displaced from low-valued housing (under $15 000) for highway construction in Austin and Houston, Texas. The 171 respondents (all of the households available in the study areas) were relocated under the 1968 or 1970 provisions that afford relocatees housing comparable to their previous housing. About 50 percent of the respondents were owners and the other 50 percent were tenants. Other characteristics included (a) 67 percent were males; (b) 55 percent were Anglos, 33 percent blacks, and 12 percent Mexican-Americans and other nationalities; (c) 73 percent were fully employed and 14 percent retired; (d) the median age was 49 years; (e) median family income was $7000; and (f) households averaged 3.2 people (2.6 for owners and 3.8 for renters). A total of 126 (73 percent of the 171) respondents upgraded their housing. The others relocated in housing comparable to their previous housing and a few in less-expensive housing.

Upgrading affected the relocatee's housing costs, net worth, and financial position. Most (83 percent) had higher housing costs; for example, mortgage payments by 42 tenants who were now owners. (Half of the original tenants became owners; 10 percent of the owners became tenants.) Transportation and utility costs for each household averaged $8 more per month after relocation. Of the 142 respondents who indicated changes in net worth, 132 (93 percent) experienced an increase. The average change in net worth was $1485. Despite the large proportion reporting increases in net worth (132 of 142 respondents), 38 percent felt that they were worse off financially and 22 percent thought they were better off. Of the Anglos, 40 percent thought their financial position was worse; 21 percent indicated improvement. For non-Anglos, 36 percent indicated financial worsening; 24 percent reported improvement.

Although 65 percent of the relocatees indicated that they had been upset about the prospects of moving, only 23 percent were upset about the entire relocation experience. Most relocatees were satisfied with the payments, information, and services received. About 75 percent gave the program a good or very good rating.

RESIDENTS DISPLACED BY HIGHWAYS

A third study analyzed the experiences of residents relocated from their homes as a result of highway location in several areas of Texas. Interviews were conducted with 165 households (58 percent were homeowners and 42 percent were renters) from the 1130 households relocated in the state between January 1971 and January 1973 under the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. The typical respondent was Anglo, employed, male, and about 48 years old. He was a member of a two-person household with annual income of $6000-$8000. The median value for acquired properties was approximately $7700 ($8500 for owners and $6800 for renters). Before relocation, monthly housing payments averaged $50 for homeowners and $80 for renters. After relocation, payments rose to $90 and $105, respectively.

Relocation housing payments approved under the 1970 act enabled at least 60 percent of the respondents to upgrade their housing accommodations and neighborhoods. About 82 percent of the respondents liked their new homes and neighborhoods about the same as or better than their previous homes. Supplemental housing payments also encouraged homeownership. More than half (41 of 70) tenants became owners after relocation. Only 11 percent (10 of 90) owners became tenants.

Relocation of Residents Displaced by Construction of I-205 in Washington

Evan Iverson

This study examines the effects of relocation (in Clark County, Washington) including the adequacy of housing before and after relocation, benefits provided by the state, opinions of relocatees concerning their new housing and neighborhoods, and opinions of the type and amount of assistance provided throughout the relocation process. The purpose of the study is to provide citizens, planners, and public officials with factual and attitudinal information derived from the actual experience of families who were relocated under recent federal and state statutes.

Of the 96 respondents to the survey, 42 owned their own home prior to relocation, but practically all of the relocatees acquired dwelling units of their own in the relocation process. The dwelling units acquired after relocation were newer and of approximately the same size as their previous homes.

The appraised market value of the dwelling units of the owners was in some instances sufficient without supplemental payments to permit owners to acquire new housing, but it was necessary to provide payments in addition to the assessed value for 64 percent of the owners to enable them to acquire satisfactory housing. The average amount of the housing supplement was $1564.

Of the renters, 82 percent qualified for and chose to receive a payment to purchase replacement dwellings. The average amount received was $1515.

Some 79 percent of the families interviewed indicated that they considered the current state relocation program to be adequate. The information received about the relocation process was also described as satisfactory.

One of the significant findings, as far as the financial impacts of relocation are concerned, was the upgrading of the housing that occurred as a result of the relocation process. The renters had the option to receive a rental supplement for new living quarters, if such proved to be necessary, or to receive a single payment that could be applied to the purchase of a dwelling unit. About 82 percent (44) of the renters qualified for and chose to receive a payment to purchase replacement dwellings; 9 percent (5) of the respondents elected to remain as renters and accept the additional rental replacement supplements. These five respondents resided in mobile homes prior to and after the relocation. Another 9 percent of the renters received no rental supplement because they had not lived in their residence for the period of time required (90 days). All of the respondents were eligible to receive the moving allowance.

The structural changes examined in this study focused primarily on the age and size of the dwelling. The age of the residences after relocation was generally newer, with 72 percent of the respondents living in residences 15 years of age or less after relocation. This compares with 59 percent prior to relocation. The number of bedrooms per residence also increased from 2 to 2.5. The average number of rooms per residence remained the same. By using these factors, the residences after relocation represented an upgrading over those lived in prior to relocation.