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message from Secretary Romney

This first issue of Challenge, the Departmental magazine, symbolizes the coming-of-age of our team. We have now been together long enough to know each other, to have smoothed out some organizational wrinkles, and to have set a course for the long pull ahead.

We have defined our problems; now it is time to meet their challenge.

I look upon this magazine as a valuable tool of management. It will strengthen our sense of community, of belonging. It can be a forum for the exchange of ideas. It will provide a vehicle for telling you about new policies and new directions in the Department. And it will furnish a medium for those forms of expression that are not well served by our more conventional publications.

Challenge should be a showcase for the best thoughts in HUD, a display window for the most exciting HUD-related projects across the country. It can be this— with your help. Every member of the Department is a potential contributor. I know we have deep pools of talent; these must be tapped, in the Central Office and in the field.

I am a Voluntary Action enthusiast and I believe that the best hope for this endeavor, as for any other, lies in the voluntary involvement of many people. The Editor will welcome suggestions, ideas, and manuscripts. You are free to make such contributions at any time. I urge you to do so.

Challenge is formidable. It is my hope that, in months to come, Challenge will be able to document many creative and useful responses initiated or inspired by HUD.
editor's notebook

Detroit Housing Commission Director Robert D. Knox on resident-managers of low-rent housing projects: "Ultimately...success will depend upon the quality of the persons elected resident-managers. So far the level appears to be high—which says something about the electors, our public housing tenants." (Renewal and Housing Review—Winter 1968-69, Detroit, Michigan)

The Springfield (Mass.) Redevelopment Authority has issued a report that is all paper and more than a yard high. The improbable format is as big as an advertising poster. Measuring 25 x 38 inches, the report covers the period July 1967–June 1968 and reports all the activities of the Authority for the year. In two colors, with everything on one page—so it can be hung on a wall for ready reference, it is a dististent departure from the traditional format employed in annual reports.

Racine Courts, formerly owned by the Chicago Housing Authority was the first in the nation to be sold to its residents.

Urban Land Institute's Land Use Digest (February 17, 1969) points out that at least 20 percent of central city property in "160 major cities is sitting idle on vacant lots"...The Digest also notes "one-third of all private land is in the urban centers in vacant lot form."...

Seven out of ten Americans dwell on 1½ percent of the Nation's land while by 1980 these figures will rise to eight out of ten. (Mid Continent Memo, Denver, Colorado, November 8, 1968)

"If the production of automobiles in the U.S. were as primitive as the production of urban housing, the customer who wanted a new car would go to his local service station." ("An Assembly Line Answer to the Housing Crisis"—Walter McQuade—Fortune, May 1, 1969)

"The key problem is that the city depends mainly upon real estate taxes for revenue and that is a losing game. You cannot build a modern city on a real estate tax base. We have raised real estate taxes to the point where they cannot be raised much more. Homeowners cannot take it any more. If we tried to raise real estate taxes now, our bridges would not be wide enough to accommodate all the people fleeing, bag and baggage, to outlying areas. We are killing the goose that laid the golden egg." ("One Mayor's Story of the Mess in Cities," Mayor Joseph Barr of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, U.S. News and World Report, April 21, 1969)

"HUD's Romney wants a record of housing production, not record production of housing studies." (Engineering News-Record, April 3, 1969)

"The character of our business will be tested by its response to what has been described as the most serious domestic problem our Nation has confronted in 100 years. I'm thinking of the crisis in our cities. To the simple question "What business is that of ours?" there is a simple answer: 'What happens in the cities happens to us.'" (H. I. Romnes, Chairman of the Board, AT&T—Remarks to Bell System management people outlining business objectives, January 1968)
The National Society of Interior Designers has expressed an interest to HUD in volunteering assistance through its 26 chapters located in major cities, to local housing authorities to improve the livability of low-rent housing projects.

Ground breaking for the first college dormitory ever financed by a College Housing Loan to a nonprofit student-owned housing coop was held in Michigan on June 21. Operated entirely by student residents the $1.24 million project is sponsored by the Inter-Cooperative Council at the University of Michigan.

THE DETROIT HOUSING COMMISSION EXPECTS MORE THAN $150 MILLION IN NEW CONSTRUCTION FOR THIS YEAR IN COMPARISON WITH $70 MILLION STARTED IN RENEWAL AND PUBLIC HOUSING AREAS DURING 1968. ALSO ON THE PLUS SIDE, DHC REPORTS, DURING 1968 THAT IT SOLD MORE LAND FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION IN RENEWAL AREAS THAN IT PURCHASED FOR CLEARANCE. TWO OF THE BIGGEST LAND SALES WERE TO THE DETROIT NEWS, FIVE ACRES FOR $1,196,000 AND THE MICHIGAN BLUE CROSS-BLUE SHIELD, 11 ACRES AT $1,203,000.

“A massive 92 percent of all Americans recognize that cities are “the center of business communications, and the arts and must be made better places to work and live in.” (“Urban Action Favored,” Louis Harris, Outlook, June 1969)

Lack of qualified manpower is likely to limit expansion of computer technology in the cities. Considerable training of administrators will be an important first step. (“The Search for Urban Manpower,” Norman Beckman and Marcia Kavanagh, Occupational Outlook Quarterly, Spring, 1969)

“The first ‘live’ production in this town’s glittering new L’Enfant Plaza Theatre played only one performance last week. Nevertheless, it was rated a smash hit. For it starred Fannie Mae—in the first annual stockholders meeting of the Federal National Mortgage Association.” (“Fannie Mae,” Shirley Scheibla, Barron’s, June 23, 1969)

Will nostalgia win out over urban renewal? According to AP’s Cathy Castillo (Washington Evening Star of Friday, August 15, 1969) City fathers in Seattle “must decide whether to go for urban renewal or to stay with one of America’s last real farmer’s markets. Shall the colorful and uncommon Pike Place Market—where fish vendors wrap their smoked herring in newspaper and vegetable sellers plead ‘Lady don’t squeeze the tomatoes’—be replaced by an $18 million renewal package?”

AKRON, OHIO, IS PUTTING MODULAR HOUSING CONCEPTS TO THE TEST. DURING THE NEXT TWO YEARS THE AKRON METROPOLITAN HOUSING AUTHORITY, IF IT CAN BUY ENOUGH LAND, WILL PUT UP AROUND 1,500 MODULAR HOMES, SCATTERED THROUGHOUT THE CITY AND EITHER RENTED OR SOLD TO LOW-INCOME FAMILIES. JACK SAFERSTEIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE AMHA SAYS, “IT’S THE ONLY WAY THAT AKRON OR ANY OTHER BIG CITY CAN SOLVE ITS HOUSING NEEDS.” (“Look It’s A House,” DAVID HESS, CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, AUGUST 4, 1969.)

HOUSING prices can be slashed as much as 40 percent if their were nationwide building codes and if there was full use made of mass production techniques according to Better Homes and Gardens in its September 1969 issue.

Mrs. Mildred Maddix, 46, and mother of eight who lives at 285 Hinsdale Street in the East New York Section of Brooklyn has this opinion of her neighborhood: “This street is so bad that when I go outside I feel sick at the filth and I have to come back inside and the house is terrible and I want to go back out again. My friends say to me, ‘Mildred you’re looking bad.’ And I say to them, ‘This is Vietnam. Who can look good living in Vietnam?’” (“Decay and Despair Pervade a Street in East New York”—New York Times—August 14, 1969)

Challenge Invites the contributions of its readers. In future editions the magazine will include a Readers’ Challenge column of questions and suggestions about all HUD programs and operations. Items for the column should be submitted to The Editor, Challenge, Room 6239, HUD, Washington, D.C. 20410.
OPERATION

Breakthrough
a nationwide effort to produce millions of homes

Harold B. Finger
HUD Assistant Secretary
for Research and Technology

The spectacular moon-flight of Apollo 11 demonstrated what can be achieved when American determination is concentrated on a specific goal. We take national pride in our ability to accomplish remarkably complex and difficult feats by committing our talents and resources to such an objective.

Yet year after year, we have failed to take up a national challenge which can no longer be ignored and which may test our will and tax our energies, talents, and ingenuity far more severely than does our present space program. That challenge is to make our cities livable and to provide a decent home for every American.

The Housing Act of 1968 defined the national mission. We must make homes available for families of all income levels—attractive, reasonably priced homes that promote a pride of occupancy.

As a part of HUD's commitment to this mission, OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH is a new housing approach designed to use modern management, marketing, and production techniques and to establish an improved system for providing housing to those who need it. The primary objective is to stimulate volume production of housing that can be delivered to a volume market.

Faced with our backlog of unmet housing needs, HUD can hardly be content with research alone. For this reason, BREAKTHROUGH is the kind of major effort that can put national skills and ingenuity directly to work on developing the process that will help us realize our housing goals.

Twenty-Six Million New Homes

The omnibus National Housing Act of 1968 specified our housing needs: in the next ten years we must build or rehabilitate 26 million housing units, including six million for families of low and moderate income. This means that we must add at least another million a year to our present yearly average of about 1.5 million new homes. Indeed, to achieve the goal of 26 million units, we would have to

Harold B. Finger, HUD's first Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, came to the Department in May, 1969, from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration where he served since 1967 as Associate Administrator for Organization and Management.
reach a yearly production level more than twice our present average.

But to provide this massive supplement to our present rate of housing production, we will need the cooperation of industry and labor, of financiers and consumers, and of Federal, State, and local authorities. We will need a dynamic nationwide partnership committed to solving our housing crisis.

As it is now, we have to run just to stand still. The existing industry has to struggle with the inexorable rate of building deterioration as well as with the housing demands of a rapidly expanding population. Even conservative estimates indicate that three hundred million people will be living in the United States in the year 2000—just 30 years from now.

**Major BREAKTHROUGH Goal**

The goal of OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH is to establish an improved system for the production, development, marketing, and financing of housing that will supplement present methods and assure a decent home for all of the Nation’s people. HUD’s role in OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH is essentially three-fold: (1) helping to locate construction sites and to form housing markets large and continuous enough to encourage volume housing production, (2) funding and providing other incentives to private industry to develop complete housing systems that can be produced in volume, and (3) granting benefits to consumer groups and to State and local authorities that assist the BREAKTHROUGH effort.

Since early in May, we have held many conferences in Washington and across the country with industry and labor leaders; with mayors, governors, and their representatives; with organizations representing the consumer. We explained what we are committed to do and what we hope they will do in this new partnership for housing production.

**Fragmented Housing Market**

In all of our discussions, the term “market aggregation” was frequently used to pinpoint a critical objective: we must group or pool the housing needs of developers, sponsors, and authorities to form sizable assured markets—thereby stimulating private enterprise to volume housing production.

Housing is today burdened with the most fragmented market in America. This keeps the industry fragmented, localized, and incapable of meeting the total housing needs projected for the future. The largest builders in the country produce only one to two percent of our yearly total. The administrative processes under which our housing system operates and especially the multitudinous building codes and zoning restrictions make it difficult to overcome this extreme fragmentation.
To encourage technological innovation in BREAKTHROUGH, housing systems, HUD is selecting special prototype construction sites that will be free of restrictions. We have invited State and local authorities to propose such sites from a variety of climate, land, and market conditions throughout the United States. We have also asked them to help with market aggregation.

The mayors and governors, State legislatures, county officials, and housing authorities, industry and building trades, financiers and concerned citizens can perform a vital national service by making inventories of housing needs and consumer demand, by identifying available land, by removing or relaxing restrictive building, housing, and zoning codes, by locating sources of construction financing. Their cooperation has already begun.

The Department will grant priority funding from all available HUD programs to those State and local areas undertaking such activities. Sewer and water grants, open space grants, planning grants, and Urban Renewal are prominent examples.

Proposals from Private Industry
Secretary Romney struck the BREAKTHROUGH keynote when he observed that "we must tap the enormous energies of private enterprise to solve the national housing crisis." As we strive to assemble greatly expanded housing markets, we must at the same time exert ourselves to marshal most effectively the resources of private industry.

HUD started issuing Requests for Proposals on June 24, 1969, to interested firms or individuals to present their proposals for OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH. More than 4,000 firms have received the Request for Proposals. We invited two types of proposals, to be submitted by September 19, 1969.

The first type of BREAKTHROUGH proposal is for a complete housing system that can be produced in volume. This total housing systems proposal must include the management, marketing, and production capability for a large-scale operation—not just for producing homes but also for the effective use of available land. HUD plans to award from 10 to 20 of these major contracts in November 1969.

The second type of proposal is for innovative components which may contribute to a complete housing system, for improved software approaches, or for untried concepts which through research and development may produce future housing systems or processing improvements.

Design, Development, and Construction

OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH is a three-phase program. Firms that won Phase I contracts immediately began a two-to-four month design and development effort. Some of their plans will probably call for increased industrialization and wider use of standardized parts, perhaps even complete housing modules. Others may involve improved management of available systems. During this first phase, BREAKTHROUGH contractors are perfecting their design of prototype demonstration units and planning specific construction on the regional sites selected by HUD. Proposals for regional prototype sites from State and local officials were also to be submitted by September 19.

Phase II will involve actual construction of prototype units on one or more of the eight regional sites. We want enough prototypes to check cost estimates, land use plans, design flexibility, mix of housing type and of price level. We have asked the contractors to submit cost estimates on various production levels and on the minimum number of prototypes needed to evaluate their approach effectively.

Seal of Approval
The National Bureau of Standards, the Forest Products Research Laboratory, private laboratories, and the National Academies of Science and Engineering will participate in a rigorous testing, evaluation, and test validation program for BREAKTHROUGH pro.
prototype units to determine their durability, quality of design, and consumer acceptance. Successful completion of the testing program will provide the Department with a basis for approving the housing system for use in all HUD programs.

It is our hope that this “seal of approval”—based on thorough performance tests and evaluations—will help pave the way for updating or modifying restrictive building, housing, and zoning codes that have discouraged technological innovations and improvements. We are not trying to do away with codes. We want modern codes based on the actual requirements of a house and of a community and on impartial performance standards for construction.

Volume Production of Housing
The third BREAKTHROUGH phase is volume production of housing, the ultimate goal that lies from one to two years ahead. High-volume, high-quality production is not an instant achievement. Nevertheless, HUD is committed to reaching that goal at the earliest possible date.

The Department is not the final housing customer once volume production begins. Developers, sponsors, investors, consumers, and local authorities from each of the aggregated market areas across the country will have the opportunity of visiting BREAKTHROUGH regional prototype sites to review test results, cost figures, designs, and overall housing systems. They may then select the housing systems most suitable for their community’s housing needs. This competitive approach encourages housing concepts that offer the advantages of economy, technological practicality, producibility, high quality, beauty, attractive design, and good living conditions.

Although HUD can encourage aggregation of markets, we cannot guarantee that any one housing system will be chosen for volume production over another by the various authorities, developers and sponsors. Therefore, the marketing talents of the industry are still required. Once a contract has been signed for a volume BREAKTHROUGH project, the Department will provide priority consideration for subsidies for homeownership payments, rent supplements, water and sewer grants, and community facilities loans. These are examples of the kind of support available from HUD.

A National Commitment
The plan of OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH is clear, but working it out will be a tremendously complex effort. It is not the hardware or technological problems that will challenge us most, but rather those problems arising from diverse individual, institutional and community interests.

We have only begun to confront our major housing problems. Housing development continues to be plagued by the soaring costs of land, labor, materials and money. Inflation and high interest rates are disturbing roadblocks in the way of volume production. Much experimentation remains to be done to determine effective methods of financing and managing large housing programs.

HUD does not claim to have all the answers; indeed its complicated machinery and processing have even contributed to some of the problems. But we know what obstacles we face and we are seeking an even clearer definition of those obstacles. Just as success in a space mission depends upon full exploration of existing and potential problems, so does success in OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH—a housing program.

There are encouraging signs. National, State, and local leaders are backing OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH. Labor leaders have indicated some receptiveness to new approaches. One of our greatest challenges is making more effective use of our present labor force as well as preparing a large enough labor force for our housing needs of the future.

Our housing program, to succeed, must marshal not only our most advanced and ingenious technology, but so many adverse elements: governments at every level, private industry and business large and small, labor unions, financial institutions, voluntary organizations, community support, and the personal commitment of every citizen. If we can get this national commitment to housing, we will have taken a giant step toward delivering decent, liveable homes to all who need them. That is the whole point of OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH.

WHAT HUD HAS SET OUT TO DO:

- Capitalize on the full resources of private industry to help provide the 26 million homes needed in the next ten years
- Help form housing markets large enough to make volume production profitable
- Work with State and local leaders to find sponsors, developers, and local authorities to undertake large-scale housing programs
- Locate available land for innovative housing use and for construction of prototype demonstration units
- Fund companies to undertake a three-phase program: (1) design and development of complete housing systems (2) prototype construction and (3) volume production
- Fund continuous research to develop innovations for total housing systems
- Encourage increased industrialization and standardized use of housing parts and modules
- Develop performance standards for housing construction through a rigorous testing program to decide HUD certification and consumer acceptance
- Work with State and local authorities, unions and concerned citizens to remove or modify restrictive building, housing and zoning codes
- Encourage a more effective use of our present labor force and prepare a large enough labor force for the housing industry of the future
- Develop more effective financing and management techniques for large-scale housing programs
- Cut red tape in arranging program funding
- Give priority consideration for funds from all available HUD programs to authorities and areas cooperating with OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH
Eighty-four year old Mrs. Mary LeCount had lived in her two-story house on Baltimore's east side for 42 years. She was threatened with the financial burden of major and much-needed repairs on her 100 year old home. With only an $84-a-month Social Security pension, Mrs. LeCount qualified for a rehabilitation grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and subsequently received the maximum grant of $3000.

The renewal is "just fine" she said. "I'm glad that I really had someone to do something good for me."

Her small six-room home is one of the 250 that have been slated for rehabilitation in Baltimore's Gay Street urban renewal plan. HUD's rehabilitation grant helped bring Mrs. LeCount's home into conformance with the Gay Street renewal plan and increased the economic life of the home by 30 years. Improvements included wallpaper, paint, a new gas heating system, electrical wiring and hot water heater.

But despite the work going on, Mrs. LeCount did not move out. "I have never broke up housekeeping and I'm on my own."

Pride in homeownership among elderly people of limited means is reflected in the volume of activity at HUD involving programs designed to meet the special needs of this low-income group. In addition to numerous Federal housing subsidies to the elderly, 60 percent of HUD rehabilitation grants have gone to applicants over 62 years of age. As the life span continues to increase, so do the numbers of people in the 62 and older age group who proudly own and try to maintain their homes in spite of dwindling finances and declining physical abilities.

More and more of the elderly, because of low incomes and few assets, are qualifying and using HUD's low-interest rehabilitation loan program and the rehabilitation grant program to improve the appearance, safety and comfort of their homes.

These programs are making it possible for many elderly people to remain active, independent, and secure from the financial hardships that usually accompany upgrading a home.
Major cities will continue to feel the impact of U.S. population growth. Dr. Jerome P. Pickard, HUD urban growth expert, told a congressional committee that the Nation’s population is expected to increase at least 100 million by the year 2000. The 12 largest urban areas will absorb about 85 percent of that increase, he predicted. Dr. Pickard said that 272 new communities of 50,000 to 500,000 are needed, but, at best, these new towns would contain only 30 percent of the people.

Paper houses designed to last 20 years are being produced by Universal Papertech Corporation of Hatfield, Pennsylvania. The manufacturer claims that its 5/16 inch thick, chemically-treated paper will withstand extreme heat and pressure.

Styles range from a one-story unit of 400 square feet to multi-unit combinations up to 1,400 square feet. The basic modular unit costs about $800. According to a company release, three workers can assemble the unit in about five hours. The price tag on a three-wing paper home or warehouse with added finishes comes to $3000, slightly more than $2 per square foot.

New construction methods to eliminate unwanted outdoor noises—from airplanes to screaming neighbors—are being investigated under a HUD research grant. Wyle Laboratories of El Segundo, California, has received $160,000 to help develop low cost, soundproof construction techniques and materials.

Steel framing is now in use as a cost-saving substitute for lumber, Harold B. Finger, HUD Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, told the Forest Products Research Society. He quoted preliminary estimates which showed that a single, typical house using light weight cold-rolled steel instead of framing lumber could save about 10,000 board-feet per house. The use of steel joists alone could save 2,800 board feet in a similar house.

Rent withholding has been gaining popularity as a tool to force slum landlords to renovate dilapidated buildings. Cities which have used the tactic include New York, Boston, Detroit, Chicago, Seattle, Philadelphia, Denver, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., Portland, Oregon, and Elizabeth, New Jersey.

At least seven states have legalized rent withholding and three others are reported considering the measure.

A low-cost solution to prevent building drift has been suggested by Dr. Lev Zetlin, who heads the Center for Research and Innovation in Building at the University of Virginia. He claims that using gyroscopes and electronic sensors to actuate mechanical shock absorbers can save 70 percent on building material costs. The device has cut $3.5 million from the projected cost of a civic observation tower planned for Milwaukee.

A new waterproof, seamless flooring requiring no maintenance for five years is expected to be on the market in January. The Housing Assistance Administration is writing Federal specifications for the flooring, which is slated for use by the Government.

The flooring system can be applied by a homeowner in eight hours. An emulsion epoxy base is followed by a brushed on acrylic surface. Colored vinyl chips are then scattered in random patterns. A final moisture proof glaze is applied. Five companies have helped develop the new flooring: Tecco Corporation in Falls Church, Virginia, Vanderbilt Chemical Company and Spenser-Kellog in New York City, Cambridge Tile in Cincinnati, and Luminal Paint Company in Newark, New Jersey.
Nighttime glow highlights the long, spacious truck docks of the Philadelphia Food Distribution Center.
South Philadelphia in meager days. This smoldering dump and squatters' scattered ramshackle huts were swept away for the new Philadelphia Food Distribution Center.

Colorful but impractical. The old Dock Street market wasn't up to the times. Overcrowded and unsanitary conditions made the market an eyesore and haven for rats.

Philadelphia has converted a smoldering, smelly dump into an efficient food distribution center.

Although it cost $100 million to effect the change, the city accomplished the task on its own without resorting to the use of a penny of Federal funds.

The food center stands as a tribute to the spirit of cooperation and "self help" between Philadelphia's businessmen, citizens and government. One hundred businesses now flourish on 388 acres where for decades garbage and trash were strewn and burned.

Philadelphia expects to collect nearly $2 million per year in revenue from the dump. A similar rat colony infested the original produce area around congested Dock and Calowhill Streets.

Dock Street had been a major contributor to the notion that Philadelphia with its narrow, twisting, Revolutionary War-era streets and 19th Century-style blight was "over the hill." The city, steeped in historical lore, has been less known for its port, which serves as a key conduit for fresh fruits, vegetables, and a wide variety of foods serving a significant part of the eastern seaboard.

In the late 17th Century, Dock Creek was the focal point of Philadelphia's commercial life. Here William Penn, founder of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, first stepped ashore from the Delaware River. Here ships were moored and their cargoes unloaded. The first retail and wholesale food market in town grew as Philadelphia became the core of economic activity for the Thirteen Colonies.

Since then, the Dock Creek area has gone through an energetic adolescence and bustling middle age, only to lapse into senility with a hardening of the traffic in its narrow arteries. America's third largest city had gone stagnant with its inability to meet the inner city demands.

The surrounding city's tremendous growth had led to congestion glutting the available land, enclosing the markets within a prescribed area and eliminating all possibility for expansion.

After two and one-half centuries, the city's wholesalers had to face
reality and stop ignoring the offensive sights and smells: refrigeration facilities were poor and antiquated, stores were stacked into blighted four and five-story loft buildings on narrow streets built for 18th Century traffic. While great strides had been made in food processing, handling, and storage, the Dock and Callowhill Streets markets were locked into an outmoded environment.

Both merchants and customers were faced with interminable problems of sanitation, traffic jams, and decay. Businesses, some of them under third generation ownership, bowed to the pressures and folded as profits disappeared. This untenable situation was not lost on the Greater Philadelphia Movement, a voluntary group of business leaders dedicated to civic improvement.

On the lower South Side of the city lay the dump with its festering eyesores, including squatters who lived by scavenging through the rubbish, garbage and offal. The air and sunlight mixed with smoke rising from innumerable fires to form a sickly haze. But, with all of these drawbacks, the dump had its attractive points.

The acreage lay next to the Schuylkill Expressway, which runs through the heart of the city into suburban Bala Cynwyd and beyond. The Walt Whitman Bridge with its strong towers supported a major link between Philadelphia, its neighbors Camden and Trenton, and the New Jersey Turnpike. Also available were the sidings of the Penn-Central, Baltimore and Ohio, and Reading Railroads as well as the bed for a new traffic artery, the Delaware Expressway, which promised quick access to Wilmington and Chester to the south. An additional enticement was the International Airport ten minutes away.

In 1954, Harry A. Batten, chairman of the board for N.W. Ayer and Son, conceived the idea of moving the Dock Street Market to a new home in South Philadelphia. His idea was presented to fellow members of the Movement, who, in turn, agreed to under-

take a study of the situation. Assisted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Pennsylvania State University’s Agriculture Extension Service, the study endorsed a plan calling for the entire wholesale food industry to move from the unprofitable Dock-Callowhill Area to its present site near the Navy Yard.

Under the plan, the vacated land would play an important role in the renewal and subsequent redeveloperment of historic Society Hill near famous Independence Hall.

Drawing upon the history of Dock and Callowhill Streets, the study called for the erection of long buildings on the former dump with loading platforms on both sides of stall-like stores to be used for produce and seafood dealers. The layout provided plenty of open space for maneuvering trucks and room for future expansion. The study proposed such added services as a bank, restaurants and other conveniences for workers and customers. It also mentioned the need for sleeping accommodations and a truck repair terminal.

R. Stewart Rauch, Jr., president of the Food Distribution Center Corporation, and his staff played key roles in the design, planning, financing, and construction of the first three buildings. The structures were financed through a $1 million grant from the City of Philadelphia and a $2.8 million bond issue floated by the Center and subscribed to by three insurance companies and four savings banks.

The Greater Philadelphia Movement, buoyed by the possibilities, decided to broaden its plans to include food processors as well as wholesalers. They turned their ideas over to the Mayor and City Council so that the Redevelopment Authority could go into action.

By April, 1955, the City Planning Commission had certified the 388-acre trash dump and the blighted area around it for redevelopment. Meanwhile, the Greater Philadelphia Movement had started an estimation of costs for land acquisition, filling and grading, repair and building of streets, upgrading of water and sewer facilities, and street lighting.

These improvements were designed to attract $85 million worth of private investment into the area, bringing the total cost of the project up to $100 million.

On a Friday in June, 1959, the old Dock Street Markets closed forever and jubilant merchants opened up new stores in the Food Distribution Center the following Monday.

In place of the trash and hovels on the South Philly dump stands a modern industrial park, the first of its kind in the world, geared to provide food for millions of people.

In place of rats and garbage on winding Dock Street, Society Hill now glitters with three sleek high-rise apartments overlooking the city, enhancing its skyline. In addition, renewed older buildings in the area provide a pleasing mix with the newer structures. The program has brought people into the downtown area again. There is movement now in Society Hill, once deserted between sundown and the early morning hours.

The Center was finished nine years ahead of schedule—plans had called for its completion in 15 years. The Center’s first structure was the most modern banana ripening and packaging plant in the world. Today, between 5,000 to 6,000 trucks load and unload daily at the Center.

The City is already realizing more than $29,000 in real estate taxes per year. When the Center has reached full capacity, this revenue is expected to reach nearly $2 million per year. While the old Dock-Callowhill area lost tax assessments of around $7 million, total estimates in that area through 1969, as a result of the renewal program, amount to nearly $25 million. Thus, the City will be registering a net gain of about $20 million per year in revenue from the Center and Society Hill.

There may be some people who bemoan the loss of Dock Street with its picturesque aspects, but few will lament the disappearance of the dump. The new Center has created an estimated 12,000 new jobs and the City is confident that it will reap even greater profit in the years ahead.

The Center had made its impression upon other cities as well. Paris, after centuries of dependence upon the famous Les Halles Market, moved its wholesale area to an outlying section of the city where a facility, patterned after Philadelphia’s, has been erected. Preceding this decision, a steady stream of French architects, planners, government officials, builders and entrepreneurs, passed through the Philadelphia Center asking questions. Evidently, the answers they received were inspiring.

The Center can serve as a beacon of hope to other cities with similar problems. The former dump stands unique as the first industrial park in the world that has been dedicated solely to the processing and selling of food.
This volume is an attempt to set down in one place the major urban manpower problems, their future direction, and the myriad Federal educational and training programs designed to maximize urban manpower.

In this study, author August C. Bolino maintains that the problems of education, training, transportation and employment in the Nation's core cities are one interrelated problem—although Congress has often treated them separately.

The author was one of a small group of "pioneers" who gathered in the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training of the U.S. Department of Labor during 1962 to administer the newly passed Manpower Development and Training Act. In 1964, he became the Manpower Evaluator for Francis Keppel, then U.S. Commissioner of Education. Later, in 1967, he served as a "Technical Assistance Expert" for the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Having served in all three Federal anti-poverty agencies, he has seen many of the obstacles that stand in the way of resolving urban manpower problems.

In view of the Nixon Administration's recently announced proposal for reorganizing Federal manpower programs and HUD's Model Cities efforts in this area, his observations are particularly relevant: "The manpower waters have been muddied by an agglomeration of rules, regulations and requirements that keep local administrators from working solutions... failure to communicate administrative procedures and to alter these, when necessary, has meant that local administrators remained unaware of the range of possibilities and, worse, they were condemned to repeat mistakes. These local administrators need a single volume that discusses the many manpower laws, their effectiveness and their relationships."

This book, accordingly, has been designed as a comprehensive "primer" to identify and evaluate the complexities of our current manpower programs. It presents the problems in each program briefly, but even the manpower specialist can benefit from the author's synthesis from the voluminous materials in this field.

For the administrator and the non-manpower specialist, this volume will be valuable as a basic reference source, indicating the origins of present manpower programs, their present functions, and some speculation on their future orientations.

Such speculation, as Bolino well knows, is always dangerous for social scientists, especially when it is of the near-term variety. Nevertheless, in January, 1969, he made the following projections: the Office of Economic Opportunity would be broken up, more money and authority would go to the States, emphasis on the private sector would be continued or increased, and the manpower-poverty budget would continue to be based on rhetoric rather than reality.

While comments on other people's speculations are probably equally dangerous, the author's batting average appears to be holding up. This does not apply, however, to the action he predicted would be taken to obtain more funds for social programs. He guessed that the Administration would reduce overkill defense expenditures, the space effort, supersonic transport operation, and agricultural assistance based on a per-farm limit (a workable range could be from $15,000 to $50,000 per farm).

Bolino argues that revenues from these curtailed programs should be channeled into major efforts to provide desegregated, decent housing; adequate and equal education; and permanent jobs for everyone in healthy and safe cities. His conclusion:

We cannot profess great ideals and dreams and not make them realities. One America must be more than a dream. We need more than deliberate speed, now. The black man sees no change on his block; he still lives in a one-room or two-room flat. The white man believes that a major anti-poverty effort has been made and he wonders why the black man is agitating. The only real answer is to mobilize the financial resources to find solutions to these problems. As Professor Stagner* said, "If the white majority refuses to vote money for the furtherance of these kinds of programs, I think we are simply saying that the white majority is behaving in a suicidal fashion." We cannot be as pusillanimous in the future as we were in the past in attacking the social and economic conditions that this volume is all about.

Ross Stagner*
*Psychological Dynamics of Inner-City Problems, 1968.
Buddhist priests cast rose petals to the winds and chanted to the atonal plunkings of three-stringed samisens. Three hundred kimono clad Nisei women and children gestured gracefully in a dance commemorating their ancestral ties with Japan.

The event honored a gift to San Francisco from the people of Japan. Seventy businessmen and government officials came from Tokyo to present a 100-foot Pagoda of Peace, topped with a golden spire. The pagoda graces the new Japanese Cultural Center, located in the Western Addition renewal project area of the City.

The 5-acre Cultural Center gives San Francisco—the city of cable cars, Fisherman’s Wharf, Chinatown, and dramatic bridges—still another landmark. Covering three city blocks, it contains Japanese-style restaurants, a hotel, a theater, and a number of shops of every type.

Not to be confused with the Japanese Cultural and Trade Center is the nearby Nihonmachi (Japan Town), the development of which will follow the completion of the Japanese Cultural and Trade Center. Directly north of the Center, in a 4-block, 10-acre section of the second Western Addition renewal area, are houses and shops owned for the most part by Japanese-Americans.

The plan for the Nihonmachi area proposes informal landscaped plazas and walkways through new and restored homes, small Japanese shops, and service buildings. A mall will provide an inviting environment for shoppers.

While most of the commercial structures will be new, many of the homes will be rehabilitated to meet modern standards and their exteriors architecturally restored to be consistent with their historical origins and to preserve their intimate scale.

The Center gives the city’s big Japanese community a long-needed focal point. Rehabilitation of Nihonmachi by the Nihonmachi Community Redevelopment Corporation shows the importance of community participation. Both show what a little imagination and thought by a local agency and local citizens can do toward bringing about an exciting and dramatic re-use of a former slum area.
The President was right.

There are millions of Americans standing by, waiting for their chance to help solve the many problems facing our Nation today. These Americans may or may not be on someone's payroll. In any case, they volunteer their services on their own time.

A Detroit inner city resident, Elizabeth Hoxter, works on the night shift in a hospital and still has time to teach a daytime first aid course to neighborhood women.

Students from Valley State College, California, helped rehabilitate the home of Mrs. Jose Padillo, a Mexican-American widow with eight children. Thirty-five residents of North Ridge Hall cooperated with the fraternities Sigma Alpha Epsilon and Phi Delta Theta to win the support of local merchants to get the job done.

Three hundred businessmen in Seattle, Washington, provide a link between men in the local jail and the outside community. Their "Man to Man" program helps first offenders prepare for a job when they get out.

Many organizations are likewise helping to relieve urban or rural problems through voluntary action. One such group labels itself the "Matchmaker." This organization pinpoints needs and seeks volunteers to do the work. Another group concentrates on finding jobs for the hardcore unemployed. One company gives its employees time off once a week to tutor children living in housing projects.

Agencies like VISTA send out their own workers to help communities throughout the country. Other government agencies implement their programs by enlisting the outside support of volunteers.

President Nixon, HUD Secretary Romney, who serves as Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Voluntary Action, and Max Fisher, Special Consultant to the President on Voluntary Action, want to encourage all of these voluntary activities and many more.

The mission of the National Program for Voluntary Action is to determine what voluntary projects are now underway, to focus attention on areas for new voluntary action, to spread voluntary activity, and to formulate new plans and programs to meet the Nation's needs.

Both government agencies and private volunteer organizations have loaned staff to the Office of Voluntary Action, now housed in the HUD building.

ORGANIZATIONS PITCH RIGHT IN

Over the past few months, the Secretary, Mr. Fisher, and the Voluntary Action staff have met with representatives of over 300 organizations in order to incorporate their ideas into the overall plan. Preliminary meetings have included representatives from health and welfare, business, labor, agriculture, minorities, State and local governments, civic and professional groups.

They have recommended their various programs to the Voluntary Action Clearinghouse, which will readily disseminate information on successful programs appropriate to a community's specific problems. Various groups have asked the Office of Voluntary Action to help them enhance projects already underway. They may need recognition to spread their work, financial support, or assistance in training volunteers.

These meetings are only the first step toward stronger programs and promotion of "the voluntary way." Many have become convinced that to solve certain problems the voluntary way is the only way.

PEOPLE CAN DO WHAT GOVERNMENT CANNOT

As President Nixon said in announcing the program: "More than ever, America needs the enlistment of the energies and resources of its people—not as substitutes for government action, but as supplements to it. People can reach where government cannot; people can do what government cannot. Today, more than ever, America needs the hearts and hands of its people, joined in those common enterprises, small as well as large, that are the mark of caring and the cement of the community."

The National Program for Voluntary Action will serve as a means of encouraging those willing hands to tackle the pressing tasks of the day. Within the next month or so, the Office of Voluntary Action will once again meet with the hundreds of representatives it has already consulted in order to ask for their assistance in specific ways to solve our Nation's problems.
Key officials detonate dynamite to mark the official beginning of Civic Center construction. From left: Mayor George G. Seibels, Jr.; Governor Albert Brewer; Alex Lacy, Chairman, Birmingham-Jefferson Civic Center Authority; U. S. Senator John Sparkman; W. Cooper Green, President, County Commission; and Hugh Denman, Executive Director, Housing Authority for Birmingham District.

In Birmingham:
Brewer praised the City’s effort “to do some self-plastic surgery. Several years ago it seemed that an about-face occurred in Jefferson County,” the Governor said. “And nothing exemplifies this renewed spirit in Birmingham and Jefferson County as this Civic Center does.”

Senator Sparkman, also attending the luncheon, said that the new Civic Center would be an example and an inspiration to cities across the Nation to see “what they need and what they can do,” Sparkman played a major role in coordinating City financing with grants from the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Washington.

The Civic Center complex is being constructed in an urban renewal area at the northern boundary of Birmingham’s central business district. Approximately 57 acres of deteriorating and substandard structures will be cleared away to allow for business and commercial expansion.

**BOOM in Birmingham**

Five dynamite blasts signalled the beginning of a new chapter in the history of Birmingham, Alabama. The occasion was the July 18 groundbreaking ceremony for Birmingham’s $35 million Civic Center complex.

The huge complex is the result of close cooperation between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and dynamic officials and residents of Birmingham and Jefferson County.

Construction Begins

Participating in the celebration were five key people who made the Civic Center dream a reality—U.S. Senator John Sparkman, Birmingham Mayor George Seibels, Jefferson County Commission President W. Cooper Green, Governor Albert Brewer, and State Senator Hugh Morrow. Each detonated a stick of dynamite to mark the official beginning of construction.

At a special luncheon held earlier in the day, Governor Brewer praised the City’s effort “to do some self-plastic surgery. Several years ago it seemed that an about-face occurred in Jefferson County,” the Governor said. “And nothing exemplifies this renewed spirit in Birmingham and Jefferson County as this Civic Center does.”
Class-A Competition

To get the most timeless and functional design for the new structure, the Birmingham-Jefferson Civic Center Authority conducted the largest Class-A competition ever held under regulations of the American Institute of Architects. The contest was kicked off by announcement ceremonies in New York City. A panel of five internationally famous architectural experts was selected to judge 276 entries. The winning architect was George W. Qualls of the Philadelphia firm of Geddes, Brecher, Qualls, and Cunningham.

The Civic Center complex will house a coliseum, an exhibition hall, a concert hall, a theatre, numerous dining facilities, and a piazza. The coliseum will seat up to 13,000 people with 30,000 square feet of space on the main floor. Dining facilities range from a spacious restaurant to indoor and outdoor cafes overlooking a reflecting pool. A number of snack bars will also serve the coliseum and exhibition hall.

Boom for a Birthday

The Civic Center reflects what some people have termed a “building boom” in Birmingham, with the construction underway estimated at almost a half billion dollars. An example of this growth is that 2,500 new hotel rooms have been announced or are already under construction, many of them to be located in the Civic Center urban renewal area.

A portion of the Center will be completed and ready for use in 1971, coinciding with Birmingham’s plans for a gala year-long celebration marking the City’s 100th birthday.

Plan views of the Birmingham-Jefferson Civic Center (clockwise, beginning at lower left): 3,000 seat concert hall; 160,000 square-foot exhibition-convention hall building; 13,000-seat indoor coliseum; and 1,000-seat theatre—all centered around a large, terrace piazza and reflecting pool.

At a luncheon before the detonation ceremony, Senator John Sparkman addresses his remarks directly to Governor Albert Brewer and U.S. Congressman John Buchanan.
Hammers pound, tar smoke and plaster dust rise in the air, workers scramble over the roofs and interiors of run-down buildings. . .

This is typical of the activity of joint rehabilitation-rent supplement projects in Cincinnati, one of the busiest residential improvement communities in the Nation.

These combined programs of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development—plus a series of government innovations and wide community participation—will make good, inexpensive housing possible for 2,000 poor families who would otherwise be forced to continue living in dilapidated tenements.

"This is a godsend for people who need a nice place to live," says Mrs. Annie L. Crew, 50-year-old widow now in a completed project.

She and her three young children enjoy a clean three-bedroom apartment in a completely renovated series of ancient row houses that now look brand new. With rent supplement, she is able to occupy the spacious dwelling for $52 a month, including utilities, one-fourth of her monthly income earned as a housekeeper in a downtown department store.

Previously, she lived in what she says was a dirty, run-down place costing $65 a month plus utilities.

The flurry of rehabilitation activity in Cincinnati stems from a concerted effort by the local mortgage insuring office of HUD's Federal Housing Administration to make the program produce critically needed housing. The local FHA staff has:

STURDY STONE BUILDINGS, long unfit as dwellings, are being rehabilitated at a fast pace in Cincinnati's all-out effort to provide inner city homes for lower income families at rents they can afford when aided by rent supplements from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

HUD flurry in Cincinnati
is making good housing out of bad

By George Norris
Appeared before interested neighborhood and church groups to describe the problem and has shown color slides of how old, basically sound structures can be transformed into clean, safe dwellings.

Established a special processing unit of three experts who devote full time to handling applications for this program—from site inspections through permanent commitments to insure mortgages.

Drastically streamlined its procedures so that it is now possible, within two months, for FHA to consider verbal applications for feasibility approvals, make site inspections, arrange allocations of HUD rent supplement funds, and process final applications in preparation for construction.

John W. Kirkwood, director of the Cincinnati FHA insuring office, said an important element in the program has been the delegation of decision making to the processing team and the flexibility of operation.

"As soon as an inquiry is received about the possibility of planning a project," Mr. Kirkwood said, "our architect goes to the site to determine if the project will be physically and financially feasible. If he decides it is, he informs the applicant at once and our office supports him on the determination.

"The sponsor can then proceed immediately with preparation of drawings and other papers. Eliminated in this process has been the conditional commitment step which has consumed considerable time in the past."

Mr. Kirkwood said that a large part of the program's success is due to the close communication of the city government, FHA staff, and community groups such as the 63-year-old Better Housing League of Greater Cincinnati and Action Housing, a group sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce and the Mayor.

The Housing League, like FHA, has been active in advising community bodies on how to plan for establishing nonprofit housing sponsor organizations and how to apply for FHA participation in a project. Action Housing has done similar work and has lent "seed money" for start-up expenses.

George Norris, HUD Office of Public Affairs (right) talks with Mrs. Anna Crutchfield, president of the Tenant Council. Mr. Raven, FHA Multifamily Rehabilitation coordinator and team chief looks on from the background. Mrs. Crutchfield said that everybody was very satisfied with their homes.

John Robinson (left) one of seven trainers at the Mount Auburn project, confers with an Urban Conservation Program Supervisor, William Bonansinga. The training program of the Mount Auburn project is helping young construction workers learn the trade. Mr. Bonansinga seeks to place workers on other jobs after they complete current assignments.
The insuring director reports that the dual program of rehabilitation combined with rent supplements moved slowly at first but now has the momentum of experience and organization. He said a total of 38 projects with 1,199 units dotted across the city are now in various stages of processing—under preliminary study, awaiting insurance commitments, or under construction.

To be selected for improvement, buildings must have at least sound foundations and exterior walls. Frequently it is necessary to clear the entire interior except for sub-floorings.

In most cases, new interior walls and roofs are needed. All units will have new, completely modern bathrooms and kitchens.

About half of the projects are being rehabilitated by limited dividend sponsors who do the housing improvement work for a limited return—6 percent—on their investments. A partnership of three businessmen in the construction field recently completed the 18-unit project in which Mrs. Crew lives.

Mrs. Anna Crutchfield, another occupant who is president of the project's Tenant Council, said that everyone there was highly satisfied with his home. The Tenant Council holds semi-monthly meetings to consider ways to maintain the project in the best way possible.

Mrs. Retta Navarro, Council secretary, said "it is very nice to live in a fresh home"—and certainly much better than her former dwelling which was condemned.

Most of the other projects are sponsored by nonprofit organizations formed especially for housing improvement. One of them is a 16-unit project sponsored by the Mount Auburn Good Housing Corporation, a nonprofit neighborhood group.

The project is just two blocks from the birthplace home of our 27th President William Howard Taft. That once-fine structure, symbolic of the area's conditions, has deteriorated but will soon be restored as a national historic site.
Physically, the Mount Auburn project is typical of the deterioration undergone by the buildings being rehabilitated, and has the common defects—worn out roof, trim, surface flooring and interior walls. But it also has the common assets such as sound masonry walls 18 to 24 inches thick and good subflooring.

Housing officials point out that rehabilitation, in place of new construction, keeps total costs down and thus makes for lower rents.

William B. Jolley, deputy director of the Cincinnati FHA insuring office, reports that the average unit cost in rehabilitation projects is $11,000 as compared to an estimated $20,000 for a newly constructed unit.

And in the case of nonprofit projects, the over-all project cost on which the average unit cost is based includes acquisition of original structure and land, architect, legal and administrative fees, and construction expenses. These expenditures are made from the mortgage loan money, and no downpayment is required.

Profit-motivated sponsors must pay fees from their own funds and make a 10 percent downpayment.

"We have high hopes that the home improvement underway here will continue and spread," Mr. Jolley said. "Our experience indicates that community upgrading of potentially good housing can produce extremely beneficial results for the whole area."

In addition the Mount Auburn project is unusual and important as a pioneer effort in bringing unemployed youth into the construction field.

Pre-apprentices are performing the actual rehabilitation and construction work under direction of seasoned union members. Previously unemployed young men, including school dropouts eager to learn a trade, are clearing the housing of worthless plaster and other materials, repairing roofs, building new staircases, and installing electrical wiring and plumbing. There are 30 trainees and seven trainers.

Upon completion of six months pre-apprenticeship, these beginning craftsmen will be eligible to take union exams to qualify as full-fledged working apprentices.

Classroom instruction complementing the on-site training prepares them to receive the equivalent of a high school education and to take written union exams.

The Urban Conservation Project, general contractor of the Mount Auburn project, is a nonprofit organization sponsored by a municipal youth commission and funded by the U.S. Department of Labor.

The training program has a two-fold aim of helping inexperienced young men receive salaries while acquiring productive skills and raising the level of workers available for future housing construction.

Top: Mrs. Annie L. Crew, her three children, and two grandchildren. A 50-year old widow, she pays only $52, a month, one-fourth of her income, for a three-bedroom apartment in a completely renovated row house.

Bottom: These two youngsters live in a Cincinnati Rehabilitation neighborhood. The older boy is a resident of a rent supplement apartment at Hillmount and the younger boy lives nearby.
...How will we house the next hundred million Americans? New architectural forms, construction techniques, and financing strategies must be aggressively pioneered if we are to provide the needed dwellings.

President Richard Nixon
Message to Congress on Population Growth
July 21, 1969

...Merely establishing goals based on need is not enough. Unless we organize to meet the need, the continued restatement of goals can become just another form of over-promising, which can lead to disillusionment and bitterness.

George Romney, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development
Addressing Commonwealth Club of California
May 16, 1969

"...The housing industry is imprisoned by obsolete building and zoning codes and obsolete building attitudes and concepts... They have nothing to do with modern technology. If I were privileged to lead a building trade union, I'd be out front trying to upgrade construction techniques..."

Walter Reuther, President United Auto Workers
The Pittsburgh Press
May 28, 1969

"...Sixty percent of the American people say they feel a sense of urgency about the plight of the cities and favor decisive action to solve racial and housing problems in the urban centers. Most think the Federal Government should continue or increase expenditures on behalf of the cities. However, if asked to pay higher taxes to see the lot of the cities improved, the public is unwilling, by 69 to 25 percent, to put more of its own money behind its stated convictions..."

Louis Harris
The Harris Survey
June 1969

"...Increasing concentrations of disadvantaged families in center cities are making an almost intolerable demand on the financial resources of cities for provision of new schools, more teachers, more and better housing, expanded health services and facilities, more job opportunities.

"...The housing supply of central cities is becoming increasingly inadequate both in quantity and quality."

Annual Meeting
United States Conference of Mayors
Pittsburgh
June 18, 1969

"...The one constant in our cities is change. Our job in HUD is to make sure that our programs can be adapted in a timely and responsive manner to the changing needs and conditions at the local level."

Lawrence M. Cox, Assistant Secretary for Renewal and Housing Assistance, HUD
June 15, 1969

"With the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act a clear mandate is given for a full turnaround that makes it a primary mission of FHA in the late '60's and '70's to help low and moderate-income families get adequate private housing, whether in the inner city or elsewhere... It provides an alternative of hope to those prospective home buyers who previously turned in desperation to the speculators on any terms in order to get a house.

William B. Ross, Deputy Undersecretary for Policy Analysis and Program Evaluation, HUD
June 9, 1969

"...In the face of overall general improvement, conditions are growing worse in the poorest slums."

"...The recent changes in population growth and racial composition of cities could have serious implications, if they continue in the future. If the accelerated movement of whites out of the cities continues and is accompanied by a drop in the base of immigration of blacks, the cities will experience a slight decline in population and there will be further erosion of the tax base in the face of an ever increasing demand for services."

Herman P. Miller, Chief, Population Division
U. S. Bureau of the Census
Impact of Population Trends quoted from The Philadelphia Inquirer
June 15, 1969
Conceiving successful housing for low-income families presents designers with a complex professional challenge.

When architects design for upper-income families, they can plan easily for both individuality and top value. However, residential design for low-income families is often inhibited by the need to stress high durability standards and prudent initial cost. And yet designs that allow for character and space are more critically needed for low-income families because of their limited outlets for choice and individuality in other areas.

When high durability construction is stressed on the assumption of harder use by low-income families, other aspects of design such as space and equipment are sometimes compromised. Development of efficient relationships between space and equipment can solve the problem, but in many ways space reduction and construction durability are incompatible goals. There is bound to be friction between the user and his environment, if that environment unduly restrains his freedom.

**SHOULD LIFT PEOPLE'S LIVES**

HUD Secretary Romney has pointed out HUD’s overall design objective: “The design and planning activities set forth under the Department’s programs must result in environments which have an uplifting effect upon people’s lives.”

Accordingly, the environment should be physically scaled so that it provides an ordered variety that gives each family flexibility to respond to all of its members’ needs for an evolving productive life.

Character, space, equipment, durability, and economics are major design factors that are common to a living unit, a site, a neighborhood, a community, and even larger areas. Moreover, it is commonly accepted that industrialized methods should be used in housing production and that efficient communication, circulation and transportation must be fostered in overall design. However, there is no simple, single housing design formula that will meet the social needs of all people in all communities.
NEW HUD STANDARDS UNDER REVIEW

To provide the needed planning flexibility, HUD is developing a new set of criteria for housing design and construction under the direction of a special team of HUD design professionals from the Office of the Secretary, Federal Housing Administration, and Housing Assistance Administration.

This unified, updated set of standards will provide an acceptable minimum level for design and construction quality, based to the greatest practical extent on performance criteria, with appropriate flexibility to meet varying user needs and local conditions. Architects, planners, landscape architects and engineers will be given considerable professional latitude to solve particular development problems. They will be encouraged to develop imaginative designs and construction methods which give promise of increased quality, reduced costs, or other advantages.

A draft is now undergoing review by Departmental officials at central, regional and insure office levels as well as by external groups such as associations of builders and public officials, professional planning and designing societies, and industry councils. Upon issuance, the new HUD standards will supersede numerous present documents including HUD Guides, FHA Minimum Property Standards, HAA Criteria and Bulletins for low-rent public housing.

It is anticipated that the new Standards will be revised from time to time in order to increase their effectiveness in helping to realize our national housing goals. These revisions will incorporate research findings, including those of Operation BREAKTHROUGH, as well as implementation feedback.

OPTIMUM DESIGN IS RECOGNIZED

The Standards are not intended to serve as a building code. In addition to making available


essential guide materials for reference, they are intended to assure only the basic minimum quality for housing assisted under Federal programs. Optimum design quality in HUD-assisted work has been recognized for some years through the Design Awards Program, recently commended by the Congress.

The biennial Design Awards Program stimulates good design at project, neighborhood, and community levels, by giving public recognition to those HUD-assisted activities in which three-dimensional form of superior quality appropriately combines and expresses visual, social, and economic values.

The 1970 Program, to be announced in the near future, will follow generally established procedure for design awards competitions. A jury of distinguished design professionals will judge the hundreds of entries that are expected. HUD Design Awards are usually presented at prestigious national professional conferences.

An Awards brochure is printed and widely distributed to design professionals, associations of builders, local housing and redevelopment officials, principal HUD staff, and other concerned groups. In addition, the Design Awards traveling exhibit of the winning entries is generally in great demand at conferences and universities across the country.

**DESIGN AWARDS PROVE BENEFICIAL**

The tangible benefits of the Design Awards program are considerable. Outstanding design professionals as well as design-oriented local agencies and developers are encouraged to participate in HUD-assisted efforts. The program stimulates HUD staff members and broadens Departmental liaison with professional societies in the fields of architecture, planning, landscape architecture, and engineering.

The program also provides a significant amount of organized feedback information which can be helpful in Department-wide efforts. For example, the staff working on the new Housing Design and Construction Standards made an in-depth analysis of the numerous housing entries in the 1968 Awards program.

Public Housing Program for the elderly in Indianapolis provides each unit with morning or afternoon sunlight. Architect Evans Woollen and Associates, Engineers Fink, Roberts and Petrie, Kolbjorn Saether, J. M. Rotz Engineering Company.
The Standards and Awards are two major Departmental efforts to improve the design and construction quality of assisted housing. Achievement of this challenging goal requires, however, the active commitment of all involved in the development process—designers, builders, producers, developers, financiers, local officials, HUD staff. This participation is essential for developing individual character and dignity in housing design and for applying Federal aid most effectively toward environmental improvement.

In recent years the Congressional goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family has been reaffirmed and further defined. For example, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 speaks of the need to "...enhance neighborhoods by applying a high standard of design."

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 calls for improved architectural design, for "...developing housing which will be of such quality as to reflect its important relationship to the architectural standards of the neighborhood and community in which it is situated."

THE PRESIDENT STRESSES GOOD DESIGN

In addressing HUD officials soon after his inauguration, President Nixon revealed his special concern for good design:

"We need, of course, to rebuild America's cities. We are going to have to put billions of dollars into this rebuilding program in the years ahead, looking down to the end of the century.

"The question is not whether we do it and not how many units we are going to build. This will be done. But the question is, can we do it and still maintain some character? Can we still maintain, for the individuals who live in this housing, a sense of identity, a sense of dignity...?"

Our goal then is housing design of quality and character that can respond to this human need for a sense of identity and dignity.

Multipurpose playground at New York City's P.S. 166 relates to adjacent school and community through carefully designed facilities including an amphitheatre and game tables. Architect Mel Smith, Landscape Architect M. Paul Friedberg and Associates, Artists Sam Weiner and Mon Levenson.

Two sculptured fountains, screens, and sensitive landscaping are used in the design of this Public Housing development at Joseph J. Kelly Gardens, Buffalo, New York. Architect Robert Traynham Coles, Sculptor Marilyn Stone, Landscape Architect Grewey and Ward, Inc., Engineers Filipek and Beesing, Sherry and Lysiak.
The slump in housing starts continues during the first 7 months of 1969—including 14,000 leased units—compared to 36,000 units during the similar period last year. The 14,000 leased units account for nearly 30 percent of the leased housing program since activity began in the program in 1966.

More than 7,500 families moved into their own homes, for the first time, under HUD’s interest supplement program for homeownership.

Nearly 13,000 families now receive rent supplements and another 25,000 rent supplement units are under construction.

The program to provide rental housing insured at below market interest rates continues its growth in 1969. The more than 23,000 units insured during the first seven months of 1969 accounted for nearly 15 percent of the program since the start of activity in 1961.

### Accomplishments Under Selected HUD Programs for 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidized Housing for Low and Moderate Income Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Low Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units under management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937 2,260 8,571 21,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 2,473 4,895 9,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965 85 574 2,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 2,430 2,865 13,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately Owned Rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below market interest rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 4,353 3,495 23,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent supplements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965 1,763 1,263 9,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest supplements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 323 886 1,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 1,330 1,054 6,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mortgage Insurance in Private Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units insured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 42,876 39,854 266,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units insured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 3,354 3,662 20,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Facilities (Dollars in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 $10 $4 $27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959 778 937 6,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 118 0 118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical and Social Environment (Dollars in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 $138 $194 $686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967 0 $160 $233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 24 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954 0 $13 $40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau and Joint Report, Census—HUD
Building a Banner

The unfinished cement THING jutting up in front of the HUD central office building is properly called a banner. Architects Marcel Breuer and Associates of New York and Nolen-Swinburne and Associates of Philadelphia designed the banner as part of the original plans for HUD's dog biscuit-shaped building.

When completed, the banner will rise as high as the sixth or seventh story—approximately 75 feet in the air. Made of reinforced architectural concrete poured in place, it will measure 20 feet across the beam, or face, four feet deep and weigh nearly 450 tons.

HUD personnel in Washington have been able to watch the six tiers climb upward a tier at a time. As soon as the uppermost tier dries, another is poured on top.

The banner rests on a concrete base set at right angles to the rest of the banner. The base rests on solid ground, rises through both levels of the underground garage, is visible for eight feet, and a core continues upward unseen 11 feet into the first tier of the banner.

Stainless steel, satin-finished letters 18-inches high will spell out "Department of Housing and Urban Development." The front of the banner will be illuminated by a floodlight concealed in the base. Additional spotlights will illuminate the facade of the building.