who had moved and those who had not—reported that it was important to them to have some sense of community. For most people, this meant that they would be involved in community activities and that their neighbors would know and look out for each other. Further, a number of participants expressed reluctance to move to areas far from family members and friends. As this participant from East Texas put it:



*"...I just wouldn't live anywhere else, because my family and friends live in that area; that's why I chose to stay there." (scattered-site resident, East Texas).*

In addition to these general preferences, participants who had not yet attempted moves identified a number of potential barriers that they felt would inhibit their ability to make desegregative moves. These included: fears of encountering discrimination; perceived financial barriers; and lack of transportation and access to services.

### **5.1.1 Anticipated Discrimination**

Participants in a number of focus groups talked about their fears of experiencing discrimination if they were to move to certain non-impacted, predominantly white areas. Many participants cited their own or their friends' experiences in visiting or passing through these areas as evidence of the kinds of problems they could expect to encounter. Participants from one group in East Texas mentioned the history of failed integration attempts in the nearby white community of Vidor as a reason that they would not consider moving there.<sup>44</sup> Participants in other sites said they feared a negative reception from potential neighbors, landlords, and police. These comments were typical:

*"I'll put it to you like this. Hispanic and Afro-Americans are not wanted there in West Seneca." (public housing resident, Buffalo)*

*"Some areas aren't bad, like in Hamburg, I got a friend that stay out there. But I went there one night with him and the police stopped us. 'Where are you going?'...And I go out*

---

<sup>44</sup>See East Texas Case Study, Section 3.4.



*there, I go out to the city line, police stop me, 'Where are you going?' None of your business where I'm going! Who are you to ask me where I'm going? 'Well, we need to know what you're doing out there, what you're going out there for.'"* (public housing resident, Buffalo).

In addition to anticipating racial discrimination and prejudice, a few participants spoke of other forms of discrimination they would expect to encounter. A person from Allegheny County said that having a child would pose a problem for her in locating housing. Some participants mentioned bias against Section 8 participants as another potential barrier. For example, a participant from East Texas said that local landlords think Section 8 recipients destroy housing.

Participants also raised concerns about being socially isolated and unable to handle the adjustment of making a desegregative move, particularly if adequate supportive services were not available. As this participant from Allegheny County put it:

*"She [a friend who had made a desegregative move] got over there and it was such a culture shock...and she had no supportive services, and it was just too much for her."* (participant on waiting list to make a desegregative move, Allegheny County).

### **5.1.2 Financial Barriers**

Many focus group participants who had not yet moved also talked about their concerns about potential financial barriers to making desegregative moves. For example, a number of people from Allegheny County talked about their concerns with expenses associated with moving itself. Participants from other sites spoke of the burden of having to pay security deposits and utility costs, and lack of affordable housing in non-impacted areas.



### 5.1.3 Lack of Transportation and Access to Services

Many participants raised concerns about the lack of public transportation in predominantly white, suburban areas. Convenient transportation was deemed necessary for commuting to jobs and for completing daily errands. Across the sites, participants told us that, not only was *access* to public transportation critical to moving to a new community, but that buses ideally would have to run frequently and to many different locations within the area.

*"It's got to have transportation...the buses don't run there, so its a bad situation." (public housing resident, Buffalo)*

Participants in Buffalo, where one of the developments we visited is close to the central business district, were particularly concerned about giving up the convenience of their current location, with its easy access to transportation, employment opportunities, and services. Likewise, a participant in Minneapolis said that she likes the inner city and prefers to live there.

Access to services—including good schools—was also seen as crucial to making a successful move. Many of our participants were concerned about being able to access the same kinds of services they had in their old or current neighborhoods. In addition, participants wanted to be close to shopping and other amenities, such as banks and recreational facilities.

*"...if you have a family, you want to make sure you have ...enough shopping centers nearby, where you need to get your supplies that you need for your family." (public housing resident, Buffalo)*



## **5.2 Challenges Encountered by Those Attempting Desegregative Moves**

We asked focus group participants who had made either segregative or desegregative moves to discuss their experiences. Participants who had attempted a desegregative move described a number of challenges they encountered in searching for units. These included: problems with the housing authority or the housing mobility program; lack of affordable housing units that met residents' needs; discrimination; and lack of transportation.

### **5.2.1 Concerns About the Housing Authority or Mobility Program**

Participants' experiences with mobility programs varied considerably across—and within—sites. While some participants said they had received lists of available housing units, search assistance, and assistance with rental applications and background checks, other people reported problems establishing contact with housing authority or mobility program staff. These differences may reflect variations in the level of service provided over time (e.g., in Dallas and Omaha, the mobility programs were sometimes overwhelmed by large influxes of Section 8 tenants)<sup>45</sup> or inconsistencies among program staff. Whatever the reason, a number of participants across the sites reported having problems with housing authority or mobility program staff that they felt affected their ability to make a successful move.

For example, a participant in the group of segregative movers in Omaha said that she knew of a white tenant who received a list of housing units in a nice part of town. She said that when she requested the list of units in that area, she was told it did not exist. A participant from New York, who made a desegregative move, said that the housing authority did not return her security deposit upon vacating the unit, but required her to pay the full deposit on her new unit. Another participant in New York said that she was told she could not move into either the first or second development she had selected. A third

---

<sup>45</sup>This issue is discussed in detail in Chapter 6.



said she had waited for years to move and been told repeatedly that there were no vacancies in any of the developments she had selected.

A desegregative mover from Allegheny County told how she remained in a homeless shelter while waiting for the housing authority to make the necessary repairs to her new unit—these repairs reportedly took much longer than anticipated. Hmong and Lao participants in Minneapolis recounted how they felt they were being pushed to move and reported that they were offered few housing options. One person said he was threatened with having the electricity in his unit turned off if he did not move quickly.

Finally, a number of participants complained about the insensitive treatment they have received from staff of both housing authority and mobility agencies.

*“A lot of the intake people that you go through to get processed just to get the paperwork processed, treat you like you’re some person that’s uneducated, illiterate, and you don’t know anything.” (participant on waiting list to make a desegregative move, Allegheny County)*

In addition to reporting problems with what they perceived as poor or inadequate service, focus group participants mentioned a number of barriers related to the Section 8 program itself. These included having to pay credit check or application fees and full security deposits. Several participants complained that they did not have enough time to search for housing in a suitable area (i.e., an area with decent schools, access to shopping, and public transportation). Another person said the time it takes to get a unit inspected for the Section 8 program can be an obstacle when the landlord can rent the unit more easily to a tenant without Section 8.

### **5.2.2 Lack of Affordable Units**



---

Participants from a number of focus groups talked about the lack of affordable housing units in non-impacted areas, which made it very challenging to locate a house or apartment. Participants also discussed difficulties they faced in locating housing in areas where they wished to live. A person from New York initially turned down an option because the unit was located far from the places to which she normally went. A few participants from New York and Omaha said that they found it difficult to locate housing with enough bedrooms to meet their families' needs. In some instances, people said they had settled for less than adequate units. Residents also mentioned difficulties finding units in safe neighborhoods and units that were in good condition.

### 5.2.3 Discrimination

Many participants said that landlords of "nicer" units refused to accept Section 8 program participants. Others thought that landlords were discriminating against them because of their race.

*"I have had situations where I have called and they said, 'Oh yeah, the house is for rent.' And when you get there and they see your color, it's a different story." (segregative mover, Omaha)*

### 5.2.4 Lack of Transportation

The lack of adequate public transportation was a concern of a number of participants from various sites, although the majority of transportation-related concerns were voiced by participants from Dallas and Minneapolis. Some people said there was no public transportation where they wanted to live. Other participants said that while public transportation was available in areas where they wanted live, buses stopped running in the evening, thereby making it difficult for them to travel when necessary. The significance of transportation to people affected by the decrees was clearly stated by a participant from Dallas.



*“The reason why I didn’t go out here, you know, I [sit here and wish so many days] that I had adequate transportation at the time. You know, I got transportation now, but at the time I didn’t have no transportation. I wish I could have went out there, because I’m sure I would have been better off.” (segregative mover, Dallas)*

### **5.3 Movers’ Experiences**

The central purpose of the settlement decrees was to increase class members’ access to better quality housing, safer neighborhoods, and economic opportunities. Focus group participants’ views about their new housing and communities were mixed. A number of participants believed their new units and communities were substantially better than where they had lived before, whether they moved to impacted or non-impacted areas. However, at all sites, there were still some who complained about poor housing, dangerous neighborhoods, and lack of acceptance by neighbors or other community members. Our findings suggest that if these desegregation efforts are to be successful in the long-run, residents will need more and better information about non-impacted areas, search assistance, and long-term follow-up support.

#### **5.3.1 Housing Quality**

Many participants were pleased with their new units, particularly those who had moved into scattered-site units.

*“The house is nice, I have peace and quiet out there, not one day a week but seven days a week.” (scattered-site residents, East Texas)*





One participant in Omaha who moved within an impacted area also talked about how much she liked her home. She appreciated the architectural detail of the house she rented and was quite happy with the unit, even though it did have a water leak.

However, while a number of participants were satisfied with their new units, others complained about problems with the housing or the building in which they lived. Participants from East Texas who had moved into scattered-site units were particularly likely to report problems, with several commenting that poor quality materials were used to build their units.

*“I’m already having problems like the floor lifting. So they figuring like, they put the floor down before they did the room, and it’s buckling. But if you using the proper material, it’s not gonna do all that.” (scattered-site resident, East Texas)*

Likewise, while some participants said the quality of the maintenance at their new units and buildings was good, others said that they had encountered problems. At least one comment was made regarding poor maintenance by participants from nearly every site. These comments were typical:

*“Whoever’s supposed to hear the complaints of people, they’re not. They’re just writing it down and putting it in a file but actually they’re doing nothing about it.” (scattered-site resident, New Haven); and*

*“I took the apartment because I needed a place to live, they told me that my apartment would be fixed in six months. It took them until January of last year to even start fixing my apartment, and they still haven’t fixed the ceiling.” (desegregative mover, Allegheny County).*

### 5.3.2 Neighborhoods



Most of the focus groups of movers had participants who felt conditions in their new neighborhood were significantly better than where they had lived before. Participants from across sites appreciated the quietness and cleanliness of their new communities.

*"It wasn't as quiet as where I live now, and there's a lot of peace and tranquility where I am now, and whereas where I came from, it was not there. So, it was a big difference".*  
(scattered-site resident, East Texas)

*"I just moved out there...just for the neighborhood because I knew it was nicer and cleaner out there." (desegregative mover, Dallas)*

Beyond offering general comments, participants from some of the groups spoke about the safety and convenience of their neighborhoods. People talked about how nice it was not to hear gun shots and not to be confronted with drug dealing and other illegal activities. This comment was typical:

*"But the best thing I like about it is that I feel a lot safer...There's no shootings, you know, no sirens, no one standing on the corner, there's no loose dogs." (desegregative mover, Allegheny County)*

A number of people said they now lived near grocery stores, banks, schools, and public transportation stops, all of which made their daily lives a bit easier. Most of these comments came from people who moved to non-impacted areas, although a few people who moved to impacted areas offered similar comments. However, some participants said that they could not find stores in their new communities that would cater to their specific needs. For example, one woman in Minneapolis reported not being able to find the kinds of ethnic foods she likes for her family in the grocery stores in her new community.



Although many focus group participants were pleased with their new neighborhoods, others expressed serious concerns about safety. Both segregative and desegregative movers talked at length about problems with neighbors, housing management, security personnel, and police officers. Participants talked about having to walk around drug dealers near their homes and the lack of experienced management staff who would properly screen potential tenants and deal with tenants who caused problems. Some people complained about the lack of parental supervision and the fact that teens often stayed out late, playing loud music. A few participants also spoke of the lack of safety faced by their children.

*“I mean, the neighborhood I live in, I don’t like it because if you got to go to the store you better go before it gets dark. Sometimes it’s scary to even walk to the store when it’s daytime, because it’s so drug-infested, it’s gang-infested, I mean it’s just, it’s just terrible.”*  
(desegregative mover, Omaha)

Participants from a few focus groups told of serious problems in their development or neighborhood, but seemed resigned to them, perhaps because they were long-accustomed to living in dangerous neighborhoods.

*“It’s quiet, there’s, I’m sure there’s drugs out there like every place else, but they’re kind of kept undercover. We had one drive-by shooting, but other than that, it’s fairly quiet. The police are there because my neighbor plays the radio too loud, but that’s about it.”*  
(desegregative mover, Allegheny County)

*“I like where I live, it’s just I started getting paranoid after the murders of course. And then the laundry room right in front of my door there, someone put that on fire. So that’s enough to get somebody a little nervous.”* (desegregative mover, Dallas)



Unfortunately, these experiences highlight the fact that neighborhoods considered to be “non-impacted” by legal definitions do not always offer decent housing or safe environments. These findings suggest the need for high-quality search assistance that will help participants identify potential problem neighborhoods and locate housing in safe communities.

### 5.3.3 Opportunities

Increasing the opportunities for class members to move into non-impacted areas, it is hoped, will serve to increase a range of additional social and economic opportunities for people directly affected by the consent decrees. As people move from poor neighborhoods into non-impacted areas, they will, theoretically, live in safer neighborhoods, have increased access to jobs, better schools and activities, and other people with resources. While it is still too early to see any longer-term employment and educational benefits of moves to non-impacted areas, our focus group discussions offered some evidence about how residents feel moving has affected their access to economic opportunities—both positively and negatively. Some participants spoke of increased access to jobs or good schools, while other participants felt moving had either decreased their opportunities or had no positive effects. For example, some white tenants in Allegheny County were required to make desegregative moves to impacted areas that offered few opportunities.

**Opportunities for Adults.** Participants who felt that the move had positive effects talked about the convenience of their new locations. A number of people from different sites said they now live closer to work and to their children’s schools. Most, but not all, of these participants’ moves were to non-impacted areas. Participants also shared more specific benefits of their move. For example, a participant from New York told of how her family and friends will visit her now that she has moved into a safer development. Some people have benefitted from programs established to assist Section 8 recipients with training and job placement. A participant who had made a desegregative move in Dallas received a \$10,000 award for volunteering at area schools. The award is to be used for educational purposes.



However, the lack of public transportation in many non-impacted areas prevented many participants from taking advantage of new opportunities. Without adequate public transportation, people who do not own or have access to cars find it difficult, if not impossible, to get to work, take children to child care or activities, shop, and engage in other activities that are located beyond walking distance from their homes.

*“When I was in the suburbs, you know like Garland, certain areas in Garland the bus don’t run...So if you don’t have transportation, that’s not a good area for you to go, ‘cause what if you work in Dallas and you live in Garland? If you don’t have adequate transportation, then I wouldn’t suggest that you go out there because you just gonna be stuck out there. You wake up in the morning and the car don’t start, well you can’t go to work that day.”*  
(segregative mover, Dallas)

Likewise, white residents who made desegregative moves into impacted areas in Allegheny County also talked about problems with lack of transportation. These findings suggest that mobility programs need to target their efforts toward locating housing in areas with access to transportation and employment opportunities wherever possible.

**Opportunities for Children.** Many, if not most, of the households affected by the consent decrees have children. Focus group participants spoke about the ways their children had been affected by moves into impacted and non-impacted neighborhoods, including adjustment to schools and community activities for children. Our data indicate that the impact of moving on children has been mixed; some participants spoke of expanded opportunities for their children in their new neighborhoods, while others told of the lack of opportunities or negative experiences their children have faced.

Overall, participants made slightly more positive than negative comments about children’s experiences in schools. Participants from a number of sites talked about the convenience of living closer to their children’s schools. For some children, this meant they now could walk to school. A few parents spoke about the quality of schools and teachers. A participant from Dallas who made a desegregative move commented on the small class sizes and the benefit to her child of the increased attention from the



teachers. Some participants who had moved to an impacted area also spoke of positive school-related experiences. A segregative mover from Omaha with a child diagnosed with Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder said that she and her child have received the support they need from teachers and administrators.

At a few sites, participants felt that positive opportunities have been undermined by racism. As one example, a child from Allegheny County went from being an honor roll student at his previous school to receiving poor grades after the family moved to a non-impacted area. His parent attributed the decline in school performance to the name calling and other prejudicial treatment he received from students and a teacher. A participant from Minneapolis said that the teachers and students simply did not want the in-movers at their school. Follow-up support from the mobility programs might help participants to cope with these kinds of serious problems.

In addition to better schools, a number of children have benefited from gaining access to activities and recreational facilities. Parents mentioned a range of activities, including supervised, after-school clubhouses, nearby parks or swimming pools, field trips and summer camps. A desegregative mover from Dallas said that she now has access to a 24-hour nursery. This nursery takes pressure off of her by providing care and attention to her child on occasions when she has to work late. One parent, who had moved with her family from a non-impacted to an impacted area, told of how she used her experience with Boy Scouts in the non-impacted area to help start a troop in her new community.

While the majority of participants reported positive experiences for their children, there were parents at many sites who still said there was nothing for their children to do or no one with whom they could play. A participant who lived in scattered-site housing in New Haven described the play area near her home as very small and filled with a dirty mattress.

### 5.3.4 Social Integration

We asked focus group participants who had moved about the racial and ethnic composition of their new development or area as well as about experiences in their neighborhoods. Focus group moderators were interested in learning if participants who had moved were living in relatively integrated or segregated developments or areas (regardless of a community's status as an "impacted" area). Few participants knew the actual percentage racial mix of the area or development in which they lived, although many people had a rough idea of the degree of integration or segregation. Participants in groups from five sites said that their development or area was "mixed" racially. These participants included white residents as well as minority residents who made desegregated moves and/or moved into scattered-site housing.

A number of other participants said they lived in developments or areas in which residents were either predominantly black or white. Participants in four sites commented upon the changes they see occurring around them, changes that in some cases were leading to increased segregation. Participants from Allegheny County commented on the attempt to desegregate their public housing developments. In one of these developments, management is not allowing additional white tenants to move in order to reach a 50-50 balance between white and black tenants. A participant from New York noted that whites are leaving a development into which minorities are moving, commenting that while minorities are making a desegregative move by moving into this development, in the end, it is likely that the development will again be segregated.

We committed a substantial portion of focus group time to discussing participants' opinions about and feelings of acceptance by neighbors in their new communities. The major outcomes of desegregative moves, according to our focus group participants, can be categorized broadly as follows:

- Some participants described their neighbors as "friendly" and felt accepted in their new communities;



- 
- Many participants generally liked their neighborhood, but were bothered by relatively minor problems, such as neighborhood gossiping and racial stereotyping; and
  - Other participants, regardless of feelings of neighborhood acceptance, kept themselves isolated and did not socialize with their new neighbors.

A substantial proportion of participants reported that their neighbors were friendly and that they felt accepted in their new communities. This social acceptance was reported by both white movers and minority movers irrespective of whether they moved into public housing developments, scattered-site units, or private market, Section 8 units. Generally, participants viewed their neighbors as friendly if they helped one another, such as with lawn care or watching each other's houses, or if they went out of their way to help new residents feel like part of the community.

*"...everybody's nice; they try to help one another. They help you cut your grass and everything..." (desegregative mover, Allegheny County)*

*"...where I'm at, they get along. They don't matter what color I am." (desegregative mover, Dallas)*

*"They have, like, meetings, like, once a month, and they just strive for everyone to come and participate in what's going on in the area." (desegregative mover, New York)*

Although participants felt that many of their neighbors in their new communities were friendly, some did encounter problems. These ran the gamut from relatively minor concerns, such as having to endure neighborhood gossip, to fairly serious ones, such as vandalism and police harassment. A number of focus group participants felt that they and their children had to "prove themselves" to their new neighbors in





order to be accepted. Again, the reported prevalence of these types of problems suggests the need for long-term follow-up services to aid participants in making the transition to their new community.

Some participants reported that they felt that their neighbors were gossiping about them to other neighbors and, in some cases, that they, their family and friends, and their activities were being “monitored.”

*"I mean, they're in your business but they don't bring it to you; they just kind of gossip around you." (desegregative mover, Allegheny County)*

*"We know you got the house from Section 8...I said, well are you monitoring me or something?...I really felt like they was monitoring me. And it really kind of ticked me off because it was more like, well, we're gonna be watching you." (scattered-site resident, East Texas)*

Because of their neighbors’ attitudes, many minority participants who made desegregative moves indicated that they preferred to keep to themselves and not associate with their new neighbors. Fear of discrimination or tension meant that many people kept to themselves without even knowing anything about their new neighbors.

*"It's been going well; I live there, don't intend to socialize or have many contacts with them." (desegregative mover, Allegheny County)*



*"You would say sometimes you would be antisocial...you could say isolation."  
(desegregative mover, Dallas)*

In some sites, such as Minneapolis, where minorities are relatively few and where they have been isolated historically, a move to yet another isolating community is particularly daunting.

*"We were isolated..that's what I know as a kid, just generationally." (desegregative mover, Minneapolis)*

Of particular note on the issue of isolation is the experience of the Hmong and Lao families who were relocated from public housing in Minneapolis. These families were not included in our regular focus groups because of language barriers. Instead, we conducted group interviews with the assistance of an interpreter. This group reported themselves to be particularly adversely affected by their move to non-impacted areas. The main source of distress was having to move away from their Hmong family and friends. Many Hmong still belong to clans and seek services from shamans.<sup>46</sup> Separating clans and family through relocation and mobility programs strains these strong connections. These participants reported that they did not like being dispersed and felt very isolated. Many felt anxious that no one in their new community would help them in cases of emergency, because they did not speak English and were of a different ethnic background.

In contrast, although the number of white movers in our focus groups were few, they more often reported feeling accepted in their new communities and seemed to get along with their neighbors fairly well.

### **5.3.5 Discrimination and Harassment**

---

<sup>46</sup> Shaman are spiritual and healing leaders in the Hmong community.



Some participants reported much more severe problems with discrimination and racial harassment. For example, some said they believed that their neighbors stereotyped them because of their race.

*"I guess they kind of got used to me, said well, he's not real violent or nothing and all that we see on T.V...." (desegregative mover, Dallas)*

*"They wanted me to know that this is a predominantly white neighborhood. I said I have no problem with that because I grew up with mostly white people. They told me they don't like drugs, I said I don't use drugs, that's not a problem. We don't like loud music or parties, I said good because I don't like people that play like that either." (desegregative mover, Minneapolis)*

Others reported experiencing more serious harassment, with neighbors making overtly racist comments to them:

*"Then they told me...they'd rather be neighbors with my black dog than they would black people." (desegregative mover, Minneapolis); and*

The most severe problems reported by minority desegregative movers were assaults, vandalism and police harassment. These problems, however, were only reported by a few participants across the eight sites. For example, one participant (a white desegregative mover) noted that after her son was beaten by some black neighbor boys and he fought back, he was accepted by them. A minority participant said that her son was badly beaten by white children in their new neighborhood:



*"These three Caucasian kids jumped my son and beat him real bad where he had to go to the hospital." (desegregative mover, Allegheny County).*

Vandalism was reported by participants from Minneapolis, New Haven, and Omaha. Most of the vandalism was relatively minor, from debris being tossed in yards to paint thrown on property. None of the acts of vandalism reported were of a more egregious nature, such as fire setting or major property destruction. These acts were upsetting, nonetheless.

*"Two days after I was there someone throwed paint all over my car..." (desegregative mover, Minneapolis)*

*"One morning, I woke up somebody had killed a skunk and put it in or yard, right on the walkway. And I kept saying, is it because I'm black?" (scattered-site resident, New Haven)*

*"...well, I started feeling like it was because I was black because when we moved in, every morning we would wake up to my front yard somebody put trash on it...I kept saying to my son, don't get upset, just put on your worker's gloves, go on and smile and clean it up...And I think it finally wore them down and they, you know, accepted me." (scattered-site resident, New Haven)*

Desegregative movers in Dallas reported police harassment in suburban areas. Participants' complaints ranged from being tailed by police for up to a year after moving into a new community to being verbally harassed by police throughout one's residency. Two focus group participants who initially had made a desegregative move and who had since moved back to an impacted area reported police harassment as being the number one reason for this return.



*"...they really harassed me, and then when I got down there they was calling me black girl and stuff...I couldn't handle it." (desegregative mover who moved back to an impacted area, Dallas)*

*"For a whole year, I was just a prisoner in my own home; I'm scared of the cops." (desegregative mover who moved back to an impacted area, Dallas)*

Mobility programs need to make participants aware of their rights and offer support to them in dealing with instances of overt discrimination and harassment. Further, housing authorities and mobility programs should work proactively with receiving communities to try to head off problems and to make sure serious incidents of discrimination are addressed appropriately.

## **5.4 Implications for Mobility Programs**

We asked participants in our focus groups about the kinds of assistance that they thought would help residents make successful desegregative moves. The types of services that participants mentioned included: information about communities in non-impacted areas; search assistance; financial assistance; and homeownership opportunities. Participants also discussed factors that would facilitate their remaining in non-impacted areas rather than moving back to their old neighborhoods.

### **5.4.1 Access to Information About Non-Impacted Areas**

Many participants said they felt at a disadvantage in having to move to a new community that they knew little about. Indeed, access to information was most often identified as the type of that would most facilitate moves. Most participants said they wanted information about the community in general, its services and amenities, and types of the housing available there.



*"Community information would be useful...what the nearest stores are, what the bus, transportation is...what there is in the community." (desegregative mover, Allegheny County)*

*"...a lot of these [places] got block clubs...its usually somebody in the neighborhood that knows everything, and they can more or less give you a breakdown of who's who, what's what." (public housing resident, Buffalo)*

This finding suggests that it would be wise for housing authorities and/or mobility programs to invest in services such as providing comprehensive information about non-impacted areas (e.g., maps, schools, services, neighborhood descriptions, etc.). Neighborhood tours would also likely help facilitate desegregative moves. Many existing mobility programs already provide these types of services, including the Housing Opportunities Program in Dallas (see Turner and Williams, 1998).

#### **5.4.2 Search Assistance**

More than just providing information on available housing, many participants said they wanted “hands-on” assistance in finding and securing a unit.<sup>47</sup> They found that finding housing in non-impacted areas was particularly daunting and that the Section 8 lists that they were given by the housing authority often contained many homes of poor quality or ones that were not currently for rent. The programs at the eight case study sites varied in the extent to which they provided intensive search assistance and in some cases, such as Dallas and Omaha, the intensity of service varied over time. Participants who received intensive

---

<sup>47</sup>Again, this type of service is generally provided by most comprehensive mobility programs (Turner and Williams, 1998).



search assistance were very appreciative and some were successful in making desegregative moves, often to areas they had never considered before.

*"They have transportation that will carry you to look for a house... They will take a van and they'll take you all around to the suburbs." (desegregative mover, Dallas)*

*"Best thing they did...they took me around to find a place." (desegregative mover, Omaha)*

### **5.4.3 Financial Assistance**

Many participants said that they felt that they needed additional resources to help them move. Specifically noted were help with moving expenses, moving assistance, security and utility deposits, appliances, and lawn equipment.

*"I think it would help out a lot if maybe the Section 8 program or [Housing Authority] could kind of help us with the deposit...because that's a lot of money to come up with." (desegregative mover, Omaha)*

Some sites did provide such assistance (e.g., New York provided money directly to moving contractors to assist in moves and New Haven provided garden supplies), and participants found it extremely useful.

*"They furnished us with our own appliances, a lawn mower, rake, shovel, hoe, garden hose..." (scattered-site resident, New Haven)*

#### 5.4.4 Homeownership Opportunities

Participants at several sites said that they felt that access to homeownership made making desegregative moves more attractive. As this participant from East Texas put it:

*"...the responsibility and the achievement of having your own home is something that, you know, nothing matches that really." (scattered-site resident, East Texas).*

#### 5.4.5 Long-term Stability

Measuring any success in the implementation of the consent decrees should go well beyond the evidence of sheer numbers of desegregative moves. At this time, however, we are not able to say very much about longer-term outcomes, given the recency of many of the settlements and the implementation efforts. However, helping residents become stable in their new communities is clearly essential, or many of these tenants may simply move back to their old neighborhoods. Staff of the Housing Opportunities Program in Dallas, the oldest of the mobility programs in this study and one of the oldest programs in the nation, report that they are increasingly concerned about retention and the importance of providing adequate follow up support. Focus group participants who had made desegregative moves identified a number of other factors that might discourage residents from staying in non-impacted areas. Housing authorities and mobility programs need to be sensitive to these concerns if their desegregative efforts are to succeed.

Our findings indicate that residents may be less likely to stay in their new community if they felt had little choice about where they moved. Some focus group participants reported feeling pressured by housing authority or mobility staff to select a unit and neighborhood more quickly than they would have liked.





*“Then they tell me you have to accept this [unit], if you don’t accept this then you will just lose out on this, you know, your decree. It was just terrible. So at that point, I really wanted to move, so I accepted the apartment with, thinking that, ‘cause he told me, ‘well, you can put in for a transfer later.’ And I put in for a transfer, they denied me, of course.”*  
*(desegregative mover, New York)*

Poor quality housing may also discourages residents from staying in their new neighborhoods. For example, a participant from Dallas said she moved back to an impacted area because she refused to stay in the housing unit she had been able to find in a non-impacted area, which she considered substandard.

Participants in homeownership programs said they need information about long-term costs because many fear that their expenses could increase faster than their income. This concern was expressed strongly by East Texas participants, who said they do not have enough information on the likely cost of their scattered-site houses. While they expressed interest in buying their homes, many of these participants were unsure whether they would be able to qualify for a mortgage when the time came.

*“I’m confused, I don’t know how much my house is [worth]. I don’t know if in two years if I’m gonna get it financed, I don’t know...I’m confused and I have to ask them and I know I get on their nerves.”* *(scattered-site resident, East Texas)*

Factors that focus group participants identified as facilitators to remaining in non-impacted areas included: not being identified as a recipient of housing assistance, having a good landlord or management, and having a sense of community.

As discussed above, many participants felt that landlords and neighbors in non-impacted areas had negative attitudes about Section 8 participants. Not surprisingly, participants who had moved to a non-impacted area reported the importance of having a good landlord or management company. A good



landlord was identified as one who would be responsive to complaints and who would not interfere much in your daily life. These participants noted that it was best to make sure you had a good landlord prior to moving.

Finally, while a decent house and a nice community were important for most people to remain in their new neighborhoods, a number of participants also indicated that they wanted to be involved in their community. This gave them the sense of involvement necessary for a satisfying life.

*"...I think the development did a lot of door-to-door knocking, making sure you participated in tenant [patrol]...They make sure everyone knows everyone, and if there's a problem, they look out for each other." (desegregative mover, New York)*

## 5.5 Conclusion

It is still too early to determine the long-term impact of the consent decrees on social and economic outcomes for tenants. The findings from our focus groups, while not representative of all affected residents, highlight several key issues. These findings suggest that the impact thus far has been mixed and that housing authorities and mobility programs will need to be sensitive to residents' needs and concerns to ensure the long-term success of their desegregation efforts. Positive impacts to date for some participants include: better quality housing; safer, cleaner neighborhoods; access to services and amenities; and more opportunities (for jobs and education) for both adults and children. At the same time, other participants report serious problems, particularly racial harassment and discrimination. According to these participants, fear of discrimination causes many of them to live in social isolation and, in some cases, to move back to their old neighborhoods. Simply the fear of such discrimination has hampered many participants' interest in and willingness even to consider making a desegregative move.



Discussions with focus group participants highlight the fact that people, regardless of race, want to live in housing that is well maintained and in neighborhoods that are safe and convenient. Where moves to non-impacted areas have allowed participants to live in such environments, there may be greater likelihood of longer-term, positive effects. Not all participants who moved to non-impacted areas found themselves in quality housing or neighborhoods, however. Because areas are defined as “non-impacted” at the census tract or community level, conditions within a non-impacted area might not meet the desired standards.

Finally, our findings have implications for the types of services provided to residents by housing authorities and mobility programs. Participants identified access to information about communities in non-impacted areas and search assistance as key for supporting desegregative moves. Many also mentioned the need for financial assistance, particularly help with paying security deposits. Finally, our findings suggest that if these desegregative efforts are to succeed in the long-run, programs will need to provide follow up services to help residents to overcome the challenges they encounter in their new environments.



---

<b>CHAPTER 5 RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS.....</b>	<b>48</b>
5.0 Introduction.....	48
5.1 Perceived Barriers to Mobility.....	49
5.1.1 Anticipated Discrimination .....	50
5.1.2 Financial Barriers.....	51
5.1.3 Lack of Transportation and Access to Services.....	51
5.2 Challenges Encountered by Those Attempting Desegregative Moves .....	52
5.2.1 Concerns About the Housing Authority or Mobility Program .....	52
5.2.2 Lack of Affordable Units.....	53
5.2.3 Discrimination .....	53
5.2.4 Lack of Transportation .....	53
5.3 Movers' Experiences .....	54
5.3.1 Housing Quality .....	54
5.3.2 Neighborhoods .....	55
5.3.3 Opportunities .....	56
5.3.4 Social Integration .....	59
5.3.5 Discrimination and Harassment.....	61
5.4 Implications for Mobility Programs.....	63
5.4.1 Access to Information About Non-Impacted Areas.....	63
5.4.2 Search Assistance .....	64
5.4.3 Financial Assistance .....	64
5.4.4 Homeownership Opportunities .....	65
5.4.5 Long-term Stability.....	65
5.5 Conclusion.....	66



## CHAPTER 6

### CROSS-SITE FACILITATORS AND INHIBITORS

#### 6.0 Introduction

In this chapter, we examine the factors that facilitated and inhibited successful implementation of the elements of the decrees across the eight study sites. Given the complex and challenging nature of the task of remedying past desegregation in public housing and the unprecedented nature of the decrees, it is not surprising that we find more inhibitors than facilitators. However, our findings indicate that some sites—particularly Dallas and Minneapolis—have overcome many initial difficulties and made substantial progress.

The inhibitors we identified cover a range of issues, including:

- the predominantly minority composition of the waiting list and family housing population;
- conflicts among agencies implementing the decrees, including public housing authorities (PHAs), mobility contractors, Section 8 program contractors, local government, HUD offices, and members of task forces created as a result of the settlements;
- coordinating multiple agencies with implementation responsibilities—in most sites, the housing authority, HUD, and local city government all have significant roles;



- organized community resistance to scattered-site housing;
- reluctance to accept desegregative in-movers and to make desegregative moves;
- lack of plaintiffs' acceptance of specific elements of the decrees;
- inadequate supply of vacant rental units at Fair Market Rent levels;
- poor public transportation, which both makes desegregative moves unattractive and affects movers' access to employment opportunities; and
- lack of HUD monitoring and follow through to ensure that local agencies were implementing the decrees as specified.

The factors that we identified that appeared to facilitate successful implementation of the court-ordered remedies include:

- the housing authority's resources, both financial and managerial;
- creative diffusion of community resistance to replacement housing;
- coordination of local public services; and



- institutional reform of housing authorities.

The last factor was a notable, unexpected finding—at several sites it was apparent that the PHA administration had changed in fundamental ways as a result of having to implement the requirements of the consent decree. Because of the significance of these changes, we discuss this finding in some detail.

We discuss each of these facilitating and inhibiting factors below, offering examples from the eight case studies to illustrate how they affected the implementation process.

## **6.1 Inhibitors**

Given the challenges inherent in attempting to desegregate public housing and offer tenants new, housing opportunities, it is not surprising that we identified a number of inhibitors. Some of these inhibitors are forces external to the housing authorities and others are internal, but all presented serious impediments to the successful implementation of the decrees. However, these inhibitors should not be seen as insurmountable. Indeed, the extent of progress in Dallas after many years of effort suggests that it is possible overcome many of these obstacles.

### **6.1.1 Racial Composition of the Waiting List and Current Tenant Population**

By far the most serious impediment to desegregating public housing developments successfully is that in nearly all of these sites, the waiting list and current PHA family population are predominantly minority. For example, in Dallas, the tenant population is over 80 percent African-American and nearly all the white



or Hispanic tenants live in the housing authority's elderly developments.<sup>48</sup> In East Texas, two of the three Golden Triangle PHAs have predominantly African-American populations. Even in Minneapolis, which has a very diverse tenant population, including African-Americans, Southeast Asians, American Indians, and Hispanics, there are very few whites.<sup>49</sup> Because of the composition of the tenant population, integrating most of these housing authorities' family developments is currently impossible.

Allegheny County, a suburban housing authority, was an exception to this pattern when the *Sanders* case was settled; in 1995, 66 percent of the population of the housing authority's family developments was African-American and 34 percent of the tenants were white. Yet, even here, the trends in racial composition have become worrisome. Over time, the composition of the tenant and waiting list population has shifted, reducing the possibilities for integration within Allegheny County Housing Authority's family housing. Currently, the proportion of whites in family housing has fallen to 29 percent, and the majority of applicants on the waiting list are African-American.<sup>50</sup>

Perhaps because of this situation, few of the court orders even attempt to address the issue of desegregation within conventional public housing developments. With the exception of the *Sanders* and *Davis* cases, the decrees emphasize providing desegregative opportunities for minority tenants through scattered-site replacement housing and the use of Section 8 certificates and vouchers. The decrees generally also call for the equalization of conditions between predominantly minority- and predominantly white-occupied developments (often elderly developments). Thus, as in the cases of Dallas or Minneapolis, it may be possible for a PHA to be relatively successful in implementing the terms of its decree without desegregating its conventional public housing stock.

### 6.1.2 Conflict Among Agencies Implementing the Decree

---

<sup>48</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Section 1.1.2.

<sup>49</sup>See Minneapolis Case Study, Section 1.1.3.

<sup>50</sup>See Allegheny County Case Study, Section 2.1.





The eight decrees each require a set of complex, challenging remedies, many of which involve multiple actors with implementation responsibilities, including PHAs, mobility contractors, Section 8 program contractors, local governments, local HUD offices, and members of task forces created as a result of the settlements. In nearly all sites, conflict among agencies has caused at least some problems and has made implementation more challenging.

Conflict over selecting a mobility contractor has been a common problem, perhaps because this process involves PHAs taking the relatively unusual step of partnering with a non-profit organization. In some cases, these conflicts caused significant delays in the start up of the mobility program. In Buffalo, the City began the process of selecting a contractor in 1997 and selected a group called Housing Opportunities Made Equal to run the program in partnership with the Rental Assistance Corporation. Because the Rental Assistance Corporation administers the Section 8 program for the City of Buffalo and was a defendant in the *Comer* case, this decision was questioned by City officials and the plaintiffs' attorney and a new RFP was issued. Housing Opportunities Made Equal was selected again in 1998, although this time it had partnered with the Buffalo Federation of Neighborhoods. As a result of these disputes over selecting a contractor, the mobility program was not expected to begin operations until the spring of 1999.<sup>51</sup>

Similar conflicts delayed the selection of a mobility contractor for Allegheny County for several years. The first RFP for the program was issued in May 1995, and The Fair Housing Partnership was selected. As in Buffalo, the award was contested and a second RFP was issued in late 1995. The Fair Housing Partnership was again selected; a contract was awarded in June 1996. This contract was not executed until December 1996. According to Fair Housing Partnership staff, another delay ensued because the Allegheny Department of Economic Development did not release start up funds promptly. As a result, the Center did not begin providing counseling services until March 1998.<sup>52</sup>

Likewise, final selection of a mobility contractor in New Haven was delayed for about eight months while the housing authority's board protested the contractor selected by the panel comprised of the PHA's staff,

---

<sup>51</sup>See Buffalo Case Study, Section 3.4.2.

<sup>52</sup>See Allegheny County Case Study, Section 2.5.1.



HUD, and the plaintiffs' attorney.<sup>53</sup> In Omaha, the settlement required OHA to serve as a conduit from HUD for funding for the mobility program. According to HUD staff, OHA did not want to participate in the program, but once HUD threatened a lawsuit, the housing authority agreed to its role. Even after this dispute was resolved, according to sources from the housing authority and the mobility program, there continued to be conflict between the Omaha Housing Authority and the mobility contractor, which undermined early implementation of the mobility program. According to staff from both agencies, these problems have abated somewhat over time.<sup>54</sup>

While mobility programs seemed to generate the most problems, there were many other issues that created conflict. For example, in East Texas, according to an audit by the HUD Inspector General, disputes between two local HUD offices seriously undermined implementation of the *Young* decree during the mid-1990s. In 1993, HUD opened a Fair Housing Office in Beaumont; in 1994, a Public and Indian Housing office was located there as well. Both offices had oversight responsibility for implementing the 1995 decree. According to the HUD audit, continual strife between the office directors, turf battles, and high staff turnover undermined the effectiveness of these local offices. The report recommended that both local offices be closed; the Public and Indian Housing Office was closed in 1997, but the Fair Housing Office continues to operate.

The *Sanders* case in Allegheny involves one of the most complex decrees, requiring the cooperation of the Allegheny County Housing Authority, County government, and a Task Force created to address economic conditions around the affected developments. Relationships between these entities have not been smooth, and conflict has reportedly undermined implementation on a number of fronts. In particular, disagreements about how to allocate \$30 million in CDBG funds for improvements around public housing developments have led to delays in disbursing these funds.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup>See New Haven Case Study, Section 2.1.

<sup>54</sup>See Omaha Case Study, Section 2.4.

<sup>55</sup>See Allegheny County Case Study, Section 2.6.1.



### 6.1.3 Coordination Among Agencies with Implementation Responsibilities

Even when there is not actual conflict among the agencies with responsibility for implementing the desegregation settlement, getting multiple entities to coordinate their activities effectively has proven quite challenging. Obtaining cooperation and carefully planning implementation activities can take a great deal of time and significantly delay the implementation process. In Minneapolis, the *Hollman* decree affected housing and redevelopment authorities throughout the Twin Cities area, but suburban communities were not party to the settlement negotiations. The Minneapolis Public Housing Authority has had to invest considerable time and resources to gain their cooperation; as a result, although the case was settled in 1995, only 19 units of replacement housing have been produced to date. However, the lengthy planning process seems to be paying off—since the housing authority created its Metropolitan Housing Opportunities Program and Metropolitan Housing Implementation Group, plans have been made for developing or acquiring another 522 units.<sup>56</sup>

In Dallas, lack of coordination between the three defendants—HUD, the City of Dallas, and the Dallas Housing Authority—recently resulted in a situation where, according to housing authority staff, the Section 8 program has grown so rapidly that the mobility program is having difficulty providing effective services for its clients. To meet its obligations to provide housing opportunities for low-income families, the City received 1,400 new Section 8 vouchers from HUD, which it then gave to the housing authority to administer. At the same time, HUD began to provide additional Section 8 vouchers for replacement housing in non-impacted areas, as well as relocation vouchers from West Dallas and other Dallas Housing Authority properties. The influx of vouchers from the City and HUD has meant that over-stretched mobility program staff could provide only basic services—briefings, van tours, landlord outreach, and rental listings. Mobility program staff were concerned about the lack of time for individual counseling and follow-up support, both of which they believe to be critical to the long-term success of the program.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>See Minneapolis Case Study, Section 2.1.6.

<sup>57</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Sections 2.4 and 2.5.



In Buffalo, there are three agencies responsible for overseeing the Section 8 program: the housing authority; the Rental Assistance Corporation, which administers Section 8 within the City of Buffalo; and the Belmont Shelter Corporation, which administers Section 8 for a consortium of towns and villages in suburban Erie County. Because of the number of agencies involved, implementing relatively simple remedies such as changes to tenant selection and assignment procedures requires a great deal of time and coordination. As of the summer of 1998, the three parties had yet to develop a system for cross-listing of applicants. In addition, there was a dispute over which agency would administer the 800 Section 8 vouchers that will be provided as part of the *Comer* settlement.<sup>58</sup>

#### 6.1.4 Organized Community Resistance

Community resistance to replacement housing in non-impacted areas has been one of the most serious inhibitors to successful implementation across the eight sites. In only two sites—Dallas and Minneapolis—have the housing authorities been able to develop strategies for diffusing resistance and, while these efforts have been innovative, they have only been partially successful.

In Minneapolis, according to press accounts, more affluent, outer-ring suburban communities have avoided cooperating with the agencies implementing *Hollman* by instituting restrictive zoning requirements which limit affordable housing construction by requiring big lots, two-car garages, or single-family homes. Within the City of Minneapolis, residents of one neighborhood signed a petition to prevent the housing authority from renting one scattered-site unit, complaining that violence had increased due to the influx of subsidized housing.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup>See Buffalo Case Study, Sections 3.1.4 and 3.3.2.

<sup>59</sup>See Minneapolis Case Study, Section 2.1.6.



Despite the Dallas housing authority's success in overcoming opposition to one scattered-site development, at the time of the case study, the housing authority still faced a homeowners' association lawsuit which threatened to stop the construction of replacement housing in non-impacted areas.<sup>60</sup> This case was rejected by the district court in August 1997, but the homeowners appealed to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The case was heard in January 1998, and was undecided at the time of the case study. The Fifth Circuit subsequently ruled in favor of the homeowners in March 1999.

Although the Court's ruling came after the research was completed, it is important to include a discussion of the decision because of its potential significance and possible impact on future developments in the implementation of the *Walker* decree.<sup>61</sup> The homeowners' suit, filed in 1996, alleged that the construction of public housing in a predominantly white community denies the residents "equal protection" under the Fourteenth Amendment. Essentially, their case argued that only the "least intrusive" race-based remedy should be used to correct racial discrimination, and that since rental assistance is less intrusive than building public housing, funds for the construction of the development should be used instead for subsidized rentals. The Fifth Circuit ruling agrees with this argument and states that the race-conscious remedy of siting new housing in predominantly white areas is not narrowly tailored to remedy the vestiges of past discrimination and segregation and further, has the potential to harm the homeowners by lowering property values, and bringing increased crime and disorder to their community.

The Court argues that the Section 8 program is a more appropriate remedy for the past discrimination, calling it a race-neutral remedy that is "increasingly successful at moving black families into white areas." Further, the court states that the program could be even more successful with additional funding for vouchers and mobility efforts and higher FMR exception rents. The Court indicated that it believed that not enough time had elapsed to decree that these strategies were not sufficient to remedy the past discrimination and that "adopting a race-conscious remedy [should be] a last resort." The Court also

---

<sup>60</sup>*Walker vs. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, Highlands of McKamey VI, and Community Association, Preston Highlands Homeowners' Association, et al.*

<sup>61</sup>This discussion will provide important background information for the long-term impact evaluation of the decrees.



characterized the *Walker* defendants, the DHA, City of Dallas, and HUD as cooperating defendants who no longer discriminate and actively participate in crafting and implementing remedial measures to eliminate the vestiges of past discrimination.

The plaintiffs' attorney and the DHA attempted to appeal the case to the Supreme Court. However, in January 2000, the Supreme Court declined to hear the case, returning it to the local jurisdiction. The parties to the case will now have to reconsider the 1995 agreement, particularly the requirement that DHA construct 474 units of new housing in predominantly white areas. As of this writing, it is unclear how this decision will ultimately affect the implementation of the *Walker* decree.<sup>62</sup>

Other sites have also experienced serious resistance to the construction of scattered site units, although not to the level that has occurred in Dallas. Opposition in New Haven has been particularly blatant—and politicized. In 1992, there were several public hearings and rallies in the Morris Cove community of New Haven at which residents protested the placing of scattered-site units in their community. In the most extreme incident, several single family homes that the housing authority had purchased were the targets of arson. A group in another New Haven community managed to get an injunction—eventually suspended—to prevent the housing authority from acquiring property in their neighborhood.<sup>63</sup>

The location of scattered-site housing remains an extremely controversial issue in Allegheny County, with several suburban communities formally opposing the placement of any units in their communities. The Allegheny County Housing Authority initially tried to concentrate its purchases within a single school district; this plan did not become an issue until after local elections in 1996. Local politicians protested that scattered-site housing meant the loss of taxable units and was unfair to other residents. As a result of this controversy, HUD issued a new acquisitions policy meant to emphasize mixed-income developments and require the agency to purchase lower-cost units that required more rehabilitation. This new policy has not diffused the opposition; in September 1998, 250 people protested the housing

---

<sup>62</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Sections 1.2.4, 2.2.2 and 5.0.

<sup>63</sup>See New Haven Case Study, Section 2.3.1.



authority's purchase of three townhouses in one development. In November 1998, local councilmen organized a petition to secede from Allegheny County rather than accept these three units of subsidized housing. A number of suburban communities have recently filed suit to try to block the replacement housing plan altogether; thus far, the court has dismissed these cases.<sup>64</sup>

Finally, although it has been less extreme than in either New Haven or Allegheny, there has also been considerable opposition to scattered-site units in Omaha. Public hearings were required before the Omaha Housing Authority could purchase properties for replacement housing. According to housing authority staff, these hearings were often heated, as residents of the neighborhoods in which the units were located attended the meetings to speak against approval of the purchases.<sup>65</sup>

### **6.1.5 Reluctance to Accept Desegregative In-Movers and Make Desegregative Moves**

All sites were ordered to offer desegregative opportunities for residents either through their Section 8 programs or, in a few sites (Allegheny County, New York, and East Texas), within their family public housing developments. In all sites, both community residents' reluctance to accept in-movers and public and assisted housing residents' reluctance to make these desegregative moves have proved to be significant inhibitors.

**Desegregative Moves in Public Housing.** The *Sanders* decree in Allegheny County is the only one of the eight settlements that requires both white and minority tenants to make desegregative moves within public housing. Achieving these moves has proven difficult; staff report that it is not unusual for whites to refuse desegregative assignments to family developments and African-Americans to refuse moves to predominantly white elderly developments, even when refusal forces them to the bottom of the waiting list. This reluctance may be due to fears and lack of information, as well as the failure of the housing

---

<sup>64</sup>See Allegheny County Case Study, Section 2.2.2.

<sup>65</sup>See Omaha Case Study, Section 2.2.1.



authority to improve the quality of its housing and the surrounding neighborhoods. Reportedly, many participants prefer to wait for a Section 8 certificate or and voucher rather than accept a unit in public housing. As noted above, the white population of Allegheny County's family developments has decreased substantially since the decree was signed.<sup>66</sup>

The *Davis* decree in New York City requires that minority families be offered units in historically white developments. While the decree has had a substantial impact on the racial composition of many of the affected developments, over 600 families remain on the waiting list. Part of the reason is that few vacancies currently exist in the targeted developments. But of more relevance here, many African-American families are reportedly reluctant to move to some developments, particularly those in Staten Island. Tenants in some of the affected developments have also been reluctant to accept in-movers, claiming that the consent decree is unfair and "discriminates against whites."<sup>67</sup>

In East Texas, desegregating public housing would require that African-American tenants from Beaumont and Port Arthur move to predominantly white Orange County and vice versa. For a variety of reasons, these desegregative moves are unlikely to occur. Beaumont and Port Arthur are urban areas; Orange County is more rural and does not offer the same access to services or job opportunities. Moreover, race relations in the area present a significant barrier. Orange County includes the town of Vidor, the site of an ill-fated attempt to integrate a public housing development, and a town perceived by many African-American residents as an unsafe, hostile community. Likewise, white public housing residents from Orange County reportedly fear they would encounter intolerance if they attempted to move to public housing in Beaumont or Port Arthur.<sup>68</sup>

**Desegregative Moves with Section 8.** Reluctance to make desegregative moves using Section 8 is also a significant barrier. Generally, sites with mobility programs reported having to provide residents with a great deal of support and encouragement to get them to consider moving to predominantly white, non-

---

<sup>66</sup>See Allegheny County Case Study, Section 2.1.1.

<sup>67</sup>See New York Case Study, Section 2.4.

<sup>68</sup>See East Texas Case Study, Section 3.4.





impacted areas. In many cases, residents were very reluctant to leave familiar areas. For example, in New Haven staff from both the plaintiffs' attorney and the mobility program reported that residents did not want to move to suburban areas, preferring to remain in the City near their jobs and social networks. Many residents participated in the welfare-to-work transition program, which made their employment and access to supportive services such as child care more critical. In addition, mobility program staff reported that residents feared that they would encounter prejudice in white, affluent areas.<sup>69</sup> As discussed in Chapter 4, in Omaha, staff reported that many residents were so unwilling to make desegregative moves that they waited until the end of the 120-day restricted period was lifted and they could use their Section 8 certificate or voucher in an impacted area.<sup>70</sup>

The *Hollman* decree in Minneapolis involves a somewhat more complex situation. According to a survey conducted by the Urban Coalition of St. Paul and Minneapolis, the majority of African-Americans wanted to move from their developments and, while concerned about the relocation process, did not oppose making desegregative moves. In contrast, the large Southeast Asian population was generally reluctant to leave public housing; Hmong residents, in particular, strongly opposed relocation. The Hmong had only recently immigrated to the United States. Living in a tightly-knit community with other Hmong is an integral part of their cultural identity; separating clans and family through relocation disrupts this strong connection. Further, most Hmong families are large and hard to house. Finally, the language barrier fosters heavy dependence on local Southeast Asian service providers, services which are inaccessible in suburban areas.<sup>71</sup>

Lack of acceptance from suburban communities was a serious issue for desegregative movers at the sites with existing mobility programs. As discussed in Chapter 5, many residents complained of social isolation and discrimination, with some reporting racial harassment. For example, in Dallas, which has the oldest mobility program, some focus group participants who had made desegregative moves reported very little

---

<sup>69</sup>See New Haven Case Study, Section 2.6.2.

<sup>70</sup>See Omaha Case Study, Section 2.3.

<sup>71</sup>See Minneapolis Case Study, Section 2.1.3.



interaction with their neighbors and several who had moved to suburban communities said they had been harassed by police. Even those who had not experienced overt harassment spoke of the stress of being the only African-Americans in nearly all-white communities.<sup>72</sup>

### 6.1.6 Lack of Residents' Acceptance of Specific Elements of the Decree

These public housing desegregation settlements were intended to improve conditions for minority tenants at the eight sites. However, in seven of the eight sites, at least some residents opposed specific elements of the decrees, in particular the demolition of public housing units and requirements for desegregative moves. In Dallas, in response to concerns raised by African-American residents about the loss of low-income housing in West Dallas as a result of the *Walker* decree, local congressional representatives introduced the Frost-Leyland Anti-Demolition Statute in 1987. This statute, in effect until 1995, prevented the use of HUD or Dallas Housing Authority funds for the demolition of public housing in Dallas, preventing any redevelopment activity on the West Dallas site.<sup>73</sup>

Tenants at other sites also have objected to elements of the decrees, but their protests have not had as clear impacts. As discussed above, in Minneapolis, Hmong residents strongly opposed relocation, fearing the disruption of their communities. However, since their developments were being demolished, they had no choice but to relocate. In New Haven, tenants did not support the mobility program and reportedly have been reluctant to make desegregative moves. In Allegheny County, tenant groups objected to CDBG funds being used to redevelop and desegregate neighborhoods around their public housing developments, instead of going directly to the plaintiff class.<sup>74</sup> Finally, in Buffalo, some tenants

---

<sup>72</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Section 3.3.

<sup>73</sup>According to several key informants in Dallas, it is not clear that the impetus for this legislation actually stemmed from an organized group of West Dallas tenants. Instead, it may have been a political deal whereby white political leaders used a few disgruntled West Dallas tenants for their own purposes, namely to prevent the construction of replacement housing in predominantly white areas. See Dallas Case Study, Section 1.2.1.

<sup>74</sup>See Allegheny County Case Study, Section 2.6.2.



reported concerns about the PHA's plans to demolish so many units in their developments and with the requirement that the revitalized housing be put into private management.<sup>75</sup>

### **6.1.7 Inadequate Supply of Units at the Fair Market Rent Level**

In about half the sites, a lack of units at the Section 8 Fair Market Rent (FMR) level—particularly in non-impacted areas—presented a major barrier to desegregative moves. In New York City, 200 Section 8 vouchers were set aside for plaintiff class members. However, because of the extremely tight rental market, only 51 of these vouchers have been used since the case was settled in 1992. Reportedly, there are very few vacancies (especially large units) available at the FMR level and the lease-up rate for the overall Section 8 program is very low.<sup>76</sup>

While New York is the most extreme example, the affordable housing rental markets in Omaha, Minneapolis and Dallas are also very tight. Staff in Omaha said that the vacancy rate was at about 5 percent; staff in Minneapolis and Dallas reported even lower vacancy rates. In Dallas, there has been a great deal of new construction of high-end housing, leaving Section 8 tenants to compete with other low-income households for a limited supply of affordable housing. The PHAs at these sites have requested FMR exceptions, and in Dallas, because of the consent decree, the housing authority is able to offer landlords with large units in non-impacted areas a leasing bonus. Even with these exception rents and incentives, staff report that in such competitive markets, landlords in non-impacted areas have little incentive to lease to Section 8 tenants. Among other issues, landlords must forgo rents during the inspection and lease-approval process and must contend with the rules of the Section 8 program.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup>See Buffalo Case Study, Section 3.2.2.

<sup>76</sup>In New York, most successful Section 8 recipients use their subsidy to lease in place and are primarily small family households and the elderly. See New York Case Study, Section 2.3.2.

<sup>77</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Section 2.4.3., Omaha Case Study, Section 2.4.3, and Minneapolis Case Study, 2.3.1.



### 6.1.8 Poor Public Transportation

Poor public transportation in suburban areas presents a barrier to desegregative moves at all sites except New York. As discussed above, residents in New Haven have resisted moving to suburban areas because of the difficulty of traveling to employment opportunities and tenants have resisted making desegregative moves in Allegheny County because of the lack of public transportation. In Dallas, the local transit authority rerouted a bus line to the DHA's new, scattered-site development; even so, the distances are so great that tenants still are relatively isolated.

### 6.1.9 Lack of HUD Monitoring and Follow-Through

Despite HUD's affirmative actions since 1993 to settle outstanding public housing desegregation suits, our findings indicate that HUD's follow-through on implementation often falls short. Although most of the decrees do not explicitly call for HUD to track implementation, HUD has responsibility for overseeing these housing authorities and therefore, for monitoring their actions related to these desegregation plans. Our findings indicate that lack of aggressive monitoring from HUD has exacerbated problems at some sites, including poor compliance and mistakes that have left some African-American tenants in poor quality housing.

The problems are most evident in East Texas, where HUD is the sole defendant and has primary responsibility for implementing the requirements of the *Young* decree. HUD's own investigation showed that strife between the two local HUD offices in Beaumont led to a situation in which local PHAs were left with confusing and contradictory instructions and little compliance monitoring. Further, slow HUD approval and decision-making processes delayed implementation of key program elements. The 1995 Final Decree and Judgment in the *Young* case called for HUD to provide \$500,000 annually for at least five years to fund a Fair Housing Services Center. HUD did not issue a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)



---

for the Center until December of 1997 and did not select a contractor until September 1998. Because of these delays, the Center will not begin providing services to East Texas residents until the spring of 1999.<sup>78</sup>

## **6.2 Facilitators**

As discussed in Chapter 4, none of the eight housing authorities had achieved full compliance with the terms of their decrees at the time of our site visits. Many sites were still in the first years of implementing complex remedies and had not developed effective strategies for overcoming the many challenges they faced. As a result, most of the examples of facilitators that we were able to identify are drawn from three sites that had the most success in overcoming challenges to date: Dallas, Minneapolis, and New York. It is important to keep in mind that when we describe a PHA as having been successful, this term is relative and does not imply a smooth process or complete compliance with the terms of the decree. Rather, it implies that the PHA had effectively implemented a substantial portion of the required elements.

### **6.2.1 Housing Authority Resources**

In this section, we describe three types of resources that facilitated implementation: managerial capacity and effective leadership; local government support; and access to funds to support implementation.

#### **Managerial Capacity**

The managerial capacity of the housing authorities clearly affected their ability to successfully implement the terms of the desegregation settlements. Troubled housing authorities with frequent management turnover, e.g., Allegheny County and New Haven, had great difficulties overcoming obstacles and were unable to develop effective strategies for implementing many of the requirements of their decrees. Well-

---

<sup>78</sup>See East Texas Case Study, Section 3.1.3.



managed PHAs, like those in New York City and Minneapolis, were better prepared to address the challenges they faced. As will be discussed in more detail below, a change in leadership and philosophy in Dallas since the filing of the original decree has facilitated the implementation of more recent court orders.

Basic competence at PHA management was, however, not a guarantee of success. For example, Buffalo received a PHMAP score of 91.75 in 1997, classifying it as a “high-performer.”<sup>79</sup> However, despite this high management rating, after two years, the Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority had made little substantive progress in implementing the terms of its decree. Likewise, the Omaha Housing Authority, also considered a high-performer since 1990<sup>80</sup>, has encountered a number of problems in effectively carrying out the remedies specified in the *Hawkins* case. This finding suggests that effective implementation seems to require creative leadership as well as managerial competence.

### **Local Government Support**

In addition to being a PHA with strong managerial capacity, Minneapolis has the unusual resource of having the support of a regional government structure. The existence of the Metropolitan Council and the emphasis on regionalism in the Twin Cities area provided a structure for the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority to coordinate with other PHAs and suburban governments in implementing the *Hollman* decree.<sup>81</sup>

### **Financial Resources**

---

<sup>79</sup>See Section 2.1, Buffalo Case Study.

<sup>80</sup>The Omaha Housing Authority did not provide PHMAP scores from 1996 and 1997, but reported receiving consistently high scores throughout the 1990s. See Omaha Case Study, Section 1.1.

<sup>81</sup>See Section 2.1.6, Minneapolis Case Study.



Having access to financial resources also facilitates implementation, allowing PHAs to hire additional staff and invest in resident services. The New York City Housing Authority is the largest housing authority in the nation. It has 100,000 units of public housing and 65,000 Section 8 certificates and vouchers—and the corresponding amount of administrative fees. With its large staff and financial resources, the New York City Housing Authority was able to create an office with a small staff dedicated solely to implementing the terms of the *Davis* consent decree. These staff coordinate with other staff within the agency to coordinate implementation of both the public housing and tenant-based remedies.<sup>82</sup>

The facilitating effect of financial resources is shown even more dramatically by Dallas. The Dallas Housing Authority experienced a huge increase in its Section 8 program as a result of the *Walker* decree; the size of its program has more than doubled since the case was first settled and continues to grow as the result of later remedial orders.<sup>83</sup> The housing authority also received additional funding for its mobility program and, as a result of the consent decree with the City of Dallas in 1990, funds for bonus payments to landlords in non-impacted areas.<sup>84</sup> As a result of these resources, the housing authority has been able to develop a comprehensive mobility program and invest in innovative strategies to improve its family developments, including constructing a multi-purpose service center on its West Dallas site, a community college facility in its new Frankford and Marsh development, and developing a shopping mall to serve the West Dallas community. The Dallas Housing Authority has also received substantial HOPE VI funding to develop very high-quality replacement housing on its West Dallas site. With its administrative fees, the housing authority has been able to create an unusually strong Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program, which coordinates a range of job training and educational services at Dallas Housing Authority developments.<sup>85</sup>

## 6.2.2 Creative Diffusion of Community Resistance

---

<sup>82</sup>See New York Case Study, Section 2.3.3.

<sup>83</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Section 2.3.

<sup>84</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Section 2.4.

<sup>85</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Section 2.2.



Community resistance to replacement housing in non-impacted areas from both local homeowners and local politicians is one of the most serious inhibitors to successful implementation across the eight sites. As discussed above, lawsuits and organized protests have delayed—or prevented—the construction or acquisition of scattered-site housing in nearly all sites with this requirement, with Dallas and Allegheny County having some of the most severe problems.

Although organized community resistance presents a formidable obstacle, two sites—Dallas and Minneapolis—have managed to overcome this opposition, at least to some extent. Below, we describe the experiences of these two sites.

### **Dallas**

As discussed above, the situation in Dallas has changed substantially since the completion of the field work for this project, with the housing authority now blocked from constructing replacement housing in non-impacted areas. However, the housing authority had impressive success in diffusing opposition in the aftermath of an earlier lawsuit. The earlier suit was filed in 1995 by homeowners in a North Dallas community who filed suit to try to stop the construction of a 75-unit development on the Frankford and Marsh site. The homeowners alleged that the site that the housing authority had selected was not appropriate for public housing. The district court dismissed the case in 1997 and the agency then began actively working with the homeowners association to create a positive relationship. The housing authority invited seven or eight of the most vocal homeowners to form an advisory panel for the new development. The advisory panel worked with the housing authority during the design phase in order to create a development acceptable to the community.

The development that resulted from this partnership was designed to blend in with the surrounding private developments. The townhouses, which are of differing sizes on a single parcel of land, were designed to look like large single-family homes, and they feature amenities such as central air conditioning and washer hook-ups. In addition, the Dallas Housing Authority requires all tenants to be enrolled in its FSS program. The first tenants moved into their units at the end of July 1998, having received months of





---

counseling beforehand. The housing authority offers a range of services on-site, including a facility run by Brookhaven Community College, which serves residents from the entire area. Thus far, the development is quite successful and community opposition has ceased.<sup>86</sup>

### **Minneapolis**

The *Hollman* case has thus far not been as contentious as *Walker* and there has been no organized community resistance. However, the *Hollman* decree requires the construction of replacement housing on a regional basis, a model that fits with the Twin Cities' emphasis on regionalism. As noted above, many of the suburban jurisdictions initially were resistant to the idea of scattered-site units in their communities. To persuade private developers, suburban housing redevelopment agencies, and suburban PHAs to participate in constructing replacement units, the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority initiated the Metropolitan Housing Opportunities Program. This program offers grants for the capital costs of up to 690 units, and offers operating subsidies for 40 years, subject to annual Congressional appropriations. HUD will award these subsidies to the housing authority through its Annual Contributions Contract, and the authority will reallocate these funds to other local PHAs and redevelopment authorities based on the number of units they construct or acquire. As an incentive for these suburban agencies to participate, 30 percent of the units they create will be reserved for local residents. Under this program, 19 units had been completed in suburban communities as of the end of 1998 and more than 500 additional units were planned.

In addition to the Metropolitan Housing Opportunities Program, the housing authority organized the Metropolitan Housing Implementation Group, a consortium of housing funding agencies. Members include the housing authority, the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, the Metropolitan Council<sup>87</sup>, the

---

<sup>86</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Sections 1.2.4 and 2.2.2.

<sup>87</sup>The Metropolitan Council is the Twin Cities area's regional government.



Minneapolis-St. Paul Family Housing Fund, the Local Initiatives Support Corporation and HUD. The mission of this group is to encourage the production of *Hollman* units in suburban communities.<sup>88</sup>

### 6.2.3 Coordination of Local Public Services

In order for replacement housing in non-impacted areas to succeed in attracting—and keeping—tenants, PHAs will need to address the problems of isolation and lack of transportation. In Dallas, the housing authority has been able to coordinate successfully with the Dallas Area Regional Transit Authority to provide services for its replacement housing. The transit authority rerouted a bus line to serve the Frankford and Marsh development within two weeks of its opening and provides regular service to the Hamptons at Lake West, replacement housing constructed on the West Dallas site.<sup>89</sup> These bus routes have not solved the problems of isolation and transportation to jobs and the city entirely, but do provide a valuable service for residents.

### 6.2.4 Institutional Reform

We found that several of the housing authorities in this study had changed in fundamental ways as a result of having to implement the requirements of the consent decree. The most notable example was Dallas, but the PHAs in Minneapolis and, surprisingly, the East Texas agencies in Port Arthur and Beaumont, have developed new, forward-thinking strategies for providing housing opportunities—and in some cases, economic opportunities—for their tenants. Because this finding was so unexpected, we felt it was important to both understand the kinds of changes that had occurred and the factors that seemed to contribute to these institutional changes.

---

<sup>88</sup>See Minneapolis Case Study, Section 2.1.6.

<sup>89</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Section 2.2.2.



### **Institutional Change in Dallas**

There is substantial evidence that prior to the *Walker* decree, the Dallas Housing Authority discriminated against its African-American tenants, isolating them in the enormous West Dallas development and providing them with substandard Section 8 housing.<sup>90</sup> After the first *Walker* decree was signed in 1987, the housing authority administration resisted implementing the court-ordered remedies, particularly the mobility program.

However, this situation began to change with the appointment of a new Executive Director in 1989. This director is credited with having brought a new spirit to the agency; his successor has reportedly carried on his management reforms. The agency became a well-managed housing authority, maintaining its developments and improving its Section 8 program. But even more than simply becoming a high-performing PHA, the agency has become innovative and forward-thinking. All parties (the plaintiffs' attorney, HUD officials, City officials and housing authority staff) agree that the new housing the agency is constructing is extremely high-quality and that the agency has done an outstanding job of providing resident services on-site. The Dallas Housing Authority's Housing Opportunities Program (HOP) is well-respected and, with the appointment of the long-time HOP director as the director of the Section 8 program, the entire Section 8 program has taken on a mobility focus. As discussed above, the agency has been creative in diffusing community opposition, inviting members of a homeowners association to serve as an advisory panel for its new Frankford and Marsh development. But the most striking example of the housing authority's new philosophy is the commitment the agency has made to the West Dallas community, developing a nearby shopping mall and working with Goodwill Industries to bring employment opportunities to the area—both efforts are above and beyond what the agency was required to do under the *Walker* decree.<sup>91</sup>

### **Institutional Change in Minneapolis**

---

<sup>90</sup>For a history of discriminatory practices at the DHA, see Dallas Case Study, Section 1.1.

<sup>91</sup>See Dallas Case Study, Sections 1.2.1, 2.2, and 4.4.1.



---

The regional nature of the *Hollman* decree has forced the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority to take an entirely new approach to providing housing opportunities for its tenants. Historically, the agency's family housing was concentrated on the near Northside of Minneapolis, an economically depressed and isolated area. Before *Hollman*, the majority of the housing authority's Section 8 families were clustered in this area as well (see Chapter 4). But the *Hollman* consent decree required the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority—and all other PHAs and housing redevelopment authorities in the Twin Cities area—to view public housing as a regional concern. This change reflects the Twin Cities region's commitment to regional planning.

The requirement to locate replacement housing in non-impacted areas has led the housing authority and its partners to devise creative solutions to gain the cooperation of at least some suburban housing and redevelopment authorities. As described above, these include the incentives provided under the Metropolitan Housing Opportunities Program and the creation of the Metropolitan Housing Implementation Group. Although the lengthy negotiation and recruitment process has delayed the creation of new housing opportunities, it appears that these innovative measures may bring about the desired results.<sup>92</sup>

### **Institutional Change in East Texas**

Finding evidence of institutional reform in two of the three East Texas housing authorities (Port Arthur and Beaumont) was unexpected. The *Young* case is the oldest case among the eight sites in this study. It has been litigated multiple times and still, 14 years after the initial decree, there has been relatively little progress overall. Further, it is a case against HUD rather than a case against a specific PHA; the PHAs' roles in implementing the decree elements are fairly minimal when compared to the requirements imposed on the agencies in Dallas and Minneapolis. In general, the PHAs are to make physical improvements to their developments and the surrounding neighborhoods.

---

<sup>92</sup>See Minneapolis Case Study, Sections 1.2, 1.4, and 2.1.6.



---

One of the three East Texas PHAs in this study, Orange County, remains a troubled housing authority in receivership. However, the other two housing authorities, Port Arthur and Beaumont, have changed substantially as a result of the *Young* decree. Both have entirely new administrations and are now considered high-performers. Both agencies were mandated to offer new, higher-quality housing opportunities to their tenants. Given the nature of the housing stock in the area, both PHAs have chosen to focus on providing opportunities to tenants through scattered-site housing and homeownership programs rather than constructing new developments.

The Port Arthur housing authority has been particularly innovative in developing strategies to offer new opportunities to its tenants. The agency has used HOPE I funds to convert one development into homeownership units. To offer desegregative opportunities, the agency acquired 24 single-family homes in non-impacted areas of the city. Tenants are given the option to buy their homes after 15 months. Finally, the agency has provided tenants with closing cost and down payment assistance (with a cap of \$5,000 per family) since 1991.

The Beaumont housing authority is also developing homeownership opportunities for low- to moderate-income households to expand the housing options available to class members. The housing authority established a non-profit and is working with the City in an effort called “Beaumont on the Grow.” Under this program, the agency has purchased 50 homes that tenants lease for two years and then are offered the option to buy.

In sum, it appears that these four PHAs have developed new, innovative strategies for providing housing opportunities—and, in Dallas, economic opportunities—for low-income families. Across the four sites, some of the factors that led to these changes were:

- Time, i.e., enough time for the PHA to begin making substantial changes and overcome initial obstacles;
- Resources, including financial, managerial, and local government support (as in Minneapolis);



- New leadership and/or managerial commitment to change; and
- The terms of the decree which required housing authority staff to think creatively about developing new ways to provide housing opportunities and services to tenants.

The fact that such substantial changes could occur in Dallas and the two East Texas sites after many years of frustrating litigation should offer hope for other sites that are in the early phases of attempting to implement their desegregation settlements.



---

<b>CHAPTER 6 CROSS-SITE FACILITATORS AND INHIBITORS</b> .....	<b>68</b>
6.0 Introduction.....	68
6.1 Inhibitors.....	69
6.1.1 Racial Composition of the Waiting List and Current Tenant Population .....	69
6.1.2 Conflict Among Agencies Implementing the Decree .....	70
6.1.3 Coordination Among Agencies with Implementation Responsibilities .....	72
6.1.4 Organized Community Resistance .....	73
6.1.5 Reluctance to Accept Desegregative In-Movers and Make Desegregative Moves .....	75
6.1.6 Lack of Residents' Acceptance of Specific Elements of the Decree .....	77
6.1.7 Inadequate Supply of Units at the Fair Market Rent Level .....	78
6.1.8 Poor Public Transportation .....	79
6.1.9 Lack of HUD Monitoring and Follow-Through.....	79
6.2 Facilitators .....	79
6.2.1 Housing Authority Resources .....	80
6.2.2 Creative Diffusion of Community Resistance .....	81
6.2.3 Coordination of Local Public Services .....	83
6.2.4 Institutional Reform.....	83

---

## CHAPTER 7

### LONG-TERM EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 7.0 Introduction

As the evidence in this report shows, it is very difficult for housing authorities to achieve desegregative outcomes. Our findings at the baseline assessment also suggest that the decrees have had some positive effects on residents and housing authorities despite a relatively low level of desegregation for housing authority residents. However, these findings are preliminary and we propose none of the housing authorities have fully implemented all of the elements required by the decrees.

Due to these factors, the long-term impact evaluation design we propose includes four components: (1) a second round of site visits to collect information (qualitative and quantitative) about the processes used to implement the decrees' elements as well as their effects on residents; (2) a survey of public housing residents who lived in developments affected by the decrees; (3) detailed case studies that analyze the implementation and effectiveness of decree elements in the eight baseline sites; and (4) a statistical estimate of the effects of the decrees on segregation. The combination of these four sources of information will provide HUD answers to the following questions:

1. How long did it take for the main decree elements to be implemented?
2. What were the main inhibitors preventing the successful implementation of the main decree elements?
3. What were the main facilitators that led to the successful implementation of the main decree elements?
4. What factors accounted for successful (or unsuccessful) mobility counseling?
5. What unexpected outcomes resulted from implementing the decrees?
6. Did the decrees affect residents in ways other than desegregation, such as improved living conditions, reduced social isolation and increased levels of opportunity?





7. Did the decrees affect segregated residential patterns among PHA residents?

The seven questions presented above can be broken down into three broad categories: (1) time needed to implement the decree (question 1); (2) factors that affected the process used to implement the decree (questions 2 through 4); and (3) outcomes from the decree (questions 5 through 7). The answers to these questions require a combination of qualitative and quantitative information. Note that only one question relates to an assessment of the desegregative effect of the decrees in the eight sites. The other six address issues about other effects on tenants as well as the processes used by housing authorities to implement remedial decree elements. As a result, the recommended long-term impact evaluation should include a variety of information that can be used to analyze outcomes beyond those related to desegregating the residential location patterns of public housing and Section 8 residents. The data necessary to conduct our recommended long-term impact evaluation are detailed below.

### **7.1 Data Collection Component**

Our proposed long-term impact evaluation includes a second round of site visits during which researchers should: (1) conduct key informant interviews, (2) conduct focus groups with housing authority residents, (3) collect current development-level information about the racial characteristics of housing authority developments, (4) collect current information about the location and race of Section 8 certificate holders, (5) collect information about the amount and type (if any) of funds used to comply with the decree, (6) collect data on the number, outcomes and racial composition of housing authority residents undergoing mobility counseling, and (7) collect statistical information about the racial composition of public housing developments and the location and race of Section 8 certificate holders.

#### **7.1.1 Key Informant Interviews**



Key informant interviews will provide information about the processes used by housing authorities to implement specific elements of decrees, and allow for the long-term impact evaluation to catalog factors that inhibited or facilitated implementation of decree elements. In order to get as complete a picture as possible, we recommend that researchers interview individuals who represent all parties to the decree as well as others knowledgeable about the case in each site. Therefore, the researchers should attempt to interview PHA staff responsible for implementing decree elements, attorneys for both defendants and plaintiffs, mobility counseling staff, tenant leaders, HUD regional and national staff and others, such as local newspaper reporters and academicians, who are knowledgeable about the case. Ideally, these interviews would include people who have been involved in the case for a long period of time and could provide an historical perspective.



### **7.1.2 Focus Groups with PHA Residents**

Similar to the baseline research design, we recommend that the long-term impact evaluation include focus groups with housing authority residents in order to assess: (1) the effectiveness of mobility counseling, (2) any effects of the decree on residents' social isolation, opportunities and quality of life, and (3) any unexpected outcomes resulting from the decree. We recommend that the focus group participants be recruited using the methodology (which included an initial solicitation in writing, followed-up with telephone calls) employed by baseline researchers. In addition, the focus groups conducted as part of the long-term impact evaluation should follow discussion guides developed as part of the baseline assessment. While not statistically representative, these focus groups will provide a rich picture of the ways in which the decrees have affected residents' lives.

### **7.1.3 Resident Survey**

While focus groups will allow researchers to capture the observations of a number of residents efficiently, we recommend that the long-term impact evaluation also include a survey. The instrument would ask residents questions about their experiences since the decrees were implemented. Focus groups allow for in-depth discussion, but can not provide a broader picture of outcomes for a representative sample of residents affected by the decree. A resident survey should be conducted in order to collect information about outcomes that not only relate to desegregation, but to changes to residents' quality of life and life opportunities resulting from the decree.

The survey will provide a more systematic source of information about themes and issues raised by focus group participants during the baseline assessment. Specifically, residents could be asked: (1) whether or not they have noticed improvements to their public housing development or neighborhood, (2) about their experiences with mobility counseling (if appropriate), and (3) about their experiences in a new neighborhood (if appropriate). Ideally, the survey should include enough respondents to be representative of residents who lived in public housing developments affected by decree elements. However, our experience with other projects that have used surveys, indicates that it is difficult to locate



---

many former public housing residents, and so the survey results may have to be supplemented with information gathered from different groups of residents.

#### **7.1.4 Collect Information about Expenditures on Decree Elements**

In many decree elements, the housing authority is required to use its financial resources to improve the conditions in and around public housing developments. As a result, researchers should collect information during the long-term impact evaluation that details the source and amount of funds allocated for public housing improvements mandated by the decree. The housing authority may not be the only source of such data; researchers may have to collect information from local governments who receive funds through HUD's CDBG and/or HOME program(s).

#### **7.1.5 Mobility Counseling Data**

Mobility counseling is an element in seven of the eight baseline study sites. It was included in order to increase the probability that Section 8 certificate holders would consider and make desegregative moves. To the extent that the decrees foster desegregative outcomes, mobility counseling is a crucial element and warrants particular attention. As a result, the long-term impact evaluation should collect information about the participants in mobility counseling. At a minimum, this information should report on the number of participants, their race, the year in which mobility services were provided and lease-up rates. In addition, the research team should collect information about the initial location of participants before they received mobility counseling, the initial location that the participants moved to after receiving mobility counseling as well as their most current address. These data could be geocoded and displayed in maps that show the spatial distribution of: (1) Section 8 certificate holders prior to receiving mobility counseling, (2) location of initial location after receiving mobility counseling, and (3) location of Section 8 certificate holders after any subsequent moves. These data can be analyzed using spatial analytical techniques discussed in Section 3.5 of this report.

#### **7.1.6 Development-level and Section 8 Locational Data**



The research team should collect statistical information about the racial composition of public housing developments. Ideally, these data would be in electronic form and have information that reflects occupancy patterns as of the time of the site visit. Once collected, this information can be used to generate updated segregation measures like those described in Chapter 3 of this report. In addition, these measures can be used in the statistical estimates of the decrees' effects on segregation. To the extent possible, the long-term impact evaluation team should use data collected by HUD; this will ensure that the data are similar across all of the sites included in the long-term study.

The research team should also collect data on the race and location of all Section 8 certificate holders that contains information about whether or not the certificate holder received mobility counseling. These data can be used for computing Section 8 segregation measures and allows for statistical comparisons of the spatial distribution of Section 8 certificate holders who received mobility counseling to those who did not.

## **7.2 Case Study Component**



---

As discussed earlier in this report, a case study methodology is appropriate for analyzing complex social phenomena in a holistic manner (Yin, 1989). As a result, our recommended long-term impact evaluation calls for researchers to develop detailed case studies from the information collected as part of each site visit. These case studies will allow for a more complete analysis of questions relating to the progress made by housing authorities in complying with their decree, implementation strategies, the decrees' effects on residents, effects of mobility counseling and other outcomes resulting from the decree.

These case studies should follow a similar structure to those prepared as part of the baseline impact assessment. Therefore, the case studies should include a timeline that details significant milestones relating to the decrees in all eight sites, a description of the racial composition of public housing developments and location of Section 8 certificate holders, a description of any changes made to the decree subsequent to the baseline impact assessment site visits, an assessment of the extent to which decree elements have been implemented and a discussion of factors that contribute to (or inhibit) successful implementation of decree elements.

### **7.3 Statistical Analysis of Changes to Segregation Component**

An important issue in all eight cases studied during the baseline period is PHA maintenance of racially segregated housing. Hence a central question of the long-term impact evaluation is the extent to which the remedies built into the settlements achieved the ultimate goal of less segregated residential outcomes for PHA residents.

Unfortunately, the most straightforward method to estimate a decree's effect on a site's segregation, where a researcher would compare segregation measures computed using data representing a pre-decree baseline period to ones calculated with data from a post-decree period, would yield incorrect results. Although such an approach has an intuitive appeal, simple "before-and-after" comparisons do not account for changes that would have occurred in the absence of implementing the decrees' elements. Therefore, it is necessary to estimate segregation values that represent a "counterfactual" and indicate the level of



segregation that would have been present at a particular point in time if the sites' decree elements had never been implemented.

We propose that counterfactual values be modeled using appropriate statistical techniques, outlined in Appendix C, that will provide reasonably accurate estimates of what the segregation patterns for public housing residents and Section 8 Certificate holders would have been if the decrees had never taken effect. These estimates will be used to generate segregation measures for both types of assisted tenants. If successful, the remedial elements included in the decrees should result in segregation measures that are statistically different from those that represent the estimated counterfactual.

#### **7.4 Conclusion**

Our recommended long-term impact evaluation will provide HUD: (1) an analysis of the process used in each site to implement specific decree elements; (2) an assessment of the impact of decree elements on residents; and (3) an assessment of the changes in segregation brought in each site that was brought about by the decree. We recommend that the long-term impact evaluation start no later than 2004 in order to ensure that key informants who are knowledgeable about sites' decrees are available for interviews.



---

<b>CHAPTER 7 LONG-TERM EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>87</b>
7.0 Introduction.....	87
7.1 Data Collection Component .....	88
7.1.1 Key Informant Interviews .....	88
7.1.2 Focus Groups with PHA Residents .....	89
7.1.3 Resident Survey .....	89
7.1.4 Collect Information about Expenditures on Decree Elements .....	89
7.1.5 Mobility Counseling Data .....	90
7.1.6 Development-level and Section 8 Locational Data .....	90
7.2 Case Study Component .....	90
7.3 Statistical Analysis of Changes to Segregation Component .....	91
7.4 Conclusion.....	92





## CHAPTER 8

### LESSONS and FUTURE CHALLENGES

#### 8.0 Introduction

In this chapter, we discuss what our analysis suggests are the key lessons learned, the challenges that face those seeking to desegregate public housing, and the broader lessons for other efforts to promote deconcentration of public and assisted housing residents. The eight sites included in this study have attempted to implement a wide range of complex and far-reaching remedies. Their experiences can offer guidance not only for other housing authorities facing—or seeking to avoid—desegregation litigation, but also for those that are attempting to implement scattered-site and mobility initiatives as part of their regular public housing program.

#### 8.1 Lessons

There are two central lessons learned from our assessment of these eight sites' attempts to implement their desegregation remedies. *First, and most important, desegregation and deconcentration of public housing residents are very difficult to achieve under the best of circumstances.* External forces, particularly historical patterns of segregation and public policies that led to objective inequalities between communities, limit the ability and willingness of individuals to move into unfamiliar neighborhoods and developments. Minority tenants may realistically fear discrimination, harassment, and social and physical isolation if they attempt to move to predominantly white public housing developments or communities. Conversely, white residents may also fear harassment and further, are unlikely to want to move to neighborhoods that they perceive as dangerous and lacking in amenities such as good schools and access



to stores and services. Even when these attitudes can be overcome, Section 8 holders' options may be limited by an inadequate supply of affordable units in more affluent areas.

*A second lesson is that litigation may heighten the contentiousness of the environment, making successful implementation even more challenging to achieve.* For example, as discussed in Chapter 6, staff of the Omaha Housing Authority initially refused to comply with some of the court's orders until HUD threatened to intervene. In Dallas, the *Walker* case has created a highly contentious environment and the plaintiffs attorney has taken the City, the housing authority, and HUD back to court on multiple occasions. All of this litigation has come at a high cost, undermined mutual trust and cooperation, and created delays in implementation.

*However, our research also suggests a third, more hopeful lesson: despite such challenges, it is possible for legal challenges to bring about positive changes.* Dallas is the most encouraging example. Had we begun this study in 1995, we would have concluded that the litigation in Dallas appeared to be a failure, that much money had been spent and relatively little accomplished. But, as discussed in Chapter 6, the Dallas case shows that given enough time and effort, significant changes can occur. In Dallas, the combination of new and creative leadership with a commitment to change and financial resources helped to overcome many obstacles. Our assessment indicates that even with the ongoing litigation over replacement housing in non-impacted areas, the *Walker* decree has led to a number of positive outcomes. These include: better public housing; new opportunities for Section 8 tenants; the development of innovative strategies for equalizing conditions; and, in one instance, creative diffusion of community resistance. Notably, even in ruling against the housing authority on the replacement housing issue, the Fifth Circuit's recent decision describes the defendants, HUD, the Dallas Housing Authority, and the City of Dallas, as cooperating defendants who take an active role in developing ways to remedy past discrimination. Minneapolis provides another example of positive change. The housing authority there has been able to overcome the initial resistance of suburban communities by developing a regional planning process and offering these communities incentives for participation. In both cases, change has come slowly and the housing authorities still are not in full compliance with their decrees, but it does appear that the process is leading to better outcomes for tenants.



The key factor in bringing about positive changes appears to be a commitment by the housing authority to make a good-faith effort to implement the decree, mobilize wider support from the community, and enforce its policies related to tenant screening, eviction, and unit maintenance. In addition to strong leadership, other factors that appear to facilitate change are: financial resources; support from local governments; implementing elements of the decree in a logical, sequential order; correspondence between the timing of implementation and the resources and capacity of the implementing agencies; and the ability of the housing authority to diffuse effectively community opposition.

## **8.2 Challenges in Desegregating Public Housing**

Even under the best of circumstances, desegregating public housing remains extremely challenging and those implementing remedial programs confront a series of complex dilemmas. There are no easy answers; rather, any choice must balance competing objectives. Through our analysis, we have identified four key issues that involve especially difficult choices: whether housing authorities should try to equalize conditions on-site or off; whether Section 8 assistance should be desegregative or unrestricted; whether the pace of implementation should be aggressive or deliberate; and whether the elements of the consent decrees should be uniform or site-specific.

### **8.2.1 Equalizing Housing Conditions: On-Site or Off-Site?**

Virtually all the consent decrees included in this assessment were intended to equalize the physical conditions between public housing developments where the population is predominantly white and those where it is predominantly African-American. Given historical racial disparities in conditions, this goal can be met in one of three (non-mutually exclusive) ways:

- redistribute households among existing public housing developments;



- improve existing developments with predominantly minority occupants; and
- develop new or rehabilitated housing options for minorities in predominantly white neighborhoods.

Each choice has advantages and disadvantages, and underlying these choices is the dilemma of whether it is still possible truly to promote integration within a public housing context or only to create segregated, but comparable conditions between housing for whites and housing for minorities.

**Redistributing Tenants.** Ideally, redistributing tenants of different races more evenly among developments would reduce segregation and cost relatively little. However, as discussed in Chapter 6, in most of these sites, there are few—if any—non-Hispanic whites living in family housing or on the waiting list for public or assisted housing. In these sites then, there are almost no white families who could potentially be moved nor predominantly white family developments to which minority tenants could move.

In the few sites with more diverse populations, it has proven very difficult to persuade white families to move into traditionally minority-occupied, low-quality developments in isolated neighborhoods and to persuade African-American elderly to move into distant, traditionally white-occupied developments. In Allegheny County, the result has been that public housing units remain vacant because no desegregative tenants can be found to occupy them. The New York City Housing Authority has been successful in persuading minority tenants to move to predominantly white developments, although there are still some communities where minority families are reluctant to move.<sup>93</sup> In East Texas, desegregative moves require moving to public housing developments in other communities; tenants have been unwilling to attempt these moves, fearing harassment and discrimination from other residents. Finally, desegregating public housing developments may not have the effect of enhancing economic opportunities for tenants if all of

---

<sup>93</sup>The *Davis* consent decree does not call for moving white tenants to predominantly minority developments.



the housing authority's developments are located in areas isolated from jobs and quality educational institutions.

**Improving Existing Developments.** Our assessment shows that it is relatively easy in both administrative and political terms for housing authorities to modernize their developments in order to equalize conditions between traditionally minority-occupied and traditionally-white public housing developments. While not politically sensitive, these improvements often involve substantial investments and can take considerable amounts of time. Further, even where modernization efforts are successful, they do not change patterns of segregation among tenants. Moreover, on-site improvements do not equalize conditions or opportunities in the surrounding neighborhoods and jurisdictions; such an effort requires enormous injections of community development funds, as envisioned in Allegheny County.

**New Housing in Non-Impacted Areas.** Constructing scattered-site developments for minority tenants in predominantly white areas potentially can equalize conditions in public housing and the surrounding neighborhoods and jurisdictions, desegregate the host neighborhood, and provide improved economic opportunities for residents. However, this option is not only expensive financially but politically. Our case studies have numerous examples where residents of prospective host communities attempted to stop the construction of new housing in their neighborhood. The result is that, even after years of implementation efforts, only small numbers of minority tenants have moved to scattered-site developments at any site. The 75-unit Frankford and Marsh development in Dallas is the largest that has been constructed; the recent Fifth Circuit Court ruling in the *Walker* case means that the housing authority is enjoined from constructing any more scattered site housing. Meanwhile, no other site has moved more than a small number of individual households. After years of effort, Minneapolis has developed ambitious plans for constructing replacement housing; it remains to be seen whether these plans will be carried out successfully.

### 8.2.2 Section 8 Assistance: Desegregative or Unrestricted?



The consent decrees in all our study sites included additional Section 8 certificates or vouchers for members of the plaintiff class. But unlike in the *Gautreaux* case, there was no consistent requirement that this assistance be used only in predominantly white areas. The consent decrees in two sites had no restrictions on the type of neighborhood where the assistance could be used. In three sites, the Section 8 certificates and vouchers restricted their use to desegregative mobility options only, but generally only for a limited period of time, and three other sites had both restricted and unrestricted pools. The choice of whether to restrict the use of Section 8 assistance or not involves difficult tradeoffs among resident preferences, operational issues, and desegregation goals.

**Unrestricted Section 8.** Section 8 subsidies with no geographic restrictions maximize the chance that recipient households can quickly find apartments that best match their preferences, because the widest geographic range of options is eligible to them. The disadvantage to this approach is that, as has been observed in many other Section 8 programs as well as those in our study, relatively few desegregative moves occur under this scenario. Tenants are free to turn down desegregative opportunities in unfamiliar communities even when they might provide access to economic opportunity for themselves and their children. Good mobility counseling can help overcome some of the barriers associated with desegregative moves, but when Section 8 assistance is unrestricted, tenants have the option of remaining in predominantly minority areas.

**Restricted Section 8.** Section 8 subsidies with desegregative restrictions should, in principle, be more effective in achieving a less segregated residential pattern for subsidy recipients, at least in the short-run. However, this approach has a number of serious disadvantages. The restrictions may compel people to move into areas that do not match their preferences for neighborhood racial composition, may be isolated from kin and friend support networks (as the Hmong in Minneapolis), and may be more distant from public transportation and employment opportunities (as in Buffalo and New Haven). Further, if there are relatively few rental vacancies within Fair Market Rent in eligible areas (due to zoning limits, discrimination by landlords, etc.), a disproportionate number of subsidy holders will be unable to use their subsidy and only the most motivated and savvy participants will succeed in finding housing. Because of these problems, subsidy restrictions may prove unfair and frustrating to the plaintiff class. Finally, even if tenants—possibly with the help of mobility counselors—find housing in non-impacted areas, they may not choose to stay in their new communities without substantial follow up support.



### 8.2.3 Pace of Implementation: Aggressive or Deliberate?

Each consent decree must establish a timetable within which elements should be fully implemented. The challenge is in appropriately designing the pace of implementation. The timetable must be speedy enough to provide satisfactory relief to plaintiffs, while still allowing sufficient time for appropriate planning and thoughtful sequencing of implementation. Achieving this balance is particularly difficult when implementation involves multiple actors.

**Aggressive Implementation.** Requiring that all elements of a decree must be implemented within too narrow a window means brings the risk that the quality of implementation will suffer and the ultimate impacts of the settlement may be diminished. Poor sequencing in several sites has led to situations where the plaintiffs are frustrated that the decree is not having the beneficial effects that were anticipated. For example, in Omaha, demolition of public housing happened before sufficient replacement housing was available. The rapid demolition in combination with the large numbers of Section 8 certificates and vouchers that were released very quickly resulted in many African-American tenants living in substandard housing.

**Deliberate Implementation.** Slower, more deliberate implementation time frames also pose risks. First, defendants may take advantage of the lengthy time frame by unnecessarily delaying required actions, and opponents of the decree have more time to develop strategies to thwart implementation. Second, plaintiffs may become frustrated by the pace of perceived change, whether justified by appropriate planning concerns or not. This frustration may translate into behaviors that, ironically, work to undermine the long-term effectiveness of the decree. However, the Minneapolis experience indicates that a long, careful, planning process can have significant benefits. The housing authority has spent considerable time and effort bringing suburban jurisdictions into the planning process for replacement housing; as a result, while little housing has been constructed to date, plans are in place to produce hundreds of units.

### 8.2.4 The Remedial Elements of Consent Decrees: Uniform or Tailor-Made Across Sites?



As discussed in Chapter 4, all of the decrees we have studied have two elements in common: revisions to tenant selection and assignment plans<sup>94</sup> and the provision of Section 8 subsidies. In addition, with the exception of New York, all decrees involved demolition and/or renovation of public housing, and the provision of mobility counseling. But some elements of the decrees, particularly those involving equalization of conditions, are intended to respond to specific concerns of plaintiffs in each site. To what extent should a federal policy of desegregating public housing emphasize a set of common remedies, as opposed to allowing each site to develop a package that reflects particular conditions at that housing authority?

**Adopting a Set of Common Remedies.** Adopting similar remedies across all sites clearly signals that there is a strategic commitment by HUD to reversing the legacy of public housing discrimination and segregation. Having a common set of remedies also addresses concerns over “horizontal equity.” HUD should not treat plaintiff class members in different sites differently simply because the comparative bargaining skills of defendants’ and plaintiffs’ attorneys varied.

**Site-Specific Remedies.** Some remedies may not be appropriate in all sites, however. Certain cases may not involve allegations for which particular remedies apply. For instance, in Buffalo there were claims that the desegregative Section 8 certificates were a logically flawed response because the original case was not about segregation. In addition, some remedies may not be appropriate for a particular metropolitan area’s housing market and thus prove ineffective. The tight rental market in New York City, for example, means that plaintiffs have been unable to use even the relatively small number of Section 8 certificates allocated under the *Davis* decree. Finally, emphasizing mobility only makes sense in areas where there are affordable units in communities that offer tenants real social and economic opportunities. In areas like Buffalo and New Haven, areas that are designated as non-impacted may actually be further from employment opportunities than the areas where tenants currently live.

---

<sup>94</sup>The *Davis* case required the New York City Housing Authority to create a tenant assignment and selection plan.





### 8.3 Early Lessons for Mobility and Deconcentration Efforts

In addition to lessons about the challenges of the early phases of implementation, our findings offer lessons for other types of initiatives intended to deconcentrate and disperse public and assisted housing residents. While this is only an early implementation assessment, the challenges these eight housing authorities have faced in trying to implement these ambitious decrees are similar to those faced by other agencies implementing mobility efforts such as Regional Opportunity Counseling or in relocating residents from public housing. Thus, their experiences can offer valuable lessons to other housing authorities currently grappling with similar challenges.

First, the findings from our focus groups with tenants suggest that efforts intended to desegregate public housing or provide desegregative opportunities for Section 8 holders should include effective, multi-dimensional support for residents before, during, and after the move. The mobility programs at these sites—and indeed, all other mobility programs around the country (Turner and Williams, 1998)—are intended to provide counseling for people using Section 8 to move to predominantly white and/or low-poverty areas. The same types of services should be provided for tenants making desegregative moves within public housing.

Mobility programs should offer a range of services to overcome tenants' fears and assist them in finding housing in non-impacted areas. These services should include: strong landlord outreach initiatives; housing search assistance; information about communities in non-impacted areas; referrals to supportive services if necessary; assistance in negotiating with landlords; and follow-up support. While most of these services are provided by the programs at these eight sites, providing adequate follow up support has been more problematic; indeed, such services are rarely funded. In Dallas, the program director is concerned that a lack of assistance may have meant that many tenants move back to impacted areas after only a year in the program and has begun trying to create a support system for participants.

A second lesson from this research is that any effort to desegregate conventional public housing should include an initiative to increase the number of white applicants who are willing to make desegregative



moves. These initiatives may use many components of affirmative marketing, much like the outreach efforts of mobility counseling centers, in an attempt to recruit a more diverse waiting list. These applicants should then be more favorably inclined toward desegregative options when they come to the top of the list.

Third, the elements of any consent decree or relocation plan unrelated to litigation (e.g., plans for vacancy consolidation and/or HOPE VI sites) must be implemented in a logical, sequential order. As discussed above, in several sites, tenants were required to move before adequate replacement housing was constructed, mobility counseling programs were in place, public housing modernization efforts had occurred, or adjacent community development was even begun. Not surprisingly, the results of these efforts were disappointing and have led to numerous complications for the housing authorities and tenants.

Likewise, the timing and pace of the implementation of each required element of a consent decree or relocation plan must be consistent with the housing authority's—and, where applicable, the mobility counseling program's capacity—to administer it effectively. Implementation timing and pace must also correspond to the ability of the local housing market to respond favorably. For example, if too many Section 8 certificates are released over a short interval, the effectiveness of the mobility counseling staff to encourage desegregative moves will be reduced and there may not be sufficient vacancies in non-impacted areas (or even in impacted areas) to meet the demand.

Fourth, housing authorities involved in desegregation or large-scale relocation efforts should take proactive action to head off recipient community opposition and should work with local political leadership to develop support for assisted tenants. In many sites, community opposition set back implementation efforts for years. The housing authorities in Dallas and Minneapolis were able to overcome some of this opposition, but even in those sites, there is still considerable resistance. As discussed above, the Dallas Housing Authority recently lost a suit filed by a group of homeowners and is currently enjoined from constructing replacement housing in non-impacted areas. However, the methods that did prove successful in Dallas and Minneapolis—involving homeowners in designing developments and offering incentives to suburban jurisdictions for participation—could be used proactively in other



cities to try to reduce the potential for conflict. Further, if housing authorities are going to succeed in gaining community support for scattered-site housing and desegregative moves by Section 8 holders, they must invest in education and outreach and commit to enforcing vigorously lease enforcement, and property maintenance policies.

At the same time, HUD, the Department of Justice, and local private fair housing groups should coordinate their resources and efforts to ensure that tenants seeking to move to areas that offer greater economic opportunity are not being discriminated against in the segments of the metropolitan housing market where their demands are likely to be strongest. Many of the African-American focus group participants reported that they experienced discrimination when they attempted to make desegregative moves. While these tenants' experiences may not be representative of all residents, housing authority and mobility program staff also believed that discrimination was a serious problem and that simply the fear of encountering discrimination and harassment prevented many tenants from trying to move to non-impacted areas. Thus, our findings suggest that targeted testing and civil rights litigation efforts should be intensified in conjunction with consent decrees.

<b>CHAPTER 8 LESSONS and FUTURE CHALLENGES .....</b>	<b>93</b>
8.0 Introduction.....	93
8.1 Lessons .....	93
8.2 Challenges in Desegregating Public Housing .....	94
8.2.1 Equalizing Housing Conditions: On-Site or Off-Site? .....	94
8.2.2 Section 8 Assistance: Desegregative or Unrestricted?.....	96
8.2.3 Pace of Implementation: Aggressive or Deliberate?.....	97
8.2.4 The Remedial Elements of Consent Decrees: Uniform or Tailor-Made Across Sites?.....	98
8.3 Early Lessons for Mobility and Deconcentration Efforts .....	98

---

## REFERENCES

- Anselin, Luc. 1992. *Spacestat Tutorial: A Workbook for Using Spacestat in the Analysis of Spatial Data*. Santa Barbara, CA.: National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis.
- Bauman, John. 1987. *Public Housing, Race, and Renewal: Urban Planning in Philadelphia, 1920-1974*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Carter, William H., Michael H. Schill and Susan Wachter. 1998. "Polarisation, Public Housing and Racial Minorities in US Cities." *Urban Studies* 35 (10): 1889-1911.
- Coulibaly, Modibo, Rodney L. Green and David M. James. 1998. *Segregation in Federally Subsidized Low-Income Housing in the United States*. Westport, CT.: Praeger.
- Davis, Mary. 1993. "The Gautreaux Assisted Housing Program," pp. 243-254 in G. Thomas Kingsley and Margery A. Turner, eds. *Housing Markets and Residential Mobility*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley and Beverly Duncan. 1957. *The Negro Population of Chicago: A Study of Residential Succession*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.



---

Ellen, Ingrid Gould and Margery Austin. 1997. "Does Neighborhood Matter? Assessing Recent Evidence." *Housing Policy Debate* 8 (4):833-866.

Ellen, Ingrid Gould. 1996. *Sharing America's Neighborhoods: The Changing Prospects for Stable Racial Integration*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University.

Galster, George, Carla Herbig, and Robin Smith. 1996. *The Analysis of Attitudes Related to the Residential Desegregation of Public Housing in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania: Sanders, et al v. HUD, et al*, Final Report prepared for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington DC: The Urban Institute.

Galster, George C. 1990a. "White Flight from Integrated Neighborhoods in the 1970s." *Urban Studies* 27 (3): 385-399.

Galster, George C. 1990b. "Neighborhood Racial Change, Segregation Sentiments and Affirmative Marketing Policies." *Journal of Urban Economics* 10 (May):344-361.

Galster, George C. and Heather Keeney. 1993. "Subsidized Housing and Racial Change in Yonkers, NY." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 59 (Spring) 172-181.

Goering, John M. 1978. "Neighborhood Tipping and Racial Transition: A Review of Social Science Evidence." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 44:68-78.



---

Goering, John. 1986. ed. *Housing Desegregation and Federal Policy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Goering, John, Ali Kamely, and Todd Richardson. 1997. "Recent Research on Racial Segregation and Poverty Concentration in Public Housing in the U.S." *Urban Affairs Review* 31 (5): 723-745.

Goldberg, Carey. 1999. "U.S. Accuses Boston Housing Agency of Wide Racial Bias," *New York Times* Feb. 18, p. A16.

Goldstein, Ira and William Yancy. 1986. "Public Housing Projects, Blacks and Public Policy," pp. 262-289 in John Goering, ed. *Housing Desegregation and Federal Policy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Grier, Eunice and George Grier. 1960. *Privately Developed Interracial Housing*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hartung, John M. and Jeffrey R. Henig. 1997. "Housing Vouchers and Certificates as a Vehicle for Deconcentrating the Poor: Evidence from the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Area." *Urban Affairs* 32(3):403-419.

Hirsch, Arnold. 1983. *Making the Second Ghetto*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Illinois Criminal Justice Authority. 1996. *Spatial and Temporal Analysis of Crime: User's Manual: Technical Documentation*. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Authority.



---

Kaplan, Edward. 1985. "Tenant Assignment Plan: How PHAs Fill Their Units," *Journal of Housing* 42 (Jan./Feb.): 13-20.

Kaufman, Julie E. and James E. Rosenbaum. 1992. "The Education and Employment of Low-Income Black Youth in White Suburbs." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(3): 229-240.

Kotlowitz, Alex. 1991. *There are No Children Here: The Story of Two Boys Growing Up in the Other America*. New York: Doubleday.

Kurtz, Howard. 1985. "Reagan Budget to Slash Housing Aid," *Washington Post*, Jan. 30, p. A1.

Maly, Michael and Philip Nyden. 1996. "Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Urban Communities: Challenging the Perceived Inevitability of Segregation." Unpublished manuscript.

Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton. 1988. "The Dimensions of Residential Segregation." *Social Forces* 67 (2):281-385.

Milgram, Morris. 1979. *Good Neighborhood*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Miller, Ted, Mildred De Pallo, and Kathleen Rotendaro. 1985. *Feasibility Research for a Public Housing Desegregation Demonstration*, International Business Services, Washington DC, report to HUD under contract HC-5686, May, 15.



Molotch, Harvey. 1972. *Managed Integration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Olion Chandler, Mittie. 1992. "Public Housing Desegregation: What are the Options?" *Housing Policy Debate*, Volume 3, Issue 2, p. 509-534.

Popkin Susan J., Victoria E. Gwiasda, Jean Amendolia, Andrea Anderson, Gordon Hanson, Wendell A. Johnson, Elise Martel, Lynn M. Olson, Dennis P. Rosenbaum. 1996. *The Hidden War: The Battle to Control Crime in Chicago's Public Housing*. A report prepared by Abt Associates for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Popkin, Susan J., Victoria E. Gwiasda, Dennis P. Rosenbaum, Lynn M. Olson, and Wendell A. Johnson. 1999. "Combating Crime in Public Housing in Chicago: A Qualitative and Quantitative Longitudinal Analysis of the Chicago Housing Authority's Anti-Drug Initiative." Forthcoming in *Justice Quarterly*, September.

Popkin, Susan J., Larry Buron, and Diane K. Levy. 1998. "Mixed Income and Dispersal Strategies: Will They Help the Most Distressed Public Housing Residents." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, New York City, October.

Popkin, Susan J., James E. Rosenbaum and Patricia M. Meaden. 1993. "Labor Market Experiences of Low-Income Black Women in Middle-Class Suburbs: Evidence from a Survey of Gautreaux Program Participants." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 12(3): 556-573.

Rainwater, Lee. 1970. *Behind Ghetto Walls*. Aldine-Atheron Inc.





---

Rodriguez, George. 1985. "Racial Data on Subsidized Housing Not Compiled," *Dallas Morning News*, Feb. 13.

Rosenbaum, James E., Susan J. Popkin, Julie E. Kaufman, and Jennifer Rusin. 1991. "Social Integration of Low-Income Black Adults in Middle-Class White Suburbs." *Social Problems*, 38(4): 448-461.

Rossi, Peter and Robert Dentler. 1961. *The Politics of Urban Renewal*. New York: Free Press.

Rubinowitz, Leonard S. 1992. "Metropolitan Public Housing Desegregation Remedies: Chicago's Privatization Program." *Northern Illinois University Law Review*, 12(3): 589-669.

Rubinowitz, Leonard S., James E. Rosenbaum, Sheila Dvorin, Marilyn Kulieke, Alicia McCareins and Susan J. Popkin. Forthcoming. *Crossing the Color and Class Lines: Low-Income Black Families in White Middle-Class Suburbs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taeuber, Karl and Alma Taeuber. 1965. *Negoes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Turner, Margery Austin and Kale Williams. 1998. *Housing Mobility: Realizing the Promise* Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Turner, Margery Austin and Maris Mikelson. 1992. "Patterns of Racial Steering in Four Metropolitan Areas." *Journal of Housing Economics* (2):199-234.



White, Michael. 1986. "Segregation and Diversity Measures in Population Distribution." *Population Index* 52(2):198-221.

Yin, Robert K. 1989. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications.

Yinger, John 1995. *Closed Doors, Missed Opportunities*. New York: Russell Sage, 1995.



## APPENDIX A

**Appendix A Focus group selection and recruitment methodologies**

Site	Participants	Sample frame	Sampling methodology	Contacts
Allegheny County	Separate groups of white and black public housing residents who had recently made a desegregative move; people on the public housing/Section 8 waiting list willing to make a desegregative move	List provided by housing authority	Random sample drawn from 600 families on the housing authority's waiting list and residents	Urban Institute mailed all solicitation letters and received telephone calls from prospective participants. Participants were screened and selected over the telephone
Buffalo	Public housing residents living in developments scheduled for demolition / modernization	List provided by housing authority of all residents in two developments	Random sample of 100 residents each at Lakeview and A.D. Price developments	Urban Institute mailed 50 solicitation letters each to residents at Lakeview and A.D. Price developments; made telephone calls to residents confirming attendance
Dallas	Section 8 recipients who made a desegregative move	Separate lists for each group provided by the Housing Opportunity	All recipients on the list (109)	Urban Institute mailed all solicitation letters and received telephone calls from prospective participants. Participants



**Appendix A Focus group selection and recruitment methodologies**

Site	Participants	Sample frame	Sampling methodology	Contacts
	Section 8 participants who made a segregative move  Section 8 participants who initially made a desegregative move, but moved back to an impacted area	Program (HOP) of all such recipients since 1995	Random sample of 100 recipients (out of 849 on list)  All recipients on the list (22)	were screened and selected over the telephone
East Texas:  Beaumont	Section 8 participants	List of program participants at ceiling rents provided by housing authority	All recipients on the list (97)	Urban Institute mailed all solicitation letters and received telephone call responses from prospective participants



**Appendix A Focus group selection and recruitment methodologies**

Site	Participants	Sample frame	Sampling methodology	Contacts
Orange County	Participants in the “Beaumont on the Grow” lease-to-own program	List provided by housing authority	All participants on the list (54)	Urban Institute mailed all solicitation letters
	Section 8 participants	List provided by housing authority	All recipients on the list (19)	Urban Institute had no contact with potential participants
	Non-claimant housing development residents	Resident Initiative Coordinator distributed announcements of meeting throughout development and posted notices on community bulletin boards	All who responded participated in discussion group	



**Appendix A Focus group selection and recruitment methodologies**

Site	Participants	Sample frame	Sampling methodology	Contacts



**Appendix A Focus group selection and recruitment methodologies**

Site	Participants	Sample frame	Sampling methodology	Contacts
East Texas (continued):				
Port Arthur	Scattered site residents in Housing Authority home ownership program	List provided by housing authority	All recipients on the list (20)	Urban Institute mailed all solicitation letters and received telephone call responses from prospective participants; UI wrote those to confirm participation



**Appendix A Focus group selection and recruitment methodologies**

Site	Participants	Sample frame	Sampling methodology	Contacts
Minneapolis	Relocatees under the consent decree who moved with Section 8 certificates and vouchers (desegregative movers and segregative movers) or relocatees who moved to scattered site units and public housing units.	List generated by housing authority.	All recipients on the list (264)	<p>The Urban Institute prepared a mailing of solicitation letters in sealed, postage paid envelopes that were sent to housing authority. Staff at the housing authority attached address labels and mailed solicitation letters to recipients on the list.</p> <p>UI received telephone calls from prospective participants who were screened and selected.</p>
New Haven	Claimants under the consent decree who already moved with Section 8 certificates or to scattered-site units.	List provided by housing authority and mobility contractor.	All residents on the list (185)	Urban Institute mailed all solicitation letters and received forms from interested participants. Participants were called and sent a letter to confirm their participation.

**Appendix A Focus group selection and recruitment methodologies**

Site	Participants	Sample frame	Sampling methodology	Contacts
New York	<p>Claimants under the consent decree who had already moved</p> <p>Claimants under the consent decree still on the waiting list</p>	Confidential list held by housing authority and not made available to the Urban Institute	Random sample of 100 claimants in each group	Urban Institute mailed solicitation letters to housing authority to forward to sample of claimants. Housing authority was given specific written instructions on sampling procedure. UI received telephone calls from prospective participants who were screened and selected
Omaha	<p>Section 8 recipients who made desegregative moves</p> <p>Section 8 recipients who made segregative moves</p>	List provided by Project Jericho (mobility program) of all program participants who moved into impacted and nonimpacted tracts. Forwarded to UI by housing authority staff.	Random sample of 100 residents in each group.	Urban Institute mailed 100 solicitation letters to each group and received calls from prospective participants



## **APPENDIX B**



## INTERVIEW GUIDES

### Attorney Interview Guide

(PHA, HUD, Plaintiff)

Thanks for meeting with us today. We're conducting a study for HUD on the *[name]* Consent Decree and we'd like to talk with you about the experiences to date with efforts to implement the various aspects of the decree. We're interested in learning about the successes as well as any difficulties that may have occurred with implementation efforts.

We'll be taking notes during our discussion, but want to assure you that everything you say will be kept strictly anonymous. We will not name you in the report even if we quote something you say. No one but us will see our notes.

#### A. Litigation Status

**1. Have there been any amendments to the consent decree? If yes, please describe.**

- Are there any elements of the consent decree that have been disputed? If yes, please explain?
- Is there any pending litigation?



## B. Implementation

*[Note: ask individual questions only if provision applies to this site]*

**1. The *[name]* consent decree, as we understand it, requires the PHA to change its tenant selection procedures. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- What types of changes are required (merging Section 8 and PH, etc.)?
- Have these changes been implemented? IF NO: Why not? What is the timetable for implementation?
- How many residents have received assistance since these changes were implemented?
- How have residents responded to these changes?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding PHA tenant selection procedures?

**2. We understand that the consent decree requires PHA to provide Section 8 subsidies to displaced PHA residents. Is this correct? To other class members?**

IF YES:

- What progress has been made in providing Section 8 to class members? How many have received assistance?



- Has the PHA encountered any problems in providing this Section 8 assistance to displaced residents? To other class members? How are these problems being addressed?
- What is the timetable for providing Section 8 subsidies? Has this changed since the original consent decree? Why/why not?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding the provision of Section 8 subsidies?

**3. Is it correct that the consent decree includes mobility counseling for class members?**

IF YES:

- Which class members are supposed to receive counseling? Are they required to participate?
- Has PHA started implementing a mobility counseling program?
- Is PHA providing the counseling in-house or did it contract with an NPO?
- IF USING AN NPO: What was the selection process for hiring the NPO? Was an RFP issued? How many organizations responded? Were residents/class members involved in the selection?
- Did the NPO have any prior experience in providing mobility/housing counseling? What type?



- What kind of counseling is being offered to participants (housing search assistance, motivational counseling, information about desegregated areas, assistance in negotiating with landlords, supportive services, follow up services)?
- How many participants have received these services?
- How many have made a desegregative move?
- Have any moved back to their original community?
- Have there been any problems in implementing the mobility program? What kind? (Probe specifically: Community resistance? Participants unwilling/reluctant to move to desegregated areas? Transportation? Financial barriers?)

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding mobility counseling?

**4. Has the PHA been successful in identifying landlords in low-poverty areas who will accept Section 8? Why/why not?**

**5. Has there been any community resistance to the Section 8 program? To the mobility program in particular?**

- What kinds of problems have there been?
- What kinds of things have been done to overcome these problems?



**6. Is it correct that the consent decree requires the PHA to apply for FMR exception rents?**

IF YES:

- Has the PHA applied for any? For how many areas? For what rent amounts?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding FMR exception rents?

**7. The consent decree requires the local government to make commitments to removing barriers to affordable housing. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- What has PHA done to negotiate commitments from local government?
- Has the local government made any changes in zoning regulations? What types of changes?
- What is the current timetable for making these changes?
- How many Section 8 holders have found units in areas subject to these new regulations?

IF NO:





- What is your understanding of the decree regarding the local government's involvement with removing barriers to affordable housing?

**8. The consent decree requires the creation of a fair housing enforcement office. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- Has this office been created?
- How is this office administered? By the PHA? By the City?
- How many complaints has it received?
- What kind of cases has it reviewed? What determinations were made?
- How many of these cases have been resolved? How were they settled?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding the creation of a fair housing enforcement office?

**9. The consent decree, as we understand it, requires the PHA to demolish and replace a number of conventional public housing units. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- Have the units been demolished?



- How are the units being replaced (tenant-based subsidies, project-based assistance, combination)?
- IF THERE WILL BE PROJECT-BASED REPLACEMENT: How is the redevelopment being funded? HOPE VI? CGP? Is there a plan available? Is some of the development being modernized instead of replaced?
- Where will the new housing be located? On site? In the community? In a different area? IF IN A DIFFERENT AREA: How do the new areas compare with the original location?
- Were the tenants involved in the decisions about where to locate replacement housing?
- How will the new/modernized development be managed? Will it be mixed-income? Private Management? Resident-managed?
- What is the timetable for demolition/providing replacement housing? Has this changed since the original consent decree? Why/why not?
- Has the PHA encountered any barriers in trying to demolish/replace units? What kind? How are they being addressed?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding the demolition and replacement of public housing units?

**10. Is it correct that the consent decree requires the PHA to improve conditions in its current public housing stock?**

IF YES:

- What developments are affected? Why were they included?
- Has PHA made any changes in management (private management, site-based, etc.)?
- Have there been any changes in maintenance? What?
- Are any major improvements planned? What?



- How will any improvements be funded (CGP, operating funds, HOPE VI, etc.)?
- How much has been spent to date?
- What changes have been made to date? What is the timetable for the remaining changes?
- What obstacles exist (if any) to making these improvements?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding improvements to PHA's current housing stock?

**11. Is it correct that the consent decree requires improvements in security?**

IF YES:

- What type of improvements are planned/have been made? PHA police? Hiring of security guards? Community policing? Community crime prevention (tenant patrols)? Security improvements (security systems, gates, fences, ID cards, etc.)? Drug prevention?
- Have these changes had any impact on crime rates in and around the development? Evidence (i.e. actual crime data)?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding improvements in security?

**12. We understand that the consent decree requires the city or PHA to make improvements in the community around the PHA's developments. Is this correct?**



IF YES:

- What kinds of improvements are planned?
- Are there any plans for redevelopment in the surrounding neighborhood? IF

YES:

What are the plans? Expected costs? Progress to date?

- Are there any plans for specific economic development projects?
- How will these be funded? What are the expected costs? Progress to date?
- Have CDBG funds been applied for? For what purpose?
- How much has been completed to date? How much has been spent?
- What obstacles exist (if any) to making improvements?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding improvements in the surrounding community?

**13. The consent decree, as we understand it, calls for improvements in access to public transportation for PHA residents. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- What do these improvements entail? What are the plans, costs, etc?
- How will these changes be funded?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding public transportation?



### **C. Impact on Residents**

#### **1. How many residents have been affected by the changes that were ordered in the consent decree?**

- How many residents have made desegregative moves? How defined? Evidence?
- How many have participated in the counseling program (if applicable)?
- How many are living in new/revitalized developments?
- How many developments have received improvements?

#### **2. What have been the experiences of residents who have moved or tried to move to desegregated areas?**

- Have any encountered difficulties in moving? What kind? Has the PHA provided any assistance?
- Have any experienced discrimination? Examples? What has the PHA done in response to these problems?
- Do you have a sense of how residents feel about their new communities?

#### **3. How well has the counseling program worked thus far?**



- Has it been effective in getting people to move to new areas?
- Has it been effective in helping residents become stabilized in their new communities?
- Is it providing adequate services? Are there other things the program could be doing to help people move?



**4. What have been the experiences of residents who have are living in new/revitalized public housing developments?**

- Are they satisfied with maintenance? Why/why not?
- Are they satisfied with security? Why/why not?
- IN NEW/REVITALIZED DEVELOPMENTS: How satisfied are residents with the new housing? Have there been any problems or complaints?

**D. Lessons**

- 1. What are the overall lessons to be drawn from the early implementation experience?**
- 2. Is there anything else you'd like to add about the impact of the consent decree?**



---

**HUD (Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity Staff) FHEO staff**

**A. Implementation**

*[Note: ask individual questions only if provision applies to this site]*

**1. Is the PHA making any special efforts to identify landlords in low-poverty areas who will accept Section 8?**

- If Yes: What strategies do you use to locate units in desegregated (or low-poverty) areas ?
- Do you make presentations to property management associations?
- What about other strategies like contacting individual landlords through ads, Internet listings, for rent signs, etc.?

**2. Have you encountered any difficulties in recruiting landlords in non-impacted areas for this program?**

- What kinds of problems have you had?
- Have there been any instances of discrimination? What did you do in those cases?
- What kinds of things have you done to overcome these problems?





**3. Have you encountered any community resistance to the Section 8 program? To the mobility program in particular?**

- What kinds of problems have you had?
- What kinds of things have you done to overcome these problems?

**4. Does the consent decree require the PHA to apply for FMR exception rents?**

- Have you applied for any? For how many areas? For what rent amounts?
- How did you determine that exception rents were needed for these areas? Are there other areas where you considered applying for exception rents?
- What are the racial and economic characteristics of these communities?
- How many participants have found units in these areas since the consent decree was implemented?
- IF HAVEN'T APPLIED: Are there any areas that require exception rents? What is the timetable for applying for exception rents? What has prevented you from doing this thus far?

**5. Did the consent decree require the local government to make any commitments to removing barriers to affordable housing?**



- How did you determine what barriers existed?
- What has PHA done to negotiate commitments from local government?
- Has the local government made any changes in zoning regulations? What types of changes?
- What is the current timetable for making these changes?
- How many Section 8 holders have found units in areas subject to these new regulations?

**6. Does the consent decree require the creation of a fair housing enforcement office? [*Note—who is required to do this? City or PHA?*]**

- How is this office administered?
- How many complaints has it received?
- What kind of cases has it reviewed? What determinations were made?
- How many of these have been resolved? How were they settled?

**7. What are the overall lessons to be drawn from the early implementation experience?**



---

## HUD PIH Staff

### A. Implementation

*[Note: ask individual questions only if provision applies to this site]*

1. **Was the local HUD office asked to give approvals on any procedures implementing the consent decree or make any regulatory interpretations related to contracting or procurement?**
  
2. **Does the consent decree require PHA to make any changes to its tenant selection procedures?**
  - IF YES: What types of changes (merging Section 8 and PH, etc.)
  - Have these changes been implemented? IF NO: Why not? What is the timetable for implementation?
  - How many residents have received assistance since these changes were implemented?
  - How have residents responded to these changes?
  
3. **Does the consent decree require PHA to provide Section 8 subsidies to displaced PHA residents? Other class members?**



- What progress has been made in providing Section 8 to class members? How many have received assistance?
- Have you encountered any problems in providing this Section 8 assistance to displaced residents? To other class members? How are these problems being addressed?
- What is the timetable for providing Section 8 subsidies? Has this changed since the original consent decree? Why/why not?

**4. Does the consent decree include mobility counseling for any class members?**

- Which class members are supposed to receive counseling? Are they required to participate?
- Has PHA started implementing a mobility counseling program?
- Is PHA providing the counseling in-house or did it contract with an NPO?
- IF USING AN NPO: What was the selection process for hiring the NPO? Was an RFP issued? How many organizations responded? Were residents/class members involved in the selection?
- Did the NPO have any prior experience in providing mobility/housing counseling? What type?
- What kind of counseling is being offered to participants (housing search assistance, motivational counseling, information about desegregated areas, assistance in negotiating with landlords, supportive services, follow up services)?



- How is the NPO/PHA identifying units in desegregated areas? Recruiting landlords to participate?



- Have you encountered any problems in implementing the mobility program? What kind? (Probe specifically: Community resistance? Participants unwilling/reluctant to move to desegregated areas? Transportation? Financial barriers?)

**5. Does the consent decree require PHA to demolish and replace any conventional public housing units?**

- Have any units been demolished?
- How are the units being replaced (tenant-based subsidies, project-based assistance, combination)?
- IF THERE WILL BE PROJECT-BASED REPLACEMENT: How is the redevelopment being funded? HOPE VI? CGP? Is there a plan available? Is some of the development being modernized instead of replaced?
- How will the new/modernized development be managed? Will it be mixed-income? Private management? Resident-managed?
- What is the timetable for demolition/providing replacement housing? Has this changed since the original consent decree? Why/why not?
- Have you encountered any barriers in trying to demolish/replace units? What kind? How are they being addressed?

**6. Does the consent decree require PHA to improve conditions in any of its current public housing stock?**



- What developments are affected? Why were they included?
- Has PHA made any changes in management (private management, site-based, etc.)?
- Have there been any changes in maintenance? What?
- Are any major improvements planned? What?
- How will any improvements be funded (CGP, operating funds, HOPE VI, etc.)?
- How much has been spent to date?
- What changes have been made to date? What is the timetable for the remaining changes?
- What obstacles exist (if any) to making these improvements?

**7. Does the consent decree require any improvements in security?**

- What types of improvements are planned/have been made? PHA police? Hiring of security guards? Community policing? Community crime prevention (tenant patrols)? Security improvements (security systems, gates, fences, ID cards, etc.)? Drug prevention?
- How are these security measures funded (PHDEP, CGP, operating funds, other)?
- Are they being provided by the PHA or through partnerships with outside agencies (police, social service agencies, etc.)?
- What obstacles exist (if any) to making these improvements?



- Have these changes had any impact on crime rates in and around the development?  
Evidence (i.e. actual crime data)?





**8. Does the consent decree require that the city or PHA make improvements in the community around the PHA's developments?**

- What kinds of improvements are planned?
- Are there any plans for redevelopment in the surrounding neighborhood? IF YES: What are the plans? Expected costs? Progress to date?
- Are there any plans for specific economic development projects?
- How will these be funded? What are the expected costs? Progress to date?
- Have CDBG funds been applied for? For what purpose?
- How much has been completed to date? How much has been spent?
- What obstacles exist (if any) to making these improvements?

**9. Does the consent decree call for any improvements in access to public transportation for PHA residents?**

- What do these improvements entail? What are the plans, costs, etc.?
- How will these changes be funded?

**10. What are the overall lessons to be drawn from the early implementation experience?**

### Local Government Staff Interview Guide

Thanks for meeting with us today. We're conducting a study for HUD on the *[name]* Consent Decree and we'd like to talk with you about the involvement of the local government in implementing elements of the decree to date.

We'll be taking notes during our discussion, but want to assure you that everything you say will be kept strictly anonymous. We will not name you in the report even if we quote something you say. No one but us will see our notes.

***[NOTE: Ask individual questions only if provision applies to this site.]***

1. **What is the role of the local government in the lawsuit?**
  - What is the local government required to do according to the consent decree?
  - Does it play a role in monitoring implementation?
  
2. **The consent decree, as we understand it, requires the local government to make commitments to removing barriers to affordable housing. Is this correct?**



IF YES:

- What has the local government agreed to do?
- Has the local government made any changes in zoning regulations? What types of changes?
- What is the current timetable for making these changes?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding local government involvement with removing barriers to affordable housing?

**3. We understand that the consent decree requires the creation of a fair housing enforcement office. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- Who is required to do this? City or PHA?
- How is this office administered?
- How many complaints has it received?
- How many of these complaints have been resolved? Litigated?

IF NO:



- What is your understanding of the decree regarding the creation of a fair housing enforcement office?

**4. We understand the consent decree requires the city to make improvements in the community around the PHA's developments. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- What kinds of improvements are planned?
- Are there any plans for redevelopment in the surrounding neighborhood? IF YES: What are the plans? Expected costs? Progress to date?
- Are there any plans for specific economic development projects?
- How will these be funded? What are the expected costs? Progress to date?
- Have CDBG funds been applied for? For what purpose?
- How much has been completed to date? How much has been spent?
- What obstacles exist (if any) to making these improvements?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding community improvements?

**5. Is it correct that the consent decree requires the PHA to demolish and replace a number of its conventional public housing units?**



IF YES:

- What has been the role of the local government in bringing about the demolition and replacement? Selecting sites, funding, etc.?
- Have any units been demolished?
- How are the units being replaced (tenant-based subsidies, project-based assistance, combination)?
- IF THERE WILL BE PROJECT-BASED REPLACEMENT: How is the redevelopment being funded? HOPE VI? CGP? Is the local government assisting with financing (leveraging funds, tax credits)? Is there a plan available? Is some of the development being modernized instead of replaced?
- Where will the new housing be located? On site? In the community? In a different area? IF IN A DIFFERENT AREA: How do the new areas compare with the original location?
- Were the tenants involved in the decisions about where to locate replacement housing?
- How will the new/modernized development be managed? Will it be mixed-income? Private management? Resident-managed?
- What is the timetable for demolition/providing replacement housing? Has this changed since the original consent decree? Why/why not?
- Has the PHA encountered any barriers in trying to demolish/replace units? What kind? How are they being addressed?

IF NO:



- What is your understanding of the decree regarding the demolition and replacement of public housing units?

**6. Is it correct that the consent decree requires PHA to improve conditions in its current public housing stock?**

IF YES:

- What developments are affected? Why were they included?
- Has PHA made any changes in management that you are aware of (private management, site-based, etc.)?
- Have there been any changes in maintenance? What?
- Are any major improvements planned? What?
- How will any improvements be funded (CGP, operating funds, HOPE VI, etc.)?
- How much has been spent to date?
- Have there been changes in security?
  - What changes have been made to date? What is the timetable for the remaining changes?
- What obstacles exist (if any) to making these improvements?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding PHA efforts to improve the conditions in its housing stock?



**7. Is it correct that the consent decree calls for improvements in access to public transportation for PHA residents?**

IF YES:

- What do these improvements entail? What are the plans, costs, etc.?
- How will these changes be funded?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding public transportation?

**8. What are the overall lessons to be drawn from the early implementation experience?**

**9. Is there anything else you would like to add about the impact or implementation of the consent decree?**

---

## Housing Mobility Staff Interview Guide

Thanks for meeting with us today. We're conducting a study for HUD on the *[name]* Consent Decree and we'd like to talk with you about features of your housing mobility program and your experiences with the program to date.

We'll be taking notes during our discussion, but want to assure you that everything you say will be kept strictly anonymous. We will not name you in the report even if we quote something you say. No one but us will see our notes.

### A. Background

*[Note: This guide assumes the PHA has contracted with an NPO to provide the mobility counseling. This may not be true in all cases, e.g. Dallas. The guide will be adapted for those sites.]*

1. **When did the mobility program for PHA tenants begin?**
  - Is there a contract with the PHA? If so, when did you get it?
2. **How did your organization become involved with mobility counseling for PHA?**





- What was the selection process?
- Why did you choose to apply?

**3. Does your organization have prior experience in providing housing counseling?**

- Provided mobility counseling in other programs?
- Provided housing counseling?
- Worked on other PHA programs?
- Worked with low-income populations?
- Provided transitional assistance for homeless?
- Done housing relocation?

**4. What other kinds of services does your organization provide?**

- Employment & training?
- Family counseling?
- Parenting and child care services?
- Advocacy?
- Other types of services?



**B. Litigation Status**

1. Was your organization involved in enforcing the consent decree?



### **C. Landlord Outreach**

#### **1. How do you locate units in desegregated (or low-poverty) areas ?**

- Presentations to property management associations?
- Contacting individual landlords through ads, Internet listings, for rent signs, etc.?

#### **2. Have you encountered any difficulties in recruiting landlords in non-impacted areas for this program?**

- What kinds of problems have you had?
- Have there been any instances of discrimination? What did you do in those cases?
- What kinds of things have you done to overcome these problems?

#### **3. Have you encountered any community resistance to this program?**

- What kinds of problems have you had?
- What kinds of things have you done to overcome these problems?



#### **D. Counseling**

**1. When did/will your organization start providing services to PHA clients under the consent decree?**

- How many housing counseling staff do you have?
- How many landlord outreach staff do you have?
- How much funding do you receive from the PHA? Do you have any other sources of funding for this program?
- How many PHA clients have you served to date?
- How many clients have been placed in non-impacted areas?
- What are your average costs per family counseled? Per family placed?

**2. What kind of monitoring do/will you receive from the PHA?**

- Do you hold regular meetings?
- Prepare reports?

**3. How would you characterize your working relationship with the PHA?**



- Have PHA staff been cooperative in getting the mobility program started?
- Do you feel the PHA is supportive of the mobility program? Why/why not?

**4. How do/will you get clients from the PHA?**

- Does PHA send a list?
- Do you recruit at the Section 8 briefing?
- Do you hold other types of group sessions to recruit clients?



**5. What kind of application or screening process do/will you have?**

- Are you required to serve all clients from the PHA?
- Which class members are supposed to receive counseling? Are they required to participate?

**6. A. What services do/will you offer to participants in house?**

**B. What services do/will you offer through referrals?**

- Housing search assistance? What kind?
- Providing rental listings in desegregated/low-poverty areas?
- Information about desegregated/low-poverty communities? How provided?
- Assistance in negotiating with landlords?
- Motivational counseling?
- Fair housing information?
- Budgeting assistance?
- Credit counseling?
- Housekeeping training?
- Supportive services (family counseling, employment related counseling)?



- Advocacy with other agencies (PHA, welfare, etc.)
- Referrals/linkages to services in the new community?
- Follow up services? For how long?
- Help with security deposits?
- Other assistance like help with appliances, food, clothes, other goods?

**7. What are the typical steps a client would go through in searching for housing and receiving counseling services?**

- Do clients search independently?
- Are supportive services provided before the move or after (or both)?
- Do all clients receive the same package of services? IF NO: How do you determine how much service to provide?

**8. What other services, if any, do you think would make your program more effective?**

**9. We understand that the consent decree requires the creation of a fair housing enforcement office. Is this correct?**

IF YES:



- Who is required to create this office? City or PHA?
  - Have you referred any of your clients to this office because of discrimination?





## **D. Impact on Residents**

### **1. Have participants encountered any barriers to moving to desegregated areas?**

- Discrimination?
- Problems with transportation?
- Money for security deposits, moving expenses?
- Fear of moving to unfamiliar areas, away from services, etc.?

### **2. What has been the experience of residents who have moved to desegregated areas?**

- Have they gained any benefits from the move (schools, safety, jobs, better housing?)
- Have any encountered difficulties in moving? What kind? Has the PHA provided any assistance?
- Have any experienced discrimination? Examples? What has the PHA done in response to these problems?
- Do you have a sense of how residents feel about their new communities?

### **3. How well has the counseling program worked thus far?**



- Has it been effective in getting people to move to new areas?
- How many clients have been counseled? How many have moved to these areas?
- Has it been effective in helping residents become stabilized in their new communities?
- Have any residents moved back? How many?
- How many clients are receiving supportive/follow up services?
- Do you have any program reports we could see?
- Is it providing adequate services? Are there other things the program could be doing to help people move?

## **E. Summary**

### **1. To sum up, how effective do you think that the mobility program has been/will be in reducing segregation in your PHA?**

- Are residents receiving new opportunities?
- Has the PHA corrected existing problems?
- Are there other areas that still need to be addressed?



**2. What do you think the racial composition of the PHAs' developments will be in five years?**

Do you think there will be any substantial changes? Why/Why not?

**3. What advice would you give someone who was trying to start a mobility counseling program in their community?**

**4. Do you have any program materials that I can see, for example, brochures or intake forms?**

**5. What are some of the overall lessons to be drawn from the early implementation experience?**

**6. Finally, is there anything else you would like to add about the mobility program?**

## PHA Desegregation Staff Interview Guide

Thanks for meeting with us today. We're conducting a study for HUD on the *[name]* Consent Decree and we'd like to talk with you about your experiences implementing the various aspects of the consent decree and what you think the effects of the decree have been on PHA residents to date. We also have a few questions on the availability of data from PHA.

We'll be taking notes during our discussion, but want to assure you that everything you say will be kept strictly anonymous. We will not name you in the report even if we quote something you say. No one but us will see our notes.

### A. Background

#### 1. I'd like to start by getting a little background about this PHA.

*[Note: Verify the Information We've Received in Advance]*

- How many public housing units do you have? Conventional vs. Scattered site?
- How many Section 8?
- How many developments? Average age? [Get list]

#### 2. What was your most recent PHMAP score?



- Can I get a copy of the assessment today?
- Is the PHA appealing any of the scores?
- Can I get the PHA's overall PHMAP scores from 1996? From the year the consent decree was issued?

**3. What kind of historical data does PHA have available on the racial composition and physical condition of its conventional developments?**

**[Note: this may be more appropriate for an MIS person. Verify information provided by phone/mail; arrange to see data if haven't received it in advance]**

- How far back do your data go? Do they go as far back as 1993?
- Can you provide us with the addresses of all public housing developments in use in 1980 and 1990?
- What form are the data in? (computer, files, ledgers, reports, etc.)

**4. What kind of historical information does PHA have about the racial composition of Section 8 recipients?**

- Can you provide us with records of participant addresses by race from 1990 and 1996? When the consent decree was filed? (i.e., (probe for available data closest to 1990)



- What form are the data in? (computer, files, ledgers, reports, etc.)



## B. Implementation

*[Note: ask individual questions only if provision applies to this site]*

1. **The *[name]* consent decree, as we understand it, requires the PHA to change its tenant selection procedures. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- What types of changes are required (merging Section 8 & PHA waiting lists, etc.)?
- Have these changes been implemented? IF NO: Why not? What is the timetable for implementation?
- How many residents have received assistance since these changes were implemented?
- How have residents responded to these changes?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding PHA tenant selection procedures?

2. **We understand that the consent decree requires PHA to provide Section 8 subsidies to displaced PHA residents. Is this correct? To other class members?**



IF YES:

- What progress has been made in providing Section 8 to class members? How many have received assistance?
- Have you encountered any problems in providing this Section 8 assistance to displaced residents? To other class members? How are these problems being addressed?
- What is the timetable for providing Section 8 subsidies? Has this changed since the original consent decree? Why/why not?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding the provision of Section 8 subsidies?

**3. Is it correct that the consent decree includes mobility counseling for class members?**

IF YES:

- Which class members are supposed to receive counseling? Are they required to participate?
- Has PHA started implementing a mobility counseling program?
- Is PHA providing the counseling in-house or did it contract with an NPO?
- IF USING AN NPO: What was the selection process for hiring the NPO? Was an RFP issued? How many organizations responded? Were residents/class members involved in the selection?





- Did the NPO have any prior experience in providing mobility/housing counseling? What type?
- What kind of counseling is being offered to participants (housing search assistance, motivational counseling, information about desegregated areas, assistance in negotiating with landlords, supportive services, follow up services)?
- How many participants have received these services?
- How many have made a desegregative move?
- Have any moved back to their original community?
- Have you encountered any problems in implementing the mobility program? What kind? (Probe specifically: Community resistance? Participants unwilling/reluctant to move to desegregated areas? Transportation? Financial barriers?)

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding mobility counseling?

**4. Is the PHA making any special efforts to identify landlords in non-impacted areas who will accept Section 8?**

- IF YES: What strategies do you use to locate units in desegregated (or low-poverty) areas ?
- Do you make presentations to property management associations?



- What about other strategies like contacting individual landlords through ads, Internet listings, for rent signs, etc.?

**5. Have you encountered any difficulties in recruiting landlords in non-impacted areas for this program?**

- What kinds of problems have you had?
- Have there been any instances of discrimination? What did you do in those cases?
- What kinds of things have you done to overcome these problems?

**6. Have you encountered any community resistance to the Section 8 program? To the mobility program in particular?**

- What kinds of problems have you had?
- What kinds of things have you done to overcome these problems?

**7. Is it correct that the consent decree requires the PHA to apply for FMR exception rents?**

IF YES:

- Have you applied for any? For how many areas? For what rent amounts?



- How did you determine that exception rents were needed for these areas? Are there other areas where you considered applying for exception rents?
- What are the racial and economic characteristics of these communities?
- How many participants have found units in these areas since the consent decree was implemented?
- IF HAVEN'T APPLIED: Are there any areas that require exception rents? What is the timetable for applying for exception rents? What has prevented you from doing this thus far?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding FMR exception rents?



**8. The consent decree requires the local government to make commitments to removing barriers to affordable or fair housing. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- How did you determine what barriers existed?
- What has PHA done to negotiate commitments from local government?
- Has the local government made any changes in zoning regulations? What types of changes?
- What is the current timetable for making these changes?
- How many Section 8 holders have found units in areas subject to these new regulations?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding the local government's involvement with removing barriers to affordable housing?

**9. The consent decree requires the creation of a fair housing enforcement office. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- Has this office been created?
- How is this office administered? By the PHA? By the City?
- How many complaints has it received?
- What kind of cases has it reviewed? What determinations were made?



- How many of these cases have been resolved? How were they settled?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding the creation of a fair housing enforcement office?

**10. The consent decree, as we understand it, requires the PHA to demolish and replace a number of conventional public housing units. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- Have the units been demolished?
- How are the units being replaced (tenant-based subsidies, project-based assistance, combination)?
- IF THERE WILL BE PROJECT-BASED REPLACEMENT: How is the redevelopment being funded? HOPE VI? CGP? Is there a plan available? Is some of the development being modernized instead of replaced?
- Where will the new housing be located? On site? In the community? In a different area? IF IN A DIFFERENT AREA: How do the new areas compare with the original location?
- Were the tenants involved in the decisions about where to locate replacement housing?
- How will the new/modernized development be managed? Will it be mixed-income? Private Management? Resident-managed?
- What is the timetable for demolition/providing replacement housing? Has this changed since the original consent decree? Why/why not?
- Have you encountered any barriers in trying to demolish/replace units? What kind? How are they being addressed?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding the demolition and replacement of public housing units?



**11. Is it correct that the consent decree requires the PHA to improve conditions in its current public housing stock?**

IF YES:

- What developments are affected? Why were they included?
- Has PHA made any changes in management (private management, site-based, etc.)?
- Have there been any changes in maintenance? What?
- Are any major improvements planned? What?
- How will any improvements be funded (CGP, operating funds, HOPE VI, etc.)?
- How much has been spent to date?
- What changes have been made to date? What is the timetable for the remaining changes?
- What obstacles exist (if any) to making these improvements?
- Can I get a copy of the CGP application that describes these changes?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding improvements to PHA's current housing stock?

**12. Is it correct that the consent decree requires improvements in security?**

IF YES:



- What type of improvements are planned/have been made? PHA police? Hiring of security guards? Community policing? Community crime prevention (tenant patrols)? Security improvements (security systems, gates, fences, ID cards, etc.)? Drug prevention?
- How are these security measures funded (PHDEP, CGP, operating funds, other)?
- Are they being provided by the PHA or through partnerships with outside agencies (police, social service agencies, etc.)?
- What obstacles exist (if any) to making these improvements?
- Have these changes had any impact on crime rates in and around the development? Evidence (i.e. actual crime data)?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding improvements in security?

**13. We understand that the consent decree requires the city or PHA to make improvements in the community around the PHA's developments. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- What kinds of improvements are planned?
- Are there any plans for redevelopment in the surrounding neighborhood? IF YES:  
What are the plans? Expected costs? Progress to date?
- Are there any plans for specific economic development projects?
- How will these be funded? What are the expected costs? Progress to date?
- Have CDBG funds been applied for? For what purpose?
- How much has been completed to date? How much has been spent?
- What obstacles exist (if any) to making improvements?



IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding improvements in the surrounding community?

**14. The consent decree, as we understand it, calls for improvements in access to public transportation for PHA residents. Is this correct?**

IF YES:

- What do these improvements entail? What are the plans, costs, etc?
- How will these changes be funded?

IF NO:

- What is your understanding of the decree regarding public transportation?

**C. Impact on Residents**

**1. How many residents have been affected by the changes that were ordered in the consent decree?**

- How many residents have made desegregative moves? How defined? Evidence?
- How many have participated in the counseling program (if applicable)?
- How many are living in new/revitalized developments?





- How many developments have received improvements?

**2. What have been the experiences of residents who have moved or tried to move to desegregated areas?**

- Have any encountered difficulties in moving? What kind? Has the PHA provided any assistance?
- Have any experienced discrimination? Examples? What has the PHA done in response to these problems?
- Do you have a sense of how residents feel about their new communities?

**3. How well has the counseling program worked thus far?**

- Has it been effective in getting people to move to new areas?
- Has it been effective in helping residents become stabilized in their new communities?
- Is it providing adequate services? Are there other things the program could be doing to help people move?



**4. What have been the experiences of residents who are living in new/revitalized public housing developments?**

- Are they satisfied with maintenance? Why/why not?
- Are they satisfied with security? Why/why not?
- IN NEW/REVITALIZED DEVELOPMENTS: How satisfied are residents with the new housing? Have there been any problems or complaints?

**D. Summary**

**1. To sum up, how effective do you think implementation of the consent decree has been in helping to reduce segregation in your PHA?**

- Are residents receiving new opportunities?
- Has the PHA corrected existing problems?
- Are there other areas that still need to be addressed?

**2. What do you think the racial composition of the PHAs' developments will be in five years?**



- Do you think there will be any substantial changes? Why/Why not?

**3. What lessons have you learned from the early implementation experience?**

- Is there anything that you have done differently?
- What advice would you give another PHA facing the same issues?

**4. Is there anything else you'd like to add about the impact of the consent decree?**



## Tenant Leader Interview Guide

*[May be group interview]*

Thanks for meeting with us today. We're conducting a study for HUD on the *[name]* Consent Decree—an agreement reached between HUD, PHA, & local Section 8 administrators and minority residents of PHA & recipients of Section 8 certificates to end discriminatory practices in housing assistance and to improve conditions in public housing developments. We'd like to talk with you about efforts to date to implement the decree.

We'll be taking notes during our discussion, but want to assure you that everything you say will be kept strictly anonymous. We will not name you in the report even if we quote something you say. No one but us will see our notes.

### A. Implementation

*[Note: Ask questions only if provision applies to your site]*

- 1. One of the things the PHA is supposed to do is to improve conditions in certain developments to make them equal to developments in desegregated/low-poverty areas. Are you aware of any changes in *[insert names]* developments?**



- Have there been any changes in PHA management (e.g., going to private management or resident-management)? What do you think has been the effect of these changes?
- Have there been any changes in maintenance (e.g., more or better janitors)? What?
- Has the PHA made any improvements in [name of development]? To individual units? Common areas? Grounds?
- Have there been any improvements in security (e.g., hiring guards, community policing, drug prevention program, new security measures)? Have these changes reduced crime?
- Are there still other improvements that need to be made to make this development equal to developments in desegregated areas?
- Have there been any changes made to the public transportation system in this area? What?

**2. Another thing this PHA is supposed to do is demolish and replace units in [name of development]. Have any units been demolished?**

IF YES:

- How have tenants responded to the demolition? Were there concerns about losing housing, having to move, changes in the community, etc.?
- What kind of replacement housing did the PHA offer? Section 8? Units in other developments? Temporary relocation while new housing was constructed? Assistance with security deposits and other moving expenses?
- Has the PHA provided enough assistance to families who had to move? IF NO: What other kinds of assistance should it have provided?



IF NO:

- Do you know what the tenant relocation, demolition, and replacement plans are?
- Do you know what the timetable for relocation, demolition and replacement is?
- What are tenants' concerns about losing housing, having to move, changes in the community, etc.?

**IF NEW HOUSING IS BEING CONSTRUCTED:**

- Are there any plans to make the new development a mixed-income community? Will the original tenants be able to move back if they want to?
- Where is the new housing being constructed? On-site? In the community? In a different area?

**IF IN A DIFFERENT AREA:**

- How does this compare to the old neighborhood?
- Were residents involved in choosing the new locations? How do residents feel about the new housing? The new location?

**3. The PHA and the City government are supposed to make improvements in the community around this development. Have there been any changes like new sidewalks or repaved streets?**

- Have there been any other types of changes?



- Has there been any improvement in problems like litter, abandoned cars, broken windows, and graffiti? What kinds of changes? Who has been responsible for the changes?
- Are there any new things like parks, trees, or playgrounds in the community?
- Are there any new businesses in the area?
- Are there any new social service agencies (Boys and Girls Club, etc.)?
- Are there any new job opportunities or job training programs?
- Have there been any changes in the transportation in this area? Please describe.

**4. Are you satisfied with the speed at which the consent decree is being implemented?**

**B. Impact on Residents**

**1. Have any new tenants moved into this development because of the consent decree?**

- How many new tenants have moved in?
- Have there been any problems with the new tenants? Any advantages to having them here?
- How have the old tenants felt about the new people moving in?



**2. How have people felt about moving to new or revitalized developments like [*development name*]?**

- How satisfied are residents with the new housing? Have there been any problems or complaints?
- Are they satisfied with maintenance? Why/why not?
- Are they satisfied with security? Why/why not?





### **C. Lessons**

- 1. What are the overall lessons to be drawn from the early implementation experience?**
- 2. Is there anything else you would like to add about the impact or implementation of the consent decree?**



## **APPENDIX C**



---

## PUBLIC HOUSING DESEGREGATION FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL MODULES

### Module 1

#### General Thoughts on Moving - Opener

To begin, please introduce yourself and tell us something about yourself, like where you live and how long you've lived there.

- For Non-Movers Who Did Not Participate in a Housing Counseling Program
  
- For Non-Movers Who Were Required to Participate in a Housing Counseling Program
  
- 1. [If Applicable] You participated in the *[Name of Housing Counseling program]* because you wanted to make a move. Why did you want to move? *[Probe for: concern for safety, better schools, access to jobs, to be near family/friends, had to move, wanted different type of housing.]*
  
- For All Movers



1. Each of you recently moved to a new neighborhood. Why did you decide to move?

*[Probe for: concern for safety, better schools, access to jobs, to be near family/friends, had to move, wanted different type of housing.]*

2. Before you moved, what did you know about your new neighborhood? *[Probe for: prior knowledge about schools, crime, jobs, shopping, types of neighbors.]* How did you find out this information?



## Module 2

### Neighborhood Acceptance of Integration

- For All Movers
  1. What do you like about your new neighborhood? What don't you like about it?
  2. Did you consider moving to any other neighborhoods? How were these different from the one you eventually moved to? Why did you decide not to move to any of these other ones?
  3. Tell me a little about the people who live in your neighborhood? [*Probe for: race/ethnicity, age, family status, employment status, etc.*]
- For Desegregative Movers
  4. Do you think the people in your neighborhood are open to new people/families moving in? Why or why not?
  5. Do you think the people in your neighborhood are open to non-white people/families moving in? Why or why not?



6. How do you feel about living in a neighborhood that's mostly white? What kind of issues has this raised for you? Can you give me some specific examples of how this has affected you and your family *[Probe for both positive and negative effects]*?
  
- For Segregative Movers
  
4. Do you think the people in your neighborhood are open to new people/families moving in? Why or why not?
  
5. Do you think the people in your neighborhood are open to people of different races/ ethnic groups moving in? Why or why not?
  
6. Would you/did you consider moving to a neighborhood that was predominantly white? Why or why not? Can you give me some specific examples of how such a move might have affected you and your family *[Probe for both positive and negative effects]*?



- For Non-Movers
  1. What kinds of neighborhoods did you consider moving to?
  2. Please tell me about these neighborhoods. What did you like/not like about them?  
*[Probe for: crime, schools, racial makeup, jobs, stores, etc.]*
  3. Do you think the neighborhoods in this community/area are open to people of the different races or ethnic groups? Why or why not?
  4. Do you think it is difficult in this community/area for people to move to neighborhoods where most everyone is of the opposite race? Why or why not?
  5. Would you/did you consider moving to a neighborhood that was predominantly white? Why or why not? Can you give me some specific examples of how such a move might affect you and your family *[Probe for both positive and negative effects]*?

### Module 3

#### Barriers to Moving

- For All Movers
  1. What were some of the most difficult parts of your move? *[Probe for: security deposit, transportation, unfamiliarity with area, new neighbors, leaving friends and family, new schools, access to health and other services.]*
  2. How did you overcome these difficulties?
- For Non-Movers
  1. What were some of the most difficult aspects in trying to move? *[Probe for: security deposit, transportation, unfamiliarity with area, new neighbors, leaving friends and family, new schools, access to health and other services.]*
  2. Why did you decide not to move?





## Module 4

### Move Back Option

- For Section 8 Holders W/option to Move to PH When Available
  1. Are you planning/would you like to move to a public housing unit when one becomes available? *[If YES] Why?*
  2. *[If YES]* If you have a particular development in mind, why do you want to move there?
  
- For Section 8 Desegregative Movers W/option to Move Back to Segregative Areas
  1. When your lease is up, will you consider/have you considered moving from your present neighborhood? *[If YES] Why?*
  2. *[If YES]* If you have a particular neighborhood in mind, why have you chosen to move to there?



## Module 5

### Housing Counseling Program

- For Those Not Required to Participate in Housing Counseling Program
  1. Do you know about the *[Name of Housing Counseling program]*? What had you heard about it?
  2. Did you use the *[Name of Housing Counseling program]*? Why or why not?
- For Those Required to Participate in Only One Housing Counseling Session
  1. How many counseling sessions did you participate in? *[Probe for reasons.]*
- For Those Who Participated in the Housing Counseling Program
  1. How did you find out about the *[Name of Housing Counseling program]*? What had you heard about it prior to participating in it?



2. *[For those who used the Housing Counseling program]* Here is a list of services that the program provides *[Facilitator: Obtain list of program services prior to conducting focus group]*. Please tell me which of these services were the most useful in your move? Which were the least useful?
  
3. Did the program help you with your decision to move to your new neighborhood? What kind of services did it provide to help you make this decision?
  
4. What kind of service (s) or information would have been helpful to you in your move that the program did not provide?
  
5. Overall, were you satisfied with the assistance you received from the *[Name of Housing Counseling program]*? Would you recommend the program to other people? Why or Why not?
  - For Housing Counseling Programs with Class Member Recruitment Requirement
  
6. Did you receive housing information directly from any property owners or managers? If yes, what kind of information did you receive? What form did it come in?
  
7. Was this information helpful to you in your move? Did it influence your move in any way? Why or why not?

## Module 6

### Improvements to Public Housing Stock and Surrounding Areas

- For Current PH Residents
  1. Have you noticed any physical improvements in and around your development? If yes, what are they? *[Probe for specific improvements in their units, building, development, and neighborhood.]*
  2. What improvements do you think should be made that haven't been? *[Probe for/rank most important ones.]*
  
- For PH Equalization Requirements
  1. Do you think that the amenities (e.g., air conditioning, decor, grounds around development) at your development are worse, better, or the same as that of other developments? Why do you say this?
  2. Have you seen any improvements in the maintenance of your development (e.g., things getting repaired, trash being picked up, graffiti cleaned up, locks being fixed)?



- For Other Improvement Requirements [*Anti-crime, transportation*]
  1. Do you think the crime in and around your development has gotten better, worse, stayed the same? [*Probe for drugs, prostitution, shootings/violence, gangs, loiterers*]. Why do you say this?
  2. Have you noticed any changes in the transportation system in your area? What are they?

## Module 7

### Homeownership Opportunities

1. Do you know about the rent-to-own homeownership program? Are you currently participating in it?

2. *[If NO]* Why did you decide not to participate in it?

*[If YES]* Why did you decide to participate in it? What have been the advantages and disadvantages of the program?

3. Would you recommend the program to others? Why or why not?

## Module 8

### Satisfaction with Pha Administration of the Process

- For Movers
  1. Was the PHA involved in your move? How? *[Facilitator: Probe for both positive and negative involvement.]*
  2. Did you get any help from the PHA specifically to make the move to your new neighborhood *[other than the Housing Counseling program]*? What kind of help did you receive? *[Probe for: security deposit, moving assistance.]*
  3. Were you satisfied with the help you received from the PHA?
  4. What kind of help from the PHA would have been useful to you in your move?
- For Non-Movers
  1. Did you get any help from the PHA specifically to move to a new neighborhood *[other than the Housing Counseling program]*? What kind of help did you receive?



2. Were you satisfied with the help you received from the PHA?
  
3. What kind of help from the PHA would have been useful to you to make a move?





## Module 9

### New York

- For Public Housing Group
  1. What are some of the reasons that you decided to file a claim for public housing?  
*[Probe for: circumstances surrounding their initial application.]*
  2. Did you indicate a preference for any particular development(s) on your claim?  
*[If YES] Why did you want to move to this/these particular development(s)?*
  3. At the time of your initial application, was this/were these the same development(s) you wanted to move to?
    - 3a. *[If YES] Is it for the same reasons that you just mentioned?*
    - 3b. *[If NO] What differences are there between the development(s) you applied for before and that one you eventually moved to?*



4. Did you get a unit in your preferred development?
  - 4a. *[If YES]* Is it what you thought it would be? Why or why not?
  - 4b. *[If NO]* Do you like the development you're in? Why or why not?
- For Section 8 Group
  1. Why did you decide to file a claim?
  2. Why did you choose Section 8 over a Public Housing Development?
  3. At the time of your initial application, which development did you want to move to? Why don't you want to move there now?

## Module 10

### Conclusions/Wrap Up

1. Looking back on your move experience, would you make the same move again? Why or Why not?
2. Does anyone have any additional thoughts or comments about any of the topics we talked about today?
3. Does anyone have any questions or concerns about this study in general?
4. Thank you so much for participating today. Your comments and insights have been very helpful.

*[Explain and administer the Background Information Form. Hand out stipends and get receipts.]*



## Module 11

### Economic Opportunity And Social Interaction

1. What changes, good or bad, have taken place because of your move to a new neighborhood?
2. Has living in your new neighborhood provided you or your family with any new opportunities? [*Probe for employment, schools, social, other.*] What are they?



## APPENDIX D



There are three common means for establishing such a counterfactual: historical trends projection, control group comparisons, and multivariate statistical modeling. Although any of these three techniques will provide plausible counterfactual values of segregation, we strongly recommended that the long-term impact evaluation generate counterfactual segregation measures using multivariate statistical modeling. Hence the following sub-section discusses how three distinct multiple regression models could be specified to provide reasonable estimates of what the level of segregation would have been if the decrees had not been implemented.

### **Multivariate Statistical Modeling to Estimate Desegregative Effects of Decrees**

Our recommended multivariate statistical modeling approach will yield counterfactual segregation measures that are based on existing theories of neighborhood dynamics and appropriate econometric estimation techniques. The methodology has been used in the past and has six steps (Galster 1990b). While the first step has completed as part of the baseline impact analysis, the other five steps should be conducted as part of the long-term impact evaluation. The six steps are:

1. Gather pre-decree data from all eight baseline case study sites on the racial composition of public housing developments, census tract characteristics and the race and location of Section 8 certificate holders that are needed to estimate the econometric models described later in this section;
2. Compute parameter estimates from multiple regression models of: (1) the racial composition of public housing developments; (2) the racial composition of census tracts within each PHA's jurisdictional area; and (3) the number of black and white Section 8



certificate holders in any particular census tract (Models 1, 2, 3a and 3b, discussed below) using the data collected in step 1.

3. Generate counterfactual measures of the racial composition of public housing developments, racial makeup of census tracts and the number of black Section 8 certificate holders in any one tract using the parameter estimates developed as part of step 2 and post-settlement data collected during the long-term impact evaluation site visits.

For example, the results of the model estimated as part of step 2 could indicate that a development's percentage black can be estimated by multiplying the development's census tract percentage black by 0.25 and adding that product to the product of multiplying the dissimilarity index for the entire metropolitan area by 0.75. Assuming that a development's census tract is in the Year 2000 is 75 percent black, and the area's Year 2000 dissimilarity index is 0.6, the model would estimate the development's percentage black to be:  $(0.25 \times 0.5) + (0.75 \times 0.6)$ , or 0.575. In this hypothetical case, the model would predict that a development's proportion of African-American residents would be about 0.58 if it was located in a census tract that was 50 percent black and in a city with a dissimilarity index of 0.6.

Note that the estimated values calculated in step 3 represent what would have happened if the segregation case decree elements had never been implemented. They represent a "best guess" as to the way the world would have looked if not for the decree. Therefore, these estimated values are used to generate measures that estimate the level of segregation that would have been present for public housing and Section 8 certificate holders in the absence of a site's desegregation case.

4. Calculate counterfactual segregation indices using the estimates computed in step 3. These calculations would allow researchers to generate segregation measures based on the estimated values of the racial composition of public housing developments and the location of black and white Section 8 certificate holders based on Year 2000 Census data;



5. Calculate actual post-settlement segregation measures using actual data on the racial composition of public housing data and locations of black and white Section 8 certificate holders; and
6. Compare the measures generated in steps 4 (counterfactual post-settlement values) to those calculated in step 5 (actual post-settlement values); inasmuch as predicted values have associated standard errors, tests for statistically significant differences can be conducted.

After completing these six steps, researchers will have two sets of segregation measures. The first set, generated in steps 1 through 4, will represent the level of segregation in a particular PHA that would have been present in a given year if that site's desegregation case elements had never been implemented. For example, the models may indicate that, in the absence of a desegregation case, black public housing residents would have had a 10 percent chance of living in a census tract with a white resident. This measure can be compared with the actual value, which may indicate that a African-American public housing resident, in fact, has a 20 percent chance of living in a census tract with a white resident. The 10 percentage point increase in a black resident's chance of living in a census tract with a white resident represents a measure of the impact of a desegregation case's elements.

### **Models for Measuring Desegregation Impacts**

The series of model options presented below can be used to generate the data needed to calculate the indices reported in Chapter 3. All of the indices are based on: (1) the racial





makeup of individual public housing developments, (2) the racial composition of census tracts within a PHA's jurisdictions, or (3) the census tract location of Section 8 certificate holders. Therefore, we present three models that can be used to generate values for these three variables and report on the availability of data needed to operationalize them. Note that we use the following shorthand terminology:



racial-ethnic group =  $x$

census tract =  $t$

PHA jurisdiction =  $P$

individual PHA  $p$  has  $s$  developments within it.

### Model 1: PHA Site Racial Composition

Model 1 will be used to estimate the counterfactual racial composition of each multifamily public housing development within the eight long-term impact evaluation sites. To-date, we are aware of only one other study that has estimated the racial composition of individual multifamily public housing developments (Coulibaly, Green and James, 1998). Our initial design called for separate equations for elderly and family public housing sites as of 1990. Our data reconnaissance in each of the eight sites showed that many PHAs do not keep separate data for each type of development. Therefore, we can (1) estimate one model for both types of developments, or (2) use data from HUD's MTCS system to classify developments as elderly or family based on the proportion of household heads older than 62 years of age in order to estimate separate models. The model(s) estimated will be specified as follows:

Model 1:  $1990 \%x(ps) = f('90 \%x \text{ in census tract } t \text{ around development } ps, 1980-90 \text{ change in } \%x \text{ in tract around site } ps, \# \text{ of units in development } s, \% x '90 \text{ of PHA } p \text{ beneficiaries, '90 dissimilarity index for area within PHA } p \text{ jurisdiction})$

[unit of observation =  $s$  individual PHA development sites in PHAs]



[estimates, possibly, stratified by family/elderly development type]

This model can be used to predict what the racial composition would have been for each development in any given year if not for court order. This value can be compared to actual racial composition for a measure of impact. For example, the model might predict that, based on 2000 census data and the black population proportion in the PHA, a development would have a black population percentage of 5 % in a post-settlement year. But the actual development's black population percentage in that year may be 50%. This 45 percentage point difference is a measure of the decree's effect.

The model uses 1980 and 1990 census data as well as the racial composition of developments in 1990. As Table D-1 shows, two sites did not have development-level data, while three sites did not have 1990 data (though Minneapolis and East Texas had 1993 data). Therefore, the model cannot be estimated using data from all eight sites.

**Table D-1. Public Housing Data Available from PHAs**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Earliest Year Public Housing Data Available from PHA</b>	<b>Year decree took effect</b>	<b>Geographic Unit Available from PHA</b>
Allegheny County	1990	1994	Development
Buffalo	1990	1996	Development

**Table D-1. Public Housing Data Available from PHAs**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Earliest Year Public Housing Data Available from PHA</b>	<b>Year decree took effect</b>	<b>Geographic Unit Available from PHA</b>
Dallas	1990	1987*	Development
East Texas	1993	1985**	Census Tract
Minneapolis	1991	1995	Census Tract
New Haven	1990	1995	Development
New York	1990	1992	Development
Omaha	1990	1994	Development
<p>* 1987 decree was vacated in 1992. Remedial orders against the housing authority and HUD were signed in 1995 and 1996.</p> <p>** Court's finding of liability was effective in 1987. A court ordered interim injunction was issued in 1988, HUD drafted a desegregation plan in 1990 and 1991, amendments to desegregation plans have been made since 1994.</p>			



We can estimate model 1 in either of two ways. First, we can generate parameter estimates from all of the sites that have development-level data and apply those coefficients to estimate the counterfactual racial composition of PHA developments in East Texas and Minneapolis; assuming those two PHAs will have information on the size and location of developments in the future. As a check, we can compare the estimated racial composition of public housing developments in East Texas and Minneapolis to the actual numbers reported in 1993 and/or 1996 MTCS. Alternatively, we can use 1993 MTCS data to supplement the PHA-provided data and estimate coefficients using data from all eight sites. Either method will provide information needed to calculate actual and predicted measures for PHA developments, though with some error introduced into the estimates.

### **Model 2: Racial Composition of Census Tracts Containing Multifamily Public Housing Developments / Section 8 Certificate Holders**

Model 2 will be used to estimate the racial composition of census tracts within each of the eight PHAs' jurisdictional area. These estimates can be used to generate the indices that measure exposure indices for public housing residents and Section 8 certificate holders.

Both models, as specified, draw heavily on the seminal work of Duncan and Duncan (1957), Taeuber and Taeuber (1965) and Goering (1978), supplemented by the econometric modeling of Galster (1990a), Galster and Keeney (1993), Ellen (1996) and Carter, Schill and Wachter (1998). It requires addresses of public housing developments as of 1980 as well as census data from 1980 and 1990. Since we have exact locational information about public housing developments in six sites (and tract-level public housing in all eight sites), we can use either information provided by HUD or key informants to identify developments that were in operation in 1980. In addition, we can use the Urban Institute's Urban Underclass Database to generate the 1970 and 1980 tract-level data needed to estimate model 2. This database has census data



at the tract level that are comparable between the 1970, 1980 and 1990 censuses. The model is specified as follows:

Model 2: 1990%*x* in census tract *t* = *f* ('80 %*x* in census tract *t*, ('80 %*x* in census tract *t*)<sup>2</sup>, 1970-80 change %*x* in census tract, '80% population < 65 in census tract *t*, '80 % owner-occupied units in census tract *t*, '80 % of units in census tract *t* that are public housing, '80 % of residents who moved into census tract *t* since 1975, '80 median home value in census tract *t*, '80 median age of housing units in census tract *t*, '80 %*x* in area comprising PHA *p*'s jurisdiction)

[unit of observation = *t* individual tracts with public housing developments times 8 PHA jurisdictions]

These models will be used to predict what the racial composition would have been in the Year 2000 for each tract within a PHAs' jurisdictional area if not for the decree. This estimate will be used in models 1, 3a and 3b to generate simulated values for the number of Section 8 certificate holders in any given tract as well as the racial composition of individual developments. In addition, these estimates can be used to generate the counterfactual tract-level racial change between 1990 and 2000 to be used a comparison to actual racial change during the same ten-year period.

### **Models 3a and 3b: Section 8 Certificate Holders of a Particular Race in any Given Census Tract**



Models 3a and 3b will be used to predict the counterfactual number of black and white Section 8 certificate holders, respectively, in any given census tract based on tracts' Year 2000 characteristics and those of the PHA. It is an extension of Hartung and Henig (1997) and requires the addresses of public housing sites as of 1990 along with the addresses of 1990 Section 8 certificate holders. Either model will be specified as follows:



Model 3a: # black Section 8 certificate holders in census tract t in 1990 = f('90 housing units renting below FMR in census tract t, '90 housing units with more than 2 bedrooms in census tract t, '90 % black in census tract t, '90 % below poverty line in census tract t, '90 # PH in census tract t, 90 weighted distance measure of census tract t from Section 8 eligible population, '90 % x in PHA's jurisdictional area, '90 dissimilarity index in PHA jurisdictional area, '90 # of voucher/certificate holders for PHA p)

Model 3b: # white Section 8 certificate holders in census tract t in 1990 = f('90 housing units renting below FMR in census tract t, '90 housing units with more than 2 bedrooms in census tract t, '90 % white in census tract t, '90 % below poverty line in census tract t, '90 # PH in census tract t, 90 weighted distance measure of census tract t from Section 8 eligible population, '90 % x in PHA's jurisdictional area, '90 dissimilarity index in PHA jurisdictional area, '90 # of voucher/certificate holders for PHA p)

[unit of observation = t tracts across 8 PHAs]

**Table D-2. Section 8 Data Available from PHAs**

Site	Year decree took effect	Earliest Year Section 8 Data Available from PHA





Allegheny County	1994	1990
Buffalo	1996	1998
Dallas	1987*	1990
East Texas	1985**	1993
Minneapolis	1995	1990
New Haven	1995	1996
New York	1992	Not applicable to decree
Omaha	1994	1990
<p>* 1987 decree was vacated in 1992. Remedial orders against the housing authority and HUD were signed in 1995 and 1996.</p> <p>** Court's finding of liability was effective in 1987. A court ordered interim injunction was issued in 1988, HUD drafted a desegregation plan in 1990 and 1991, amendments to desegregation plans have been made since 1994.</p>		

As Table D-2 shows, only three PHAs have Section 8 data from 1990. Therefore, we can either estimate the model with data from PHAs that have information about the location of Section 8 certificate holders as of 1990, or estimate the model with Section 8 data from different years.



## Econometric Issues

The above models are presented as separate equations whose parameter estimates can be generated with the standard Ordinary Least Squares technique. In fact, the models represent a recursive system because the racial composition of a given tract is a dependent variable in model 2, but an explanatory variable in models 1, 3a and 3b. The recursive nature of the three sets of models does not affect the manner in which the parameter estimates are calculated by regression analysis. Therefore, all four models can be estimated using the variables described in the previous section, and will compute parameter estimates that quantify the effect of a particular explanatory variable on a dependent variable.

Since the models are recursive, however, the simulated counterfactual values of the racial composition of public housing developments as well as the number of black and white Section 8 certificate holders must be estimated in a two-step process. First, each census tracts' proportion black must be estimated using 2000 census data and Model 2's parameter estimates. Second, the estimated tract percentage black would be used, along with Year 2000 census data, to calculate the simulated counterfactual values of individual developments' racial composition along with the number of black and white Section 8 certificate holders in a given census tract.

There are two other econometric issues that must be addressed by researchers using our recommended multivariate estimation approach. First, parameter estimates for Models 3a and 3b cannot be estimated with Ordinary Least Squares for two reasons. First, the dependent variable is a count of the number of Section 8 voucher/certificate holders in tract  $t$ . This variable will take the value of zero (no Section 8 voucher/certificate holders) for many tracts within the eight PHAs. As a result, a Tobit, Poisson or negative binomial regression estimation technique



is appropriate.<sup>95</sup> Second, one of the explanatory variables is the spatially weighted sum of low-income households.<sup>96</sup> Therefore, spatial autoregression is needed in order to take into account the effect of distance on the dependent variable. Moreover, since all of the models contain an implicit spatial element, researchers should conduct spatial dependence diagnostic tests to identify any need for spatial econometric techniques to reduce spatial autocorrelation.

It is anticipated that the regressions will be conducted by aggregating information across as many sites that contain the necessary data. This assumes that the structural relationships defined in Models 1,2 and 3 are similar in all eight sites. This assumption may not be correct. To test this assumption, parameter estimates can be generated for the individual sites, and an F-test can then test the extent to which parameter estimates can be grouped. If there are differences, then researchers can estimate different models for each group.

---

<sup>95</sup>Although Hartung and Henig (1997) used a stepwise regression analysis to estimate the number of Section 8 certificate holders per tract in the District of Columbia area.

<sup>96</sup>The spatially weighted sum of low-income households from each tract will test the hypothesis that Section 8 voucher/certificate holders may seek housing in a spatially circumscribed area. Therefore, the number of Section 8 holders in any one tract is posited to be partly a function of potential recipients in nearby tracts. The spatially weighted number of low-income households for the  $i$ th tract is calculated as follows:  $\sum(\# \text{ of households with income} < \text{Section 8 eligibility level in tract } j) / \text{distance raised to the } n\text{th power from tract } i \text{ to tract } j$ . Non-linear effects would be represented by raising the distance from tract  $i$  to tract  $j$  to a higher power, such as distance squared or cubed. The general form is:  $\sum x_i / (d_{ij})^n$ .