

THE NEAR WEST SIDE CONSERVATION SURVEY

Site Occupant Survey of Living Units Planned for Clearance

Conducted for the
COMMUNITY CONSERVATION BOARD
City of Chicago

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

Report No. 63-B

July, 1957

Study Administration

for:

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

Clyde W. Hart, Director
Herbert Goldstein, Business Manager

for:

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION BOARD OF CHICAGO

Richard Smykl, Commissioner
Frank Kirk, Community Planner

for:

CHICAGO COMMUNITY INVENTORY
Philip M. Hauser, Director

Study Director and Technical Staff

Donald J. Bogue--Study Director

Selma F. Monsky)
Marlene Simon)--Field Interviewing

Jane Schusky)
Alma Ficks) -- Coding

Frederic J. Meier--Tabulation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
PART A. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF LIVING UNITS IN CLEARANCE AREAS.	3
Items H-1 through H-12	4-7
PART B. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF OCCUPANTS OF LIVING UNITS IN CLEARANCE AREAS	20
Items P-1 through P-21	20-26
PART C. PROBLEMS OF RELOCATION	48
Items R-1 through R-7	48-50
APPENDIX A.	
I. SAMPLING PROCEDURE	59
II. SITE OCCUPANT SCHEDULE	62
III. INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1 and 1-A	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STRUCTURES AND LIVING UNITS TENTATIVELY PLANNED FOR CLEARANCE, NEAR WEST SIDE AREA	8-19
	Item	
	H- 1: Present use of structures	8
	H- 2: Physical condition of structures	9
	H- 3: Number of rooms in living units	10
	H- 4: Running water in living units	11
	H- 5: Flush toilet in living units	12
	H- 6: Bathtub or shower in living units	13
	H- 7: Summary of plumbing facilities in living units	14
	H- 8: Living rooms redecorated in past two years?	15
	H- 9: Tenure and occupancy of living units	16
	H-10: Rent per month of renter-occupied living units	17
	H-11: Median rent by size of unit	18
	H-12: Persons per room--Occupied living units	19
2 and 2-A	THE CHARACTERISTICS OF OCCUPANTS OF LIVING UNITS IN CLEARANCE AREAS	27-47
	P- 1: Total population, 1957	27
	P- 2: Type of occupancy--of occupied living units	28
	P- 3: Race and Nationality	29
	P- 4: Sex and marital status of head	30
	P- 5: Relationship of occupant to owner	31
	P- 6: Number of persons in living unit	32
	P- 7: Number of children of preschool age (0-5 years) in living unit	33
	P- 8: Number of children of school age (6-18 years) in living unit	34
	P- 9: Number of persons 65 years of age or older in living unit	35
	P-10: Number of persons in living unit attending school	36
	P-11: Number of persons in the primary family	37
	P-12: Work-school status of head	38
	P-13: Number of employed persons in the primary family	39
	P-14: Major occupation of principal breadwinner	40
	P-15: Major industry group of principal breadwinner	41
	P-16: Place of work	42
	P-17: Gross family income	43
	P-18: Length of residence in Chicago	44
	P-19: Length of residence in Near West Side	45
	P-20: Length of residence in present location	46
	P-21: Median rent by income	47
3 and 3-A:	PROBLEMS OF RELOCATION IN CLEARANCE AREA	51-58
	R- 1: Choice of relocation site	51
	R- 2: Reasons for choice of relocation site	52
	R- 3: Difficulties anticipated if relocated	53
	R- 4: Possible benefits if relocated	54
	R- 5: Willingness to live in public housing	56
	R- 6: Preferred location of public housing	57
	R- 7: Preferred housing project	58

NEAR WEST SIDE CONSERVATION SURVEY

SITE OCCUPANT SURVEY OF CLEARANCE LIVING UNITS

I. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the results of a survey of the living units and their occupants in structures tentatively suggested for demolition in the Near West Side Urban Renewal Project. After studying the results of a structure survey that obtained information about the physical condition of buildings in the area (Part A of this report), and after taking into account the needs of the community in terms of improved public and institutional facilities, the Community Conservation Board planning staff drew up a tentative plan for renewal of the area. These plans call for the razing of certain buildings in addition to the rehabilitation of others. In order to learn the fuller implications of this tentative plan, and to obtain information needed to carry out the relocation of the occupants of sites to be cleared, a survey of residents of the planned clearance areas was made.

The tentative renewal plan called for the razing of structures (both residential and nonresidential) for four reasons:

(a) Slum Clearance. Some structures in the community have reached a stage of physical deterioration where it is no longer economically feasible to rehabilitate them. These structures are the slums that have already formed in the area. The renewal plan specifies that they be removed as a part of the project. This category also includes some structures that are not blighted, but which are located immediately adjacent to blighted buildings and which are included in the category because they must be cleared to create a parcel sufficiently large for residential reuse.

(b) Deleterious Clearance. These are residential structures that are located in sections of the neighborhoods that are planned for nonresidential use, or nonresidential structures (light industry, warehouses, etc.) that are located in sections of the neighborhood which, according to the plan, should be all-residential. The renewal plan for this clearance is based on the principle that such unlike land uses as homes or apartment buildings and factories or warehouses have deleterious effects on each other by virtue of different needs and functions. It is feared that improvements and rehabilitation efforts might well be wasted or short-lived if these blighting factors are not corrected.

(c) Environmental Clearance. The structure survey provided evidence that there were certain environmental situations in the community that needed correction, independently of the condition of the structures involved. These were chiefly residential buildings facing heavily travelled streets, buildings on lots overcrowded by structures, and residential structures facing on alleys or without direct access to the street. Where other remedies, such as reducing traffic on the abutting streets, were not possible within the framework of the plan, the need for clearance of some of the structures was apparent. They are chiefly the structures facing those streets which the plan indicates will be the main traffic arteries.

(d) Community Facilities Clearance. The tentative renewal plan calls for improving and expanding the community facilities. It is deemed that the existing street, school, park, and other public, institutional facilities are inadequate to serve the community at the level desired. There is an extremely serious traffic problem, in which residential streets are being used as thoroughfares by trucks and automobiles trying to escape the congestion of the main traffic arteries. The plan calls for closing certain streets and a widening of Racine Avenue in order to accommodate this traffic from the residential streets.

The number of structures and the number of living units contained in each of the four clearance categories and in each of the community facility subclasses is as follows:

Reason for clearance	Number*		Per cent	
	Structures	Living units	Structures	Living units
Total	<u>630</u>	<u>1,908</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Slum clearance	183	543	29.0	28.1
Deleterious clearance	127	307	20.2	15.9
Environmental clearance	71	263	11.3	14.1
Community facilities clearance	<u>249</u>	<u>795</u>	<u>39.5</u>	<u>41.9</u>
Parks and public schools	102	327	16.2	17.7
Racine street widening	88	279	14.0	15.0
Shopping and institutional	59	189	9.4	9.2

*Actual count, derived from the structure survey.

Slums and deleterious structures may fall within areas contemplated for environmental or community facilities clearance. In all tabulations, however, these slum and deleterious properties are excluded from totals for either community facility or environmental areas and appear only in slum clearance and deleterious clearance category totals, respectively.

The renewal plan anticipates the clearance of 630 structures, containing 1,908 living units, and involving an estimated 6,350 persons. Of this amount, 60 per cent of the structures, 58 per cent of the living units, and 3,800 persons are earmarked for clearance or relocation to remove slums, or deleterious mixtures of land use, and to improve the environment to desired levels. The remainder is scheduled to be cleared in order to provide the parks and public schools, the shopping and institutional facilities, and the improvement of the traffic situation needed.

The Federal urban renewal program requires the City of Chicago to assume responsibility for relocating the families that occupy the structures to be razed. This relocation should cause as little inconvenience and hardship to the relocated families as possible. In order to plan a relocation program that would

satisfy the requirements of the law and to meet the needs of the relocated families, the Community Conservation Board authorized this "Site Occupant Survey" of living units in buildings tentatively considered for demolition. It was also expected that this survey would provide detailed information about the living units and occupants of each of the clearance programs, in order that, if the plans had to be changed or curtailed for any reason, a more intelligent decision could be made concerning "which program could be changed by how much at what cost."

Whereas the structure survey (Part A) was conducted as a 100 per cent inspection of every structure, the site occupant survey was conducted as a sample survey. A sample of 366 living units was drawn from the 1,908 living units planned for clearance. The sampling fraction was changed for each of the types of clearance in such a way that moderately reliable statistics would be obtained for each type of clearance as well as for the entire clearance program as a whole. The average frequency of sampling was about one in five. This is a sufficiently large sample to provide very adequate information about the clearance program as a whole, generally trustworthy information about each of the four major parts of the program, and rough indications about each of the three community facilities programs. Appendix A contains a statement of the procedure followed for drawing the sample and a copy of the forms and instructions used in interviewing the occupants of living units that fell in the sample.

The following sections present the findings of this survey. The analysis is divided into three parts, as follows:

- Part A. Characteristics of the Living Units
- Part B. Characteristics of the Occupants
- Part C. Problems of Relocation

Each of these sections deals with several topics. Each topic is discussed briefly; this discussion is intended to serve as a quick report of the principal findings, and also to introduce the reader to the statistical tables (which follow the textual material) from which he can learn additional details. The statistics for each section have been prepared in such a way that they represent the best estimate of what would be found in each part of the clearance area if a 100 per cent survey were to be taken. It should be kept in mind, however, that the items are subject to sampling variation, and hence are only approximations of a true count.

PART A. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF LIVING UNITS IN CLEARANCE AREAS

Tables 1 (numerical distribution) and 1-A (summary information) following these notes, report selected characteristics of the structures and of living units in the structures suggested for clearance in the Near West Side area. The structure survey did not involve an inspection of individual living units in the buildings, but confined itself to the exterior, basement, halls, and public spaces. Therefore, several items of information were collected about the living unit itself in the site occupant survey in order to learn more about the living conditions in the buildings planned for clearance. Statistics concerning living units are reported for 12 items in Table 1. Each item is discussed below.

ITEM H-1. Present Use of Structures. This information was abstracted from the 100 per cent structure survey, and is presented here to permit the reader to know how the buildings planned for clearance are now being used. Of the 630 clearance structures, 390 (61.9 per cent) are completely residential, while an additional 141 (22.4 per cent) are mixed residential and commercial. There are 45 all-commercial and 33 all-industrial structures planned for clearance. In four structures residence is mixed with industry, and in 17 others the present use is institutional, unknown (vacant buildings), or other.

The clearance of structures in which residence is mixed with commerce or industry is primarily a part of the environmental clearance and the deleterious clearance programs, while slum clearance primarily affects residential structures. By coincidence, the clearance for parks and playgrounds and for the Racine street widening would also remove a considerable number of structures in which commerce and residence are mixed. The planned clearance for shopping and institutional facilities is scheduled for an area that is now almost entirely residential.

ITEM H-2. Physical Condition of Structures. The structure survey rated each building according to a five-fold classification: "Blighted," "Near Blighted," "Major Rehabilitation," "Minor Rehabilitation," and "Non-problem." This rating was tabulated for each of the buildings in the clearance program and is reported as Item H-2 in Table 1. The slum clearance program removes all of the "blighted" structures in the entire Near West Side Area. It is a selective clearance program aimed at razing such buildings.

The structures in the deleterious clearance program are, by and large, in good physical condition--70 per cent are in the "minor rehabilitation" category. As indicated earlier, their removal is desired to unscramble mixed land use rather than because of physical deterioration. In about 65 per cent of the cases, the environmental clearance program will remove buildings that are in poor physical condition--either near blighted or in need of major rehabilitation. The clearance for community facilities will remove buildings that, in about 70 per cent of the instances, require only minor rehabilitation; in the remainder of cases the buildings are either in need of major rehabilitation or are near blighted. The statistics for this item are taken from the structure survey, and hence are a 100 per cent count and represent rather exactly the physical condition of the structures planned for clearance.

ITEM H-3. Number of Rooms in Living Units. The average living unit in the structures to be razed contains four rooms. However, this is only an average. Thirty-six per cent of the living units had fewer than four rooms, and 36 per cent had more. There are comparatively few extremely small and even fewer extremely large living units, however. Only about six per cent of the living units had one room--an estimated 107 units, while there are only about 45 living units with seven rooms or more.

The slum clearance structures contain living units of all sizes, but the greatest emphasis is upon the four and five room units. The deleterious clearance group contains an unusually high proportion of single-room units and a shortage of units with five rooms or more. In the community facilities group there are fewer single-room units and more five-room units than in the other groups. This emphasis upon larger units is most notable among the units to be cleared for parks and public schools and for shopping and institutional clearance, although the excess is not large. The Racine street widening, on the other

hand, will tend to remove a concentration of three-room living units.¹

ITEM H-4. Running Water in Living Units. None of the living units were without water available somewhere in the building. In 84 per cent of the cases hot and cold running water were both available in the unit for the exclusive use of the occupants. In the remaining 16 per cent of cases there was either (a) cold water available in the unit and hot water available elsewhere--71 units, (b) cold water available in the unit with no hot water available--103 units, or (c) no water in the unit but hot and cold water available elsewhere in the building--128 units. At least some of this latter group represent single rooms intended only for sleeping rather than for general living quarters.

The slum clearance buildings have poorer facilities in this respect than any other group. In 24 per cent of these living units the tenants must either heat their own water on a stove or else go outside the unit to obtain it. The situation in the environmental clearance and the deleterious clearance areas is not a great deal better (20 per cent and 18 per cent, respectively, have inadequate running water facilities). In the areas to be cleared for community facilities, 92 per cent of the units have hot and cold water in the unit.

ITEM H-5. Flush Toilet. All of the living units have a flush toilet available somewhere in the building, but in 17 per cent of the cases it is shared with the occupants of other living units. The shared-toilet arrangement was much more common in the deleterious clearance units than elsewhere in the clearance area. This is due in part to the larger proportion of single-room units in these structures (see Section H-3). In the community facilities clearance areas there were less shared-toilet arrangements than elsewhere in the clearance areas.

ITEM H-6. Bathtub or Shower in Living Units. In six per cent of the living units (105 units) there were no facilities for bathing anywhere in the building, and in an additional 17 per cent (317 units) the bath or shower was shared with other residents. Lack of bathing facilities was most common in the slum clearance units, and shared bathing facilities were most common in the deleterious clearance areas. Lack of bathing facilities and sharing of bathing facilities was least common among the community facilities clearance units, although the differences between these units and the other clearance units were not great.

ITEM H-7. Summary of Plumbing Facilities in Living Units. By combining the information for running water, flush toilet, and bathtub or shower it is possible to make an overall classification of plumbing facilities, as follows:

- a. All facilities present, occupant has exclusive use
- b. All facilities present in structure, occupant shares one or more
- c. One or more facilities not available in the structure

Item H-7 of Table 1 presents such a summary for the various clearance groups. A little more than three-fourths of the units (75.7 per cent) have all plumbing facilities present and the occupant has exclusive use. In 18 per cent of the cases there is sharing, and in six per cent there is lack of at least one facility. (In most cases this is either hot water or a bath or shower.) Lack of facilities is most common in the slum clearance, the environmental clearance, and the Racine street widening units. Shared facilities are most common in the deleterious clearance units which, as has already been pointed out, has a concentration of single-room units.

¹Among the living units for which the interviewers were unable to obtain information, it is known that there was a disproportionately greater number of single-room units. The statistics therefore have a small bias in the direction of underreporting the number of single-room units. It is entirely possible that as much as seven or eight per cent of the living units are single-room. If true, this means that the percentages in Table 1 for units with two rooms or more are slightly too large.

ITEM H-8. Interior Decoration of Living Units. As a test of the degree to which the buildings are being maintained, a question was asked, "Have the walls of your living room been painted or papered within the past two years? If so, at whose expense--yours or the landlord's?" Almost one-fourth (23.4 per cent) of the living units had not been redecorated within the past two years. An additional one-fourth (26.4 per cent) had been decorated, but at the expense of the tenant. The remaining one-half had been decorated by the owner. One-fifth of the units decorated by owners were owner-occupied. Of all renter-occupied living units, only 44 per cent had been painted or papered within the last two years at the landlord's expense, and of all renter-occupied units that had been redecorated, 40 per cent of the redecoration was done at the tenant's expense. Although this information cannot be interpreted as a measure of absolute neglect of maintenance, it is indicative. In order to be maintained, living units must be redecorated every other year, or every third year, at the very least. This means that under ideal conditions, 100 per cent of the units would have been redecorated within the past two years. If redecoration were occurring every third year, then 67 per cent should have been redecorated in the past two years.

Lack of redecoration was most prevalent among the slum clearance units. Here, only slightly more than one-third of the units had been painted or papered in the past two years at the owner's expense--the tenants did considerably more interior redecorating than the landlords. This implies that (a) some landlords apparently slacken their maintenance of living units as the building deteriorates, and (b) the residents of slum buildings are as interested in maintaining their living quarters as other citizens, for the proportion of results of slum clearance units who had redecorated their units at their own expense was above the average proportion for all clearance units.

Among the deleterious clearance and the environmental clearance units the situation was somewhat brighter, but not a great deal; in no case did the proportion of units decorated at the owner's expense reach 60 per cent. Even in the community facilities clearance group, a lack of interior maintenance was evident. On an average, only 87 per cent of these units had been redecorated, and 30 per cent of this had been done by the tenants at their own expense. The proposed clearance for shopping and institutional facilities group provides an interesting and unusual situation. One-fourth of the units had not been decorated at all, but tenant-activity to provide their own maintenance was much lower than elsewhere.

ITEM H-9. Tenure and Occupancy of Living Units. By far the majority of the living units are tenant-occupied (83 per cent). Owner-occupied units are 12 per cent of all units. Only a negligible number are occupied rent-free (this is indicative of the marked lack of "building engineers" or maintenance men in the larger apartment buildings, who usually occupy rent-free). About five per cent of the units were vacant and for rent and an additional one per cent were vacant and not for rent or with no information about availability for rent. Owner-occupancy is somewhat less frequent among the slum clearance, deleterious clearance, and environmental clearance groups than among the community facilities clearance groups. The vacancy rate is extraordinarily high among the deleterious clearance group.

ITEM H-10. Rent Per Month. Rent was computed for these units as follows: For unfurnished units, the total rent reported minus utility costs (if any) was used. For furnished units, 15 per cent of the total rent reported was deducted as compensation for the furnishings in addition to deductions for utility costs.

The average living unit in the area rents for fifty to sixty dollars per month. However, some units rent for as low as \$30 or less (seven per cent) and some rental units rent for \$90 or more (seven per cent). The great majority are clustered in the range from forty to seventy dollars. Compared with city-wide rent levels, this is very economical rent. But it must be kept in mind that these rents are for structures that are considered substandard or undesirable in a high proportion of cases. It is an interesting fact that rents are no lower in the slum clearance group than in the other clearance groups. In fact the median rent for these most deteriorated buildings is slightly above the median rental for all of the clearance buildings. The highest rentals are found not in the community facilities clearance areas (where the structures are least deteriorated), but in the environmental clearance area, which (as is shown below) is an area inhabited by Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Negro families.

ITEM H-11. Median Rent by Size of Unit. Rent comparisons are sometimes made by comparing living units of the same size or on a per-room basis rather than on a per-living unit basis in order to control differences in the size of the living quarters. Statistics for the median rent of one-room, two-room, three-room, etc. units in each of the four major clearance areas are reported as Item H-11. By dividing these statistics by the number of rooms, information on rent per room may be obtained. From these statistics it may be learned that when the number of rooms is controlled, the slum-clearance and deleterious clearance areas emerge clearly as low-rent areas for units with four rooms or less, and especially for units with one or two rooms. The environmental clearance areas have high rents, in comparison with the other areas, even when the factor of size is controlled. Small living units in the community facilities clearance areas bring high rentals, in comparison with the other areas, but large living units in these areas have lower rentals than the other areas.

Within each area, rent per room declines steadily with only a few exceptions, as the size of the living unit increases. The greatest disparity between rent per room for small units and for large units is found in the slum clearance and the environmental clearance areas.

ITEM H-12. Persons Per Room--Occupied Living Units. An average of 1.0 person per room is considered the maximum desirable for adequate living by many housing experts, and an average of 1.5 or more persons per room is indicative of serious overcrowding. By these standards, crowding exists in 23 per cent of the households, and serious crowding is found in 15 per cent. Extremely serious crowding, with two or more persons per room, is found in five per cent of the living units. However measured, crowding is far worse in the environmental clearance and the deleterious clearance areas than in the slum clearance areas. In the environmental clearance areas there is serious overcrowding in 27 per cent of the living units, and very serious overcrowding in 11 per cent. In the community facilities clearance areas, crowding is much less prevalent than in the other three clearance groups.

TABLE 1
 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STRUCTURES AND LIVING UNITS IN STRUCTURES TENTATIVELY PLANNED FOR CLEARANCE,
 NEAR WEST SIDE AREA

ITEM H-1: Present use of structures (100 per cent count)	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Structures . . .	630	183	127	71	249	102	88	59
Residential only	390	133	49	26	182	78	55	49
Residential with commercial	141	25	21	39	56	22	30	4
Residential with industrial	4	-	2	2	-	-	-	-
Commercial only	45	11	24	2	8	1	3	4
Industrial only	33	5	25	2	1	-	-	1
Other	17	9	6	-	2	1	-	1

TABLE 1-A Per cent Distribution

Total Structures	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Structures	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Residential only	61.9	72.7	38.6	36.6	73.1	76.5	62.5	83.0
Residential with commercial	22.4	13.7	16.5	55.0	22.5	21.5	34.1	6.8
Residential with industrial	0.6	0.0	1.6	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Commercial only	7.2	6.0	18.9	2.8	3.2	1.0	3.4	6.8
Industrial only	5.2	2.7	19.7	2.8	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.7
Other	2.7	4.9	4.7	0.0	0.8	1.0	0.0	1.7

TABLE 1--Continued

H-2: Physical condition of structures (100 per cent count)	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Structures	630	183	127	71	249	102	88	59
Blighted	129	129	-	-	-	-	-	-
Near blighted	77	20	13	15	29	7	13	9
Major rehabilitation	120	18	19	30	53	23	20	10
Minor rehabilitation	293	16	88	26	163	70	55	38
Non-problem	11	-	7	-	4	2	-	2

TABLE 1-A--Continued

Total Structures	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Blighted	20.5	70.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Near blighted	12.2	10.9	10.2	21.1	11.6	6.9	14.8	15.3
Major rehabilitation	19.1	9.8	15.0	42.3	21.3	22.5	22.7	16.9
Minor rehabilitation	46.5	8.8	69.3	36.6	65.5	68.6	62.5	64.4
Non-problem	1.7	0.0	5.5	0.0	1.6	2.0	0.0	3.4

TABLE 1--Continued

H-3: Number of rooms in living units.	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total living units . . .	1,908	543	307	263	795	327	279	189
1 room . . .	107	34	55	4	14	-	14	-
2 rooms . . .	181	50	27	36	68	35	26	7
3 rooms . . .	401	90	63	59	189	46	92	51
4 rooms . . .	533	154	99	69	211	108	57	46
5 rooms . . .	421	108	50	49	214	99	58	57
6 rooms . . .	221	84	8	36	93	39	26	28
7 rooms . . .	29	18	5	-	6	-	6	-
8 rooms . . .	15	5	-	10	-	-	-	-

TABLE 1-A--Continued

Total living units . . .	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
1 room . . .	5.6	6.2	17.8	1.7	1.8	-	5.0	-
2 rooms . . .	9.5	9.3	8.9	13.5	8.6	10.7	9.2	3.7
3 rooms . . .	21.0	16.6	20.4	22.4	23.7	14.1	32.7	26.8
4 rooms . . .	28.0	28.2	32.6	27.0	26.5	32.6	20.8	24.4
5 rooms . . .	22.1	19.9	16.3	18.6	26.9	30.2	20.8	30.5
6 rooms . . .	11.6	15.6	2.6	13.5	11.8	12.4	9.2	14.6
7 rooms . . .	1.5	3.1	1.5	-	0.8	-	2.3	-
8 rooms . . .	0.8	1.0	-	3.4	-	-	-	-

TABLE 1--Continued

H-6: Bathtub or shower in living units	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Living Units . .	1,908	543	307	263	795	327	279	189
Exclusive use of bath or shower	1,486	409	188	205	684	287	228	169
Share use of bath or shower.	317	73	114	40	90	40	30	20
No bath or shower facilities	105	61	5	18	21	-	21	-

TABLE 1-A--Continued

Total Living Units . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Exclusive use of bath or shower	77.9	75.1	61.5	78.1	85.9	87.9	81.2	89.6
Share use of bath or shower.	16.6	13.6	37.0	15.2	11.5	12.1	11.5	10.4
No bath or shower facilities	5.5	11.4	1.5	6.8	2.6	-	7.3	-

TABLE 1--Continued

	Reasons for clearance					Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional	
H-7: Summary of plumbing facilities in living units									
Total Living Units . . .	1,908	543	307	263	795	327	279	189	
All facilities present, occupant has exclusive use	1,445	403	184	192	666	282	220	164	
All facilities present, occupant shares one or more	347	78	123	44	102	45	32	25	
One or more facilities absent	116	62	-	27	27	-	27	-	

TABLE 1-A--Continued

Total Living Units . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All facilities present, occupant has exclusive use	75.7	74.1	60.0	73.0	83.5	85.9	78.8	86.6	
All facilities present, occupant shares one or more	18.2	14.5	40.0	16.9	13.0	14.1	11.5	13.4	
One or more facilities absent	6.1	11.4	-	10.1	3.4	-	9.6	-	

TABLE 1--Continued

H-8: Living room re-decorated in past two years?	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Living Units	1,908	543	307	263	795	327	279	189
No	504	153	77	67	207	114	79	14
Yes, at tenant's expense	756	129	131	112	384	120	143	121
Yes, at landlord's expense	202	65	17	22	98	59	32	7
Yes, occupied by owner	446	196	82	62	106	34	25	47

TABLE 1-A--Continued

Total Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	160.0	100.0
No	23.4	36.6	26.7	23.6	13.4	10.7	9.6	24.7
Yes, at tenant's expense	26.4	28.1	25.2	25.3	26.1	34.4	27.7	7.6
Yes, at landlord's expense	39.6	23.6	42.6	42.6	48.0	36.8	51.2	63.9
Yes, occupied by owner	10.6	11.8	5.6	8.4	12.6	18.1	11.5	3.8

TABLE 1--Continued

H-9: Tenure and occupancy of living units	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Living Units . . .	1,908	543	307	263	795	327	279	189
Occupied by sole owner . . .	189	63	12	22	92	39	39	14
Occupied by cooperative owner	36	11	5	-	20	20	-	-
Renter occupied	1,576	436	244	232	664	262	234	168
Occupied rent free	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacant, for rent	90	22	46	9	13	-	6	7
Vacant, other	11	5	-	-	6	6	-	-

TABLE 1-A--Continued

Total Living Units . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Occupied by sole owner . . .	9.9	11.4	4.1	8.4	11.5	11.8	13.8	7.3
Occupied by cooperative owner	1.9	2.1	1.5	-	2.5	5.9	-	-
Renter occupied	82.7	80.3	79.6	88.2	83.5	80.3	83.8	89.0
Occupied rent free	0.3	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacant, for rent	4.7	4.1	14.8	3.4	1.6	-	2.3	3.7
Vacant, other	0.6	1.0	-	-	0.8	2.0	-	-

TABLE 1--Continued

H-10: Rent per month of renter-occupied living units	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Living Units	1,908	543	307	263	795	327	279	189
Under \$30	119	61	34	-	24	9	-	15
\$30 - \$40	207	54	49	10	94	33	30	31
\$40 - \$50	305	88	68	20	129	41	61	27
\$50 - \$60	462	87	72	70	233	102	99	32
\$60 - \$70	292	42	39	31	180	93	52	35
\$70 - \$80	257	96	15	54	92	41	22	29
\$80 - \$90	145	74	15	34	22	8	-	14
\$90 - over	121	41	15	44	21	-	15	6

TABLE 1-A--Continued

Total Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$30	6.2	11.2	11.2	-	3.1	2.9	-	8.2
\$30 - \$40	10.8	10.0	15.9	3.8	11.8	10.0	10.7	16.4
\$40 - \$50	16.1	16.2	22.3	7.5	16.4	12.6	21.9	14.4
\$50 - \$60	24.2	16.2	23.5	26.3	29.1	31.0	35.3	16.4
\$60 - \$70	15.3	7.7	12.7	11.7	22.5	28.5	18.7	18.5
\$70 - \$80	13.4	17.7	4.8	20.7	11.5	12.6	8.0	15.1
\$80 - \$90	7.6	13.7	4.8	13.1	2.8	2.5	-	7.5
\$90 - over	6.4	7.5	4.8	16.9	2.8	-	5.4	3.4
Median Rent	\$ 55	\$ 59	\$ 50	\$ 70	\$ 56	\$ 58	\$ 55	\$ 57

TABLE 1-A--Continued

H-11: Median rent by size of unit	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Dele- terious clearance	Environ- mental clearance	
1-Room unit .	\$ 28	\$ 15	\$ 31	\$ 35	\$ 40
2-Room units .	\$ 50	\$ 43	\$ 40	\$ 58	\$ 45
3-Room units .	\$ 50	\$ 49	\$ 44	\$ 76	\$ 48
4-Room units .	\$ 56	\$ 50	\$ 56	\$ 60	\$ 58
5-Room units .	\$ 68	\$ 75	\$ 72	\$ 75	\$ 65
6-Room units .	\$ 71	\$ 80	-	\$ 80	\$ 60

TABLE 1-A--Continued

H-12: Persons per room-- Occupied living units	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Dele- terious clearance	Environ- mental clearance	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Occupied Living Units . . .					
Less than 0.50	7.9	10.9	4.4	8.7	6.8
0.50 to 0.74	24.2	23.0	19.5	22.7	27.0
0.75 to 0.99	22.6	25.2	17.7	12.2	25.9
1.00 to 1.24	22.7	16.4	24.8	19.2	27.3
1.25 to 1.49	8.1	10.3	10.6	10.5	5.1
1.50 to 1.74	8.7	6.6	10.6	16.2	7.0
1.75 to 1.99	1.1	2.2	3.5	-	-
2.00 and over	4.7	5.5	8.8	10.5	1.0

PART B. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF OCCUPANTS OF LIVING UNITS IN CLEARANCE AREAS

Tables 2 (numerical distribution) and 2-A (summary information), following these notes, report selected items of information concerning the occupants of living units in clearance areas. The 21 items covered in these tables are discussed below.

ITEM P-1. Population. An estimated population of 6,346 persons was living in the units planned for clearance. This population was divided among the various clearance types as follows:

<u>Clearance Type of</u>	<u>Population, 1957</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Total	6,346	100.0
Slum clearance	1,811	28.5
Deleterious clearance	966	15.2
Environmental clearance	1,021	16.1
Community facilities clearance	2,548	40.2
Parks and public schools	1,056	16.6
Racine street widening	830	13.1
Shopping and institutional	662	10.5

The age composition of this population is somewhat younger than the city of Chicago as a whole. This may be seen by comparing the four broad age groups shown in Table 2 with the census age distribution for Chicago in 1950:

<u>Age group</u>	<u>Clearance units, Near West Side, 1957</u>	<u>City of Chicago, 1950</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Pre-school (0-5 years)	12.8	10.4	+ 2.4
School age (6-18 years)	22.5	15.8	+ 6.7
Working age (19-65 years)	58.8	66.5	- 7.5
Retirement age (65 years and over	6.0	7.3	- 1.3

Infants and school-age children comprise a larger proportion of the population in the clearance households than in the city population generally.

The slum clearance units tend to have fewer infants and more retired people than the other clearance units. The youngest age composition is in the environmental clearance group. However, the age composition of all the areas is quite similar to that of the others, and not too dissimilar from the general age composition of Chicago City.

ITEM P-2. Type of Occupancy of Occupied Living Units. A total of 1,807 of the 1,908 living units were occupied at the time of the survey. Of these, the great majority were occupied by husband-wife families, living with children (if they had any). Such "normal" families comprised 75.5 per cent of all living units. In nine per cent of the households there were no families; the living unit was occupied by single persons or by two persons living together. (There were no instances of two unrelated persons jointly sharing an apartment; each instance of two unrelated persons living together appeared to be a single person taking in a lodger.)

One family in ten is a "broken" family, consisting of a divorced or widowed parent living with a child; five per cent are families consisting of other combinations of relatives, such as brother and sister, an aunt and niece, etc.

In the households containing a primary family, eight per cent also contained a subfamily. An example of a subfamily is a child and his or her spouse living in the household of a parent, where the parent is conceded to be the head of the family and of the household. In many of these cases, the heads of the households are elderly widowed parents who own the homes and have a married son or daughter living with them.

The households in the clearance areas contain almost no secondary families--that is, the family of a lodger, servant, or other person not related to the head.

In six per cent of the households, a parent or parent-in-law of the head was present. It proved to be extremely difficult to differentiate between the families containing a subfamily and households containing parents or parents-in-law, for in many cases it appeared as if the elderly person was named as head out of deference to his years and to the fact that he owned the house. In many cases the son or son-in-law was the chief breadwinner, but was not named as head, while in other cases (often where his wife was the respondent) the elderly parent was named as a parent of the head rather than as the head.

There was only a moderate degree of variation concerning type of family from one clearance group to another. Among the slum clearance units there tended to be a higher proportion of single-person units and also of broken families than in the other types of clearance areas.

ITEM P-3. Race and Nationality of Occupants. The occupants of these households were very diverse in ethnic and racial background. About 65 per cent of the population was white, excluding Spanish-speaking population. Nineteen per cent were of Mexican ancestry, 4.6 per cent were Puerto Rican, 1.5 per cent was other Spanish. This totaled to 25.0 per cent of the population that was Spanish-speaking or of Spanish ancestry. Negroes comprised 9.4 per cent of the total.

The Mexican population was concentrated primarily in the slum clearance, the environmental clearance, and the Racine street widening programs. The Puerto Rican population was found primarily in the deleterious clearance and the environmental clearance areas. The environmental clearance areas were more than one-half Spanish-speaking--51 per cent. Negroes were concentrated largely in the slum clearance and the environmental clearance areas. Thus, the environmental clearance areas contained only 30 per cent white, non-Spanish population.

In the community facilities clearance areas for parks and schools, the proportion of foreign born (largely Italian) population is much higher, and the proportion of Negro and Spanish-speaking population is moderately small.

ITEM P-4. Sex and Marital Status of the Head. In 88 per cent of the living units a male was head, while female heads of household were found in 12 per cent. All but a small fraction of the male household heads were married. In about two-thirds of the households with a female head, the head was widowed, and the remaining cases were separated or divorced. Households in the slum clearance and in the Racine street widening programs had female heads more frequently than other clearance households.

ITEM P-5. Relationship of Occupants to Owner. In this area, it is rather common for a tenant to be related to the owner. A person may own a building and rent an apartment to a son, or may provide an apartment at reduced rent to a widowed or divorced daughter, to an elderly parent, or to another relative. In the clearance areas, ten per cent of the living units are occupied by renters who are related to the owners of their building. This is least common in the slum clearance and most common in the areas scheduled for community facilities clearance. The factor of relationship to owner may account in part for the low levels of rent found in this entire area.

ITEM P-6. Number of Persons in the Living Unit. Although the living units in this area contain more persons, on an average, than units elsewhere in the city, the difference in size is not as great as might have been anticipated. The median number of persons per household in this area is 3.7, whereas in the City of Chicago as a whole in 1950 it was 3.2. A part of this difference is due to the greater number of infants and children, discussed above. Thus, there appears to be comparatively little acute crowding--even among the slum clearance units. The greatest congestion appears to be among the environmental clearance living units, where an average of 4.6 persons per living unit is found. As has already been pointed out, this area is predominantly Spanish-speaking with a large Negro population also. In this area there are many households with seven or more persons.

About one-third of the households to be cleared contain three persons, and 58 per cent contain three persons or fewer. Only 5.5 per cent of all households contain seven persons or more, except, as noted above, in the environmental clearance area and the slum clearance area.

ITEM P-7. Number of Children of Preschool Age (0-5 Years) in the Living Unit. There was estimated to be a total of 811 children of preschool age in the clearance area. However, there were no preschool children at all in 72 per cent of the living units. About 17 per cent of the units contained one child; seven per cent contained two; and four per cent contained three or more. The greatest concentration of preschool children, in proportion to the number of living units, is found in the environmental clearance area. Again this is a reflection of the ethnic composition of this area.

ITEM P-8. Number of Children of School Age (6-18 Years) in the Living Unit. In the clearance units as a whole there are an estimated 1,428 children of school age. This is an average of 0.8 child per living unit. But in more than one-half of the living units (57 per cent) there are no children of school age. This is a consequence of the fact that many units are occupied by single persons, childless couples, couples whose children have grown up and departed, or by couples whose children are not yet of school age. About 22 per cent

of the living units have one school-age child; 12 per cent have two; five per cent have three; and four per cent have four or more. The environmental clearance area has a lower proportion of living units with no school children, and a higher proportion with two and three school children than the other areas.

ITEM P-9. Number of Persons 65 Years of Age and Older in Living Units. About six per cent of the population in these living units is 65 years of age or older (378 persons). As has already been pointed out, this is below the proportion in the United States and in the City of Chicago. Contrary to what might have been expected, these clearance units are occupied predominantly by adults of working age, with children of school age. There are one or more persons 65 years of age in only 17 per cent of the living units. Thirteen per cent of the households contain one such person, and four per cent contain two.

ITEM P-10. Number of Persons in Living Unit Attending School. The number of persons in school is very nearly equal to the number of children of school age (see Item P-8). The difference between the two is that Item P-10 excludes persons of school age (6-18 years) who have dropped out of school and includes persons 19 years of age and over who are still attending school. The number of persons actually in school is about three per cent greater than the number of persons 6-18 years of age, and is due to the attendance at high school and college of young adults. There is no evidence that school attendance rates are any lower in the slum clearance areas than in the other clearance areas.

ITEM P-11. Number of Persons in the Primary Family. Item P-6 reported the number of persons in living units. This item reports the number of persons in primary families (groups related by blood, marriage, or adoption) living together as a family. There are 1,538 living units occupied by primary families, and approximately one-half of these (55 per cent) consist of two or three members. Four-member families are about 20 per cent of all families. Families containing seven or more members are quite rare--about six per cent of all families. The largest families are found in the slum clearance, environmental clearance, and deleterious clearance areas. In the community facilities clearance areas a much higher proportion of families fall in the two-three-or-four member groups.

ITEM P-12. Work-school Status of Living Unit Head. In all but 16 per cent of the living units, the head was either working, attending school, or both. In only a small fraction of the living units was the head attending school (1.0 per cent). The 16 per cent of cases in which the head was not working are primarily cases of retired persons, female heads who cannot work because of young children, and a few unemployed persons. These proportions did not vary a great deal from one type of clearance area to another, although a slightly higher proportion of heads were not working in the slum clearance, environmental clearance, parks and public school clearance, and Racine Avenue widening than in the deleterious clearance, or the shopping center clearance.

ITEM P-13. Number of Working Persons in the Primary Family. In six per cent of the families, no person was working. These were households where the major breadwinner had retired and the family was living off a pension or where a member of the family other than the head was the principal breadwinner. In almost exactly one-half of the families there was one earner only, while in 37 per cent of the families there were two earners. Three earners were found in seven per cent of the families. These three-earner instances were largely cases of a relative, such as a brother, nephew, or cousin of the head residing in a household where both the head and his wife, or the head and his son were employed.

It is debatable whether such third earners contribute more or less to the family income than would a lodger or boarder. The slum clearance and the environmental clearance areas contained more living units without an earner than the other areas.

ITEM P-14. Major Occupation Group of Principal Breadwinner. The principal breadwinner of each household was identified on the basis of the income in 1956, if there was a doubt as to which worker to consider the chief earner. The occupations of these persons were classified according to the categories of the 1950 census. Residents of the clearance areas were primarily workers in the "blue collar" occupations: operatives, service workers, craftsmen, and unskilled laborers. There were almost no professional, and many fewer other "white collar" workers than in the City of Chicago's general population. This emphasis upon the less skilled and more manual jobs is greatest in the slum clearance, environmental clearance, and deleterious clearance areas, and least in the community facilities clearance areas.

ITEM P-15. Major Industry Group of Principal Breadwinner. Four types of industries provide the employment for residents of this area. Manufacturing is by far the most important employer--38 per cent of the workers are factory workers. Wholesale and retail trade, service industries, and transportation are the other three job-providing industries.

ITEM P-16. Place of Work of Principal Breadwinners. Almost one-fourth (23.4 per cent) of the principal breadwinners are employed on the Near West Side. About 11 per cent travel to the Loop and 13 per cent to the industrial district in the Near Southwest to work. The West Side (exclusive of the Near West Side) employs ten per cent. A majority of the workers are employed within a radius of about one or two miles. About 26 per cent of the workers can be said to commute more than 15 or 20 minutes to work. These are the workers who are employed on the North Shore, the South and Southwest Side, the Far Northwest Side, or the Suburbs.

This same general pattern of living near work (or working near place of residence) is characteristic of all of the types of clearance, although some of them emphasize work in the Loop, others emphasize work on the Near Southwest, etc.

ITEM P-17. Gross Family Income. More than one-half of the families in the area earned between \$3,000 and \$6,000 during 1956. About one-fifth of the families are "low income" families in that they earned less than \$3,000, while an additional one-fifth had incomes in excess of \$6,000. There were about 75 poverty-stricken families which had an income of less than \$100 a month. Except for these comparatively few families, the families of the area appear to have incomes of minimum adequacy or better. The median family income for Chicago in 1950 was \$3,956. The median family income of these clearance areas in 1957 was \$4,464.

The greatest concentration of low-income families is found in the slum clearance and the environmental clearance areas, although these areas did not have an income distribution a great deal more unfavorable than the average for all clearance areas. The income situation of the occupants of these clearance structures may be summarized by stating that on the average their incomes are probably as high as the average for the city. Even the residents of the slum clearance units are not "poor." Except for a comparatively few low income families, the incomes are adequate to maintain the families at a middle-class level of comfort.

ITEM P-18. Length of Residence in Chicago. Almost exactly one-half of the household heads have lived in Chicago more than 25 years. Only about 20 per cent have lived in Chicago less than five years and three per cent have been here less than one year. One-half of the residents have lived here 24 years or more. Thus, the area is comprised primarily of long-time residents of the city, with only a small minority of recent arrivals. The new arrivals tend to be most concentrated in the environmental clearance and the deleterious clearance areas. The residents of the slum clearance structures are also predominantly long-term residents of Chicago. As a whole, the population of this area is well urbanized and one that has called Chicago "home" for many years.

ITEM P-19. Length of Residence in Near West Side. One-fourth of the persons interviewed reported that the head of the household had lived in the Near West Side area for 25 years or more. The median length of residence in the Near West Side is eight years. The lowest median length of residence is seven years, and is found in the environmental clearance areas. The highest median length of residence is 11 years, and is found in the community facilities clearance areas. Only about seven per cent have lived here less than one year, and 12 per cent have resided here for less than two years. About one-third have lived here less than five years. From the evidence, it appears that the area was one of comparatively little turnover until about 1947, at which time a rather steady turnover of about five per cent a year began and has continued since. This turnover has been especially rapid in the environmental clearance, the deleterious clearance, and the Racine street widening areas, where 15 to 20 per cent of the present residents arrived there during the past two years. The least mobility during recent years seems to have taken place in the shopping facilities and institutional clearance areas.

ITEM P-20. Length of Residence in Present Location. Only a small minority of living unit heads have lived in their present apartment building or house for ten years or more. The average (median) length of stay in present place for the entire area is only three years. In the environmental clearance and the deleterious clearance areas it is even less--two years. The greatest length of stay in present place is found in the clearance for parks and public schools areas, and even here the median is only four years. Thus, all of these clearance areas are characterized by a rather high rate of residential turnover. About one in six has changed residence during the past year, and almost sixty per cent have lived in their present place less than four years. Thus, in recent years there has been a high degree of residential mobility in these clearance structures, although most of the persons involved are long-term residents of Chicago and of the area. We have, then, a picture of a group of renters who have a history of rather recent movement in the past, but this movement is largely one of circulating from one structure to another in the Near West Side.

The highest rates of movement during the past year are recorded for the environmental clearance, the deleterious clearance, and the slum clearance areas. Apparently, the residents of these least-desirable living units have a higher rate of turnover than the residents of the more adequate community facilities clearance units.

ITEM P-21. Median Rent by Income. One of the dimensions that planners need to know in planning for the relocation of families is the rent that each income group is now paying. This assists in predicting the costs of relocation and provides a preliminary idea of the types of living units that must be obtained for each income group. The following table reports the distribution of rents and the median rent paid by each income group.

Income group	Median rent	Total	Rent per month				
			Under \$50	\$50 to \$60	\$60 to \$70	\$70 to \$80	\$80 and over
Total	\$57	100.0	32.7	23.9	15.2	13.4	14.8
\$00 to \$1,799	Under \$50	100.0	53.3	37.0	5.4	-	4.3
\$1,800 to \$2,799	\$53	100.0	39.2	31.7	7.5	14.5	7.0
\$2,800 to \$4,199	\$51	100.0	47.3	19.3	9.5	8.7	15.2
\$4,200 to \$5,799	\$62	100.0	20.6	24.9	20.3	18.2	16.0
\$5,800 and over	\$64	100.0	21.3	20.6	22.1	16.5	19.5

There is a clear tendency for persons with lower incomes to rent cheaper places in which to live. This may be observed by noting the medians for the income groups or by noting the greater proportion of families with low incomes that fall in the "Under \$50" group than of families with intermediate or larger incomes. The relationship allows a considerable latitude, however, for there are some persons of low income that pay higher rentals, and there are some persons of higher income that pay low rentals.

Item P-21 in Table 2-A reports the median rental paid by each income group in each of the clearance areas. Because these measures required a detailed cross-classification of the rather small samples, they are only approximate indicators of the rent-income relationships within the respective areas.

TABLE 2
THE CHARACTERISTICS OF OCCUPANTS OF LIVING UNITS IN CLEARANCE AREAS,
NEAR WEST SIDE AREA

	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
P-1: Total population, 1957	6,346	1,811	966	1,021	2,548	1,056	830	662
Total Population, 1957	811	197	171	159	284	119	89	76
Preschool age (0-5 years)	1,428	474	203	287	464	235	131	98
School age (6-18 years)	3,729	1,009	533	544	1,643	630	558	455
Labor force age (19-64 years)	378	131	59	31	157	72	52	33
Retirement age (65 years and over)								

TABLE 2-A Per cent Distribution

	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Population, 1957	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Preschool age (0-5 years)	12.8	10.9	17.7	15.6	11.1	11.3	10.7	11.5
School age (6-18 years)	22.5	26.2	21.0	28.1	18.2	22.3	15.8	14.8
Labor force age (19-64 years)	58.8	55.7	55.2	53.3	64.5	59.7	67.2	68.7
Retirement age (65 years and over)	6.0	7.2	6.1	3.0	6.1	6.8	6.3	5.0

TABLE 2--Continued

P-2: Type of occupancy-- of occupied living units	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Dele- terious clearance	Environ- mental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units.	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Husband-wife/child family . . .	1,363	369	180	223	591	241	189	161
Parent-child family	187	68	23	4	92	40	52	-
Other primary family	88	6	27	9	46	13	19	14
Single person living alone . . .	169	73	31	18	47	27	13	7
Primary family with subfamily	134	28	27	13	64	26	19	20
Primary family with secondary family	7	-	-	-	6	-	7	-
Primary family with parent or parent-in-law	108	34	14	9	53	14	19	20
Primary family with lodgers . .	112	40	9	31	33	26	7	-

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Husband-wife/child family . . .	75.5	71.6	69.1	87.8	76.2	75.6	69.3	88.6
Parent-child family	10.3	13.1	8.7	1.7	11.8	12.0	18.9	-
Other primary family	4.9	1.1	10.4	3.5	5.9	4.0	7.1	7.6
Single person living alone . . .	9.3	14.2	11.7	7.0	6.0	8.4	4.7	3.8
Primary family with subfamily	7.4	5.5	10.4	5.2	8.3	8.0	7.1	10.8
Primary family with secondary family	0.4	-	-	-	0.8	-	2.4	-
Primary family with parent or parent-in-law	6.0	6.6	5.2	3.5	6.8	4.3	7.1	10.8
Primary family with lodgers . .	6.2	7.7	3.5	12.2	4.2	8.0	2.4	-

TABLE 2--Continued

P-3: Race and Nationality	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units.	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Mexican	343	125	37	45	106	27	53	26
Puerto Rican	84	11	36	37	-	-	-	-
Other Spanish	28	6	4	18	-	-	-	-
Native white (excluding Spanish)	706	193	139	35	339	171	124	44
Foreign born white	476	113	41	40	282	122	97	63
Negro	170	68	4	49	49	-	-	49

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mexican	18.9	24.3	13.9	29.7	13.7	8.5	19.3	14.6
Puerto Rican	4.6	2.2	13.9	14.4	-	-	-	-
Other Spanish	1.5	1.1	1.7	7.0	-	-	-	-
Native white (excluding Spanish)	39.1	37.4	53.0	14.0	43.8	53.4	45.3	22.8
Foreign born white	26.5	21.9	15.7	15.7	36.3	38.0	35.4	34.2
Negro	9.4	13.1	1.7	19.2	6.3	-	-	28.5

TABLE 2--Continued

P-4: Sex and marital status of head	Reasons for clearance					Community facilities clearance				
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional	Total	Shopping and institutional
<u>Total Occupied Living Units.</u>	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182		182
<u>Male Head</u>	1,599	425	234	250	690	288	220	182		182
Single	67	6	35	13	13	6	7	-		-
Married	1,382	356	176	233	617	249	186	182		182
Widowed	92	34	14	4	40	27	13	-		-
Divorced	45	23	9	-	13	6	7	-		-
Separated	13	6	-	-	7	-	7	-		-
<u>Female Head</u>	208	91	27	4	86	33	53	-		-
Single	13	6	-	-	7	7	-	-		-
Widowed	135	51	14	4	66	26	40	-		-
Divorced	26	17	9	-	-	-	-	-		-
Separated	34	17	4	-	13	-	13	-		-

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units.	Reasons for clearance					Community facilities clearance				
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional	Total	Shopping and institutional
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
88.6	82.6	89.6	98.2	88.9	89.6	81.2	100.0	100.0		100.0
3.7	1.1	13.5	5.2	1.7	2.0	2.4	-	-		-
76.6	69.4	67.4	91.3	79.4	77.1	69.3	100.0	100.0		100.0
5.1	6.6	5.2	1.7	5.2	8.5	4.7	-	-		-
2.5	4.4	3.5	-	1.7	2.0	2.4	-	-		-
0.7	1.1	-	-	0.9	-	2.4	-	-		-
11.5	17.5	10.4	1.7	11.1	10.2	18.9	-	-		-
0.7	1.1	-	-	0.9	2.0	-	-	-		-
7.5	9.8	5.2	1.7	8.5	8.2	14.2	-	-		-
1.4	3.3	3.5	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
1.9	3.3	1.7	-	1.7	-	4.7	-	-		-

TABLE 2--Continued

P-5: Relationship of occupant to owner	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units.	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Related to owner	174	28	26	27	93	38	26	29
Not related to owner	1,395	408	215	200	572	226	207	139
Owner	238	80	20	27	111	57	40	14

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Related to owner	9.7	5.5	10.1	10.8	11.9	11.8	9.7	15.8
Not related to owner	76.9	79.0	82.3	78.4	73.6	70.5	75.8	76.3
Owner	13.4	15.5	7.6	10.8	14.5	17.7	14.5	7.9

TABLE 2--Continued

P-6: Number of persons in living unit	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units.	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
1 person	142	68	31	9	34	21	13	-
2 persons	356	79	59	44	174	65	71	38
3 persons	570	170	46	72	282	110	105	67
4 persons	323	73	32	44	174	72	58	44
5 persons	180	52	41	28	59	33	26	-
6 persons	136	29	28	31	48	20	-	28
7 persons	50	23	14	13	-	-	-	-
8 persons	25	11	5	4	5	-	-	5
9 or more persons	25	11	5	9	-	-	-	-

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1 person	7.8	13.1	11.9	3.5	4.4	6.4	4.7	-
2 persons	19.7	15.3	22.6	17.5	22.4	20.1	26.0	20.9
3 persons	31.6	32.8	17.7	27.9	36.4	34.4	38.6	36.7
4 persons	18.0	14.2	12.4	17.5	22.4	22.4	21.3	24.1
5 persons	9.9	10.1	15.9	10.9	7.6	10.0	9.4	-
6 persons	7.5	5.7	10.6	12.2	6.2	6.7	-	15.2
7 persons	2.7	4.4	5.3	5.2	-	-	-	-
8 persons	1.4	2.2	1.8	1.7	0.7	-	-	3.2
9 or more persons	1.4	2.2	1.8	3.5	-	-	-	-
Median Number of Persons	3.7	3.7	3.9	4.6	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.8

TABLE 2--Continued

P-7: Number of children of preschool age (0-5 years) in living unit	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
None	1,295	397	182	157	559	222	202	135
1	306	68	28	44	166	86	52	28
2	131	34	14	44	39	7	19	13
3	53	6	32	9	6	6	-	-
4	22	11	5	-	6	-	-	6

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None	71.7	77.0	69.9	61.6	72.0	68.9	74.0	74.7
1	17.0	13.1	10.6	17.5	21.4	26.8	18.9	15.2
2	7.3	6.6	5.3	17.5	5.1	2.3	7.1	7.0
3	2.9	1.1	12.4	3.5	0.8	2.0	-	-
4	1.2	2.2	1.8	-	0.7	-	-	3.2

TABLE 2--Continued

P-8: Number of children of school age (6-18 years) in living unit	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Pavine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units .	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
None	1,037	294	150	121	472	186	174	112
1	391	96	69	49	177	54	67	56
2	218	51	14	53	100	61	32	7
3	90	47	9	14	20	20	-	-
4	41	11	14	9	7	-	-	-
5	20	11	5	4	-	-	-	-
6	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
7 or more	4	-	-	4	-	-	-	-

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None	57.3	56.9	57.5	47.2	60.9	58.0	63.8	61.4
1	21.6	18.6	26.5	19.2	22.7	16.7	24.4	31.0
2	12.2	9.8	5.3	21.0	13.0	19.1	11.8	3.8
3	5.0	9.2	3.5	5.7	2.6	6.1	-	-
4	2.2	2.2	5.3	3.5	0.8	-	-	3.8
5	1.1	2.2	1.8	1.7	-	-	-	-
6	0.3	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
7 or more	0.2	-	-	1.7	-	-	-	-

TABLE 2--Continued

P-9: Number of persons 65 years of age or older in living unit	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
None	1,497	414	211	228	644	262	227	155
1	242	74	41	22	105	46	39	20
2	68	28	9	4	27	13	7	7

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None	82.9	80.1	80.9	89.5	83.1	81.6	83.5	85.4
1	13.4	14.4	15.7	8.7	13.5	14.4	14.2	10.8
2	3.8	5.5	3.5	1.7	3.4	4.0	2.4	3.8

TABLE 2---Continued

P-10: Number of persons in living unit attending school	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
None	1,039	288	148	116	487	196	180	111
1	358	90	59	53	156	46	60	50
2	244	56	23	58	107	60	26	21
3	97	52	9	10	26	19	7	-
4	29	7	18	4	-	-	-	-
5	30	17	4	9	-	-	-	-
6 or more	10	6	-	4	-	-	-	-

TABLE 2-A---Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None	57.5	55.8	56.5	45.4	62.9	60.9	66.1	61.4
1	19.8	17.5	22.6	21.0	20.0	14.4	22.0	27.2
2	13.5	10.9	8.7	22.7	13.8	18.7	9.4	11.4
3	5.3	10.1	3.5	3.9	3.4	6.0	2.4	-
4	1.6	1.3	7.0	1.7	-	-	-	-
5	1.6	3.3	1.7	3.5	-	-	-	-
6 or more	0.5	1.1	-	1.7	-	-	-	-

TABLE 2--Continued

P-11: Number of persons in the primary family	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Primary Families	1,538	420	209	224	685	273	243	169
2	336	71	58	38	169	60	72	37
3	514	156	38	68	252	96	99	57
4	295	71	29	38	157	67	48	42
5	168	50	38	26	54	30	24	-
6	133	28	29	29	47	20	-	27
7	48	22	13	13	-	-	-	-
8	21	11	-	4	6	-	-	6
9	23	11	4	8	-	-	-	-

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Primary Families	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2	21.8	16.9	27.8	17.0	24.7	22.0	29.6	21.9
3	33.4	37.1	18.2	30.4	36.8	35.2	40.7	33.7
4	19.2	16.9	13.9	17.0	22.9	24.5	19.8	24.9
5	10.9	11.9	18.2	11.6	7.9	11.0	9.9	-
6	12.5	6.7	13.9	12.9	6.9	7.3	-	16.0
7	3.0	5.2	6.2	5.8	-	-	-	-
8	1.4	2.6	-	1.8	0.9	-	-	3.6
9	1.5	2.6	1.9	3.6	-	-	-	-

TABLE 2--Continued

P-12: Work-school status of head	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Employed, not in school .	1,499	414	230	197	658	262	221	175
In school, not employed .	4	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
Employed, in school	14	6	4	4	-	-	-	-
Not employed	290	96	27	49	118	59	52	7

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed, not in school .	82.8	80.3	87.8	77.3	84.7	81.6	81.1	96.2
In school, not employed .	0.2	-	-	1.7	-	-	-	-
Employed, in school	0.8	1.1	1.7	1.7	-	-	-	-
Not employed	16.1	18.6	10.4	19.2	15.3	18.4	18.9	3.8

TABLE 2--Continued

P-13: Number of employed persons in the primary family	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Primary Families	1,538	420	209	224	685	273	243	169
None	95	38	4	21	32	6	19	7
1	764	197	106	106	355	150	118	87
2	562	158	87	80	237	105	88	44
3	102	22	8	17	55	12	12	31
4	15	5	4	-	6	-	6	-

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Primary Families	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None	6.2	9.0	1.9	9.4	4.7	2.2	7.8	4.1
1	49.7	46.9	50.7	47.3	51.8	54.9	48.6	51.5
2	36.5	37.6	41.6	35.7	34.6	38.5	36.2	26.0
3	6.6	5.2	3.8	7.6	8.0	4.4	4.9	18.3
4	1.0	1.2	1.9	-	0.9	-	2.5	-

TABLE 2--Continued

P-14: Major occupation of principal breadwinner	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Professional and technical	11	6	-	5	-	-	-	-
Managers, officials, proprietors	78	6	19	20	33	13	13	7
Clerical and kindred workers	98	18	23	5	52	26	26	-
Sales workers	43	18	5	-	20	6	7	7
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	336	110	44	25	160	68	60	32
Operatives and kindred workers	540	149	87	103	201	81	70	50
Service workers, including private household	188	52	16	10	110	33	26	51
Laborers	330	88	51	51	140	67	45	28
No employed person in living unit	183	69	19	35	60	27	26	7

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional and technical	0.6	1.1	-	2.0	-	-	-	-
Managers, officials, proprietors	4.2	1.1	7.1	8.0	4.3	4.1	4.7	3.8
Clerical and kindred workers	5.5	3.4	8.8	2.0	6.8	8.2	9.4	-
Sales workers	2.3	3.4	1.8	-	2.6	2.0	2.4	3.8
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	18.9	21.5	15.9	10.0	20.7	21.2	22.0	17.7
Operatives and kindred workers	29.7	29.1	33.6	40.3	25.8	24.9	26.0	27.2
Service workers, including private household	10.5	10.1	6.2	4.0	14.0	10.2	9.4	28.5
Laborers	18.2	17.0	19.5	19.9	18.0	20.8	16.5	15.2
No employed person in living unit	10.1	13.4	7.1	13.9	7.8	8.5	9.4	3.8

TABLE 2--Continued

P-15: Major industry group of principal breadwinner	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Agriculture, forestry and fisheries	6	6	18	14	43	8	20	15
Mining and construction	121	46	81	72	146	67	52	27
Manufacturing - durable goods	417	118	45	47	113	66	26	21
Manufacturing - non-durable goods	274	69	23	24	75	26	19	30
Transportation, communication, and other public utilities	180	58	40	33	197	88	64	45
Wholesale and retail trade	333	63	6	5	11	6	-	5
Finance, insurance, real estate	22	6	32	14	111	20	66	25
Service	232	75	3	10	20	13	-	7
Public administration	39	6	19	35	60	27	26	7
No employed person in living unit	183	69	19	35	60	27	26	7

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
0.3	1.1	7.0	5.6	5.5	2.4	7.5	8.2	
6.7	8.9	31.3	28.6	18.9	20.8	18.9	15.1	
23.1	22.8	17.4	18.8	14.6	20.5	9.4	11.6	
15.2	13.4	8.7	9.4	9.5	8.2	7.1	16.4	
9.9	11.2	15.2	13.1	25.3	27.3	23.6	24.0	
18.5	12.3	-	1.9	1.4	2.0	-	2.7	
1.2	1.1	12.2	5.6	14.3	6.1	24.0	13.7	
12.9	14.5	1.3	3.8	2.6	4.1	-	4.1	
2.1	1.1	7.0	13.1	7.9	8.5	9.4	4.1	
10.0	13.4	7.0	13.1	7.9	8.5	9.4	4.1	

TABLE 2--Continued

P-16: Place of work	Reasons for clearance					Community facilities clearance				
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional		
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182		
Loop	193	31	24	10	128	34	82	12		
Near West side	431	127	51	57	196	83	63	50		
North Shore	159	49	39	10	61	27	20	14		
Near Northwest	119	25	14	10	70	28	20	22		
West side	173	79	33	20	41	41	-	28		
Near Southwest	230	38	29	46	117	61	28	5		
South and Southwest	143	43	14	41	45	20	20	7		
Far Northwest	18	6	5	-	7	-	-	37		
Suburbs	158	49	33	25	51	-	14	-		
No employed person in living unit	183	69	19	35	60	27	26	7		

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Loop	10.6	5.8	9.2	3.9	16.2	10.2	29.8	5.9		
Near West side	23.4	24.3	19.3	22.0	24.6	25.3	22.7	26.3		
North Shore	8.7	9.5	14.7	3.9	7.7	8.2	7.4	7.2		
Near Northwest	6.5	4.6	5.5	3.9	8.9	8.5	7.4	11.8		
West side	9.5	15.0	12.8	7.8	5.4	12.6	-	-		
Near Southwest	12.5	7.2	11.0	17.6	14.8	18.4	10.3	15.1		
South and Southwest	7.7	8.1	5.5	15.6	5.8	6.1	7.4	2.6		
Far Northwest	1.0	1.2	1.8	-	0.9	-	-	3.9		
Suburbs	8.4	9.3	12.8	9.8	6.0	-	5.0	19.1		
No employed person in living unit	11.7	15.0	7.3	15.6	9.8	10.6	9.9	7.9		

TABLE 2--Continued

P-17: Gross Family Income	Reasons for clearance					Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional	
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182	
Under \$200	5	6	5	5	14	7	7	-	
\$200 - \$799	35	11	5	10	21	13	21	-	
\$800 - \$1,199	37	17	15	15	20	22	7	-	
\$1,200 - \$1,799	67	28	5	19	50	34	7	21	
\$1,800 - \$2,199	102	45	15	5	78	60	26	18	
\$2,200 - \$2,799	143	148	68	63	169	103	59	50	
\$2,800 - \$4,199	448	124	46	57	208	48	59	46	
\$4,200 - \$5,799	435	68	49	33	123	21	54	21	
\$5,800 - \$7,199	273	58	24	33	59	12	26	12	
\$7,200 - \$8,799	174	11	29	14	34	13	7	14	
\$8,800 and over	88								

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$200	0.3	1.1	1.9	1.9	1.7	2.1	2.4	-	-
\$200 - \$799	1.8	2.2	1.9	3.8	2.8	7.7	7.7	-	-
\$800 - \$1,199	2.1	3.3	5.6	6.1	2.6	4.2	2.4	-	-
\$1,200 - \$1,799	3.7	5.5	1.9	7.5	6.4	7.0	2.4	11.8	
\$1,800 - \$2,199	5.7	8.8	5.6	1.9	10.0	10.5	9.7	9.9	
\$2,200 - \$2,799	8.0	28.7	26.2	24.4	21.7	18.8	21.8	27.0	
\$2,800 - \$4,199	24.7	24.1	17.8	22.5	26.6	31.7	21.8	25.0	
\$4,200 - \$5,799	24.1	13.1	18.7	13.1	16.0	15.0	19.8	11.8	
\$5,800 - \$7,199	15.2	11.2	9.3	13.1	7.7	6.6	9.7	6.6	
\$7,200 - \$8,799	9.7	2.2	11.2	5.6	4.4	4.2	2.4	7.9	
\$8,800 and over	4.8								
Median family income	\$4,464	\$4,232	\$4,792	\$4,480	\$4,477	\$4,573	\$4,445	\$4,269	

TABLE 2--Continued

P-18: Length of residence in Chicago	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Less than 12 months	60	11	18	18	13	-	13	-
12 - 23 months	49	6	17	13	13	6	7	-
2 - 3 years	122	41	36	13	32	13	13	6
4 - 5 years	119	40	14	27	38	6	-	32
6 - 10 years	194	56	36	33	69	14	27	28
11 - 15 years	87	45	4	18	20	6	7	7
16 - 20 years	201	45	18	13	125	45	45	35
21 - 25 years	82	23	14	5	40	13	13	14
More than 25 years	893	249	104	114	426	218	148	60

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 12 months	3.3	2.2	7.0	7.1	1.7	-	4.7	-
12 - 23 months	2.7	1.1	6.5	5.3	1.7	2.0	2.4	-
2 - 3 years	6.7	7.9	13.9	5.3	4.0	3.9	4.7	3.2
4 - 5 years	6.4	7.7	5.2	10.7	4.7	2.0	-	17.7
6 - 10 years	10.6	10.9	13.9	12.9	8.6	4.3	9.8	15.2
11 - 15 years	4.8	8.8	1.7	7.1	2.5	2.0	2.4	3.8
16 - 20 years	11.2	8.8	7.0	5.3	16.0	14.1	16.5	19.0
21 - 25 years	4.4	4.4	5.2	1.8	5.0	3.9	4.7	7.6
More than 25 years	49.8	48.4	39.6	44.4	55.6	67.9	54.7	33.5
Median length of residence in Chicago (years)	24	23	18	18	25 or more	25 or more	25 or more	18

TABLE 2--Continued

P-19: Length of residence in Near West Side	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Less than 12 months . . .	135	40	27	23	45	6	39	-
12 - 23 months	84	17	17	18	32	13	13	6
2 - 3 years	181	63	45	14	59	19	20	20
4 - 5 years	189	68	23	32	66	20	13	33
6 - 10 years	406	129	50	52	175	53	52	70
11 - 15 years	179	34	23	46	76	45	20	11
16 - 20 years	139	23	14	18	84	58	19	7
21 - 25 years	53	17	4	5	27	6	7	14
More than 25 years	441	125	58	46	212	101	90	21

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 12 months . . .	7.4	7.7	10.4	9.0	5.9	2.0	14.2	-
12 - 23 months	4.6	3.3	6.5	7.2	4.0	3.9	4.7	3.2
2 - 3 years	10.0	12.3	17.4	5.4	7.5	5.9	7.5	10.8
4 - 5 years	10.3	13.1	8.7	12.7	8.4	6.2	4.7	18.4
6 - 10 years	22.3	25.2	19.1	20.4	22.2	16.4	18.9	38.6
11 - 15 years	10.0	6.6	8.7	18.1	10.0	14.1	7.5	6.3
16 - 20 years	7.8	4.4	5.2	7.2	11.0	18.0	7.1	3.8
21 - 25 years	2.9	3.3	1.7	1.8	3.3	2.0	2.4	7.6
More than 25 years	24.6	24.3	22.2	18.1	27.6	31.5	33.1	11.4
Median years in Near West side	8	8	8	7	11	11	11	8

TABLE 2--Continued

P-20: Length of residence in present location	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Less than 12 months . . .	285	90	55	63	77	13	39	25
12 - 23 months	358	102	53	44	159	50	76	33
2 - 3 years	399	79	67	40	213	85	67	61
4 - 5 years	220	85	9	27	99	52	26	21
6 - 10 years	211	69	32	31	79	25	19	35
11 - 15 years	116	17	14	27	58	45	13	-
16 - 20 years	46	6	18	9	13	13	-	-
21 - 25 years	24	17	-	-	7	-	7	-
More than 25 years	148	51	13	13	71	38	26	7

TABLE 2-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 12 months . . .	15.6	17.5	20.9	24.9	9.8	3.9	14.2	13.9
12 - 23 months	20.0	19.9	20.4	17.5	20.8	15.7	28.3	18.4
2 - 3 years	22.2	15.3	26.1	15.7	27.3	26.6	24.4	33.5
4 - 5 years	12.1	16.4	3.5	10.5	12.7	16.1	9.4	11.4
6 - 10 years	11.6	13.3	12.2	12.2	10.0	7.9	7.1	19.0
11 - 15 years	6.5	3.3	5.2	10.5	7.7	14.1	4.7	-
16 - 20 years	2.5	1.1	7.0	3.5	1.7	3.9	-	-
21 - 25 years	1.3	3.3	-	-	0.8	-	2.4	-
More than 25 years	8.2	9.8	4.8	5.2	9.2	11.8	9.4	3.8
Median years in present location	3	3	2	2	3	4	2	3

TABLE 2-A--Continued

P-21: Median rent by income	Reasons for clearance					Community facilities clearance				
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional		
<u>All Income Groups</u>	\$ 57	\$ 57	\$ 53	\$ 71	\$ 57	\$ 58	\$ 55	\$ 57		\$ 57
Under \$1,800	Under \$ 50	\$ 50	Under \$ 50	\$ 57	Under \$ 50	\$ 55	Under \$ 50	-		
\$1,800 - \$2,799	\$ 53	\$ 52	\$ 60	\$ 57	\$ 52	\$ 57	\$ 50	Under \$ 50		Under \$ 50
\$2,800 - \$4,199	\$ 51	\$ 50	Under \$ 50	\$ 77	Under \$ 50	\$ 55	Under \$ 50	Under \$ 50		Under \$ 50
\$4,200 - \$5,799	\$ 62	\$ 65	\$ 52	\$ 60	\$ 64	\$ 60	\$ 62	\$ 76		\$ 76
\$5,800 and over	\$ 64	\$ 75	\$ 61	\$ 74	\$ 60	\$ 60	\$ 54	\$ 64		\$ 64

PART C. PROBLEMS OF RELOCATION

Each household or individual falling in the sample was asked a series of questions concerning the effect relocation would have upon him and the problems it would cause. The responses to these questions are tabulated in Tables 3 (numerical distribution) and 3-A (summary information)--Items R-1 through R-7, discussed below. Together, these statistics are intended to provide a factual basis for anticipating the needs of relocated families.

ITEM R-1. Choice of Relocation Site. When asked the question, "Suppose you had to move out of your apartment (sell your house). Where would you want to move?", the respondents expressed a strong desire to stay on the Near West Side. In 559 households (31 per cent) this was the stated desire. The second most frequent choice was to move to a place on the West Side (17.5 per cent). About 15 per cent voted for the North Side and 14 per cent for the suburbs. Only six per cent indicated they would like to move to the South Side.

The desire to stay on the Near West Side or the West Side was greatest among those in slum clearance and in the Racine street widening units. This group also showed the least desire to move to the suburbs. The community of facilities group--and especially the school and parks clearance group--showed the least inclination to remain in the area and the greatest desire to move to the suburbs.

About one respondent in six (16 per cent) could not decide where he would like to move. The question was presented as being a hypothetical one, and many respondents refused to accept the idea of moving out of their home, and hence could not or would not make a choice. This indecision was greatest among the slum clearance group and was least among the environmental clearance group. In planning for the relocation of the residents, the 287 households that did not specify a place should be regarded as a group that would resist moving at all, rather than as a group that did not care where it moved.

ITEM R-2. Reasons for Choice of Relocation Site. At the time the respondents chose a neighborhood into which they would like to move, they were asked, "Why would you rather live there? What advantages would there be to living in that neighborhood, or what do you like about it?" The responses to this query are of considerable significance for planning for the renewal of the Near West Side itself, for they reveal the kind of community to which persons living in declining neighborhoods aspire. Inasmuch as each respondent was free to give as many different reasons for his choice as he pleased, the per cent distributions in Table 3-A do not add to 100 per cent, but show the proportion of respondents who gave a particular explanation for his choice, among other possible explanations also given. The reason for choosing a particular relocation site most frequently mentioned (42 per cent of the respondents) was personal attachments--the presence of friends and relatives in the area. This was a very frequent reason given by persons who wished to stay in the Near West Side areas.

Liking for the physical characteristics of the area--space, light, air, modern buildings, cleanliness--was mentioned in 29 per cent of the cases. Liking for community facilities--schools, shopping, etc., and liking for proximity to work were mentioned in about 20 per cent of the cases. Liking for the social environment--absence of crime and delinquency, presence of people with desired personal and social characteristics--was mentioned almost as frequently. The qualities of housing were mentioned in 13 per cent of the cases. From this

pattern of response, it is evident that in thinking of a place to which they would like to move, these respondents had in mind (and placed great emphasis upon) many things in addition to housing. If frequency of mention is a measure of importance, then the actual condition of the housing is emphasized less than the physical and social environment, opportunity to be near friends, and convenience to work and shopping. About one respondent in twelve (8.2 per cent) specified a racial situation as one desirable element of the community of his choice (usually absence of Negroes).

ITEM R-3. Difficulties Anticipated if Relocated. Each respondent was asked, "Suppose you had to move out of your apartment (sell your house). What problems or difficulties would you be faced with? What kinds of things would present problems?" In response, about one living unit in nine (11 per cent) reported they would anticipate no serious difficulties. About 1.3 per cent refused to accept the idea of moving, and would not even discuss the difficulties they would encounter. The remainder, about 88 per cent, reported they would experience at least some difficulties. The major difficulty, by far, was the trouble and expense of finding another place that is suitable or that they can afford (61 per cent). Many of this group of respondents reported that it would be difficult for them to find another place with as much space for the rent they are now paying. The next most serious difficulty (13.7 per cent) was the fear or expectation that relocation would increase the distance between home and work. As described above, a large share of the employed persons work on the Near West Side and can walk to work. Separation from friends and relatives was mentioned as a hardship in 13.7 per cent of cases. Ten per cent of respondents complained that the expense of moving and furnishing a new place would be a financial burden, and nine per cent mentioned the inconvenience for their children of changing schools, or other loss of benefits for their children. In a few cases (3.6 per cent) there would be loss of income from rental property or other sources, or hardships due to the illness of a household member. In 3.5 per cent of the households, persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Negro origin reported that their difficulty would be to find a tolerant neighborhood.

ITEM R-4: Possible Benefits if Relocated. The survey did not merely "look on the dark side" of the possible relocation, but asked also, "What advantages or benefits might having to move out of your apartment (sell your house) have for you? Even though it would create problems, how might you benefit?" Eighty-two per cent of the respondents were able to find at least some benefits, as well as the inconveniences reported above. Apparently recognizing that their housing was among the least desirable in the area, 35 per cent admitted that a move would provide an opportunity to get into bigger, better, more suitable living quarters. Twenty-four per cent saw an opportunity to select a community with better physical conditions--cleaner, less crowded, with more open space, less deterioration, etc. And 19 per cent mentioned that it would permit them to choose a neighborhood with better social conditions--less gang activity, greater security from being molested on the streets in the evening, better playmates for children, neighbors of a particular type desired, etc. Fourteen per cent specifically mentioned that it would provide an opportunity to escape from their present poor housing. (In the slum clearance and the environmental clearance areas this percentage was 20 per cent.) A few (7.6 per cent) regarded it as a chance to escape from Negroes, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, or other particular population groups they preferred not to live near. Only a very few interpreted it as an opportunity to pay less rent or to move closer to friends or relatives.

The responses to this question also have considerable significance for those planning the renewal of the area, for they represent criticisms of things

as they are, and indicate what aspects of the community need to be rehabilitated, in addition to housing, to make it attractive.

ITEM R-5. Willingness to Live in Public Housing. When asked, "Suppose you had to move out, and you were offered the opportunity to move into a low-rent public housing project. Would you be willing to take an apartment in a housing project if you could decide which one you would move into? Would you take an apartment in a public housing project other than the one you'd like to get into?", more than one-half (59 per cent) of the respondents reported that they would not be willing to accept an apartment in a public housing project. This rather large rejection was based, to a large extent, upon the realization by many that their incomes were too large to permit them to qualify for public housing. An additional 23 per cent said they would accept public housing, but only if they could choose which project they would move into. Much of this rejection appeared to be based upon an unwillingness to live in projects that were predominantly Negro. Only 14 per cent consented to move into a public housing project without specifying which project.

The greatest willingness to move into public housing was shown by the occupants of the environmental clearance units. These Spanish-speaking citizens tended to regard public housing as a chance to obtain adequate space at reasonable rent under conditions where discrimination would be at a minimum.

ITEM R-6. Preferred Location of Public Housing. The persons who said they would move into a public housing project only if they could choose, were asked to state in which part of the city they would prefer to have their project located. The great bulk specified a location on the Near West Side and all but a few of the remainder indicated a preference for the North or Northwest Side.

ITEM R-7: Preferred Public Housing Project. All persons who indicated they would live in a public housing project (even if they would accept public housing without choice) were invited to specify which particular project would be their first choice. Table 3 reports the number of votes received by each project. Jane Addams, located within the Near West Side area, obtained the most votes, followed by Loomis Courts and LeClaire Courts and Lawndale Gardens. However, so few respondents were able to select a particular project, even when presented with a map listing all projects and showing the location of each, that these results are probably a reflection of familiarity with the names rather than with a knowledge of comparative advantages of living in the various alternative projects.

TABLE 3
 PROBLEMS OF RELOCATION IN CLEARANCE AREAS,
 NEAR WEST SIDE AREA

R-1: Choice of relocation site	Reasons for clearance					Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional	
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182	
Elsewhere on the Near West Side	559	181	78	78	222	66	110	46	
Other West Side	316	97	49	46	124	52	33	39	
North Side	280	62	37	45	136	86	39	11	
South Side	106	23	14	36	33	6	7	20	
Suburbs	259	40	46	36	137	59	45	33	
Can't decide	287	113	37	13	124	52	39	33	

TABLE 3-A Per cent Distribution

	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Elsewhere on the Near West Side	30.9	35.2	30.0	30.2	28.7	20.7	40.6	24.7
Other West Side	17.5	18.8	18.9	18.2	15.9	16.1	12.2	21.5
North Side	15.6	12.0	14.1	17.8	17.7	26.8	14.2	6.3
South Side	5.7	4.4	5.3	14.2	4.1	2.0	2.4	10.8
Suburbs	14.4	7.7	17.6	14.2	17.7	18.4	16.5	18.4
Can't decide	15.9	21.9	14.1	5.3	15.9	16.1	14.2	18.4

TABLE 3--Continued

R-2: Reasons for choice of relocation site	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Liking for physical environment	433	110	68	78	177	64	60	53
Liking for social environment	273	58	32	46	137	52	40	45
Liking for housing--size, quality, style, etc.	192	54	28	32	78	38	33	7
Liking for community facilities--church	134	59	-	38	37	8	8	21
Liking for community facilities--school, shopping, other	320	106	32	92	90	28	28	34
Locational conveniences--proximity to work	332	87	69	61	115	40	33	42
Economic attachments--own property, own business	28	6	-	9	13	6	7	-
Economic pressure (rent, etc.)	62	12	14	9	27	6	8	13
Personal attachments--friends, relatives	638	193	60	116	269	91	121	57
Race situation	127	29	22	23	53	40	13	-
Vague or other reasons	197	58	32	19	88	34	26	28
Did not choose a relocation site	287	113	37	13	124	52	39	33

TABLE 3-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Liking for physical environment	28.5	27.4	30.3	32.5	27.3	23.9	25.5	35.7
Liking for social environment	18.0	14.4	14.4	19.1	21.1	19.5	17.0	30.2
Liking for housing--size, quality, style, etc.	12.7	13.3	12.3	13.4	12.1	14.3	14.2	4.7
Liking for community facilities--church	8.8	14.7	-	15.8	5.5	2.8	3.3	14.0
Liking for community facilities--school, shopping, other	20.8	26.2	14.4	38.3	13.7	10.4	11.8	22.5
Locational conveniences--proximity to work	21.7	21.6	30.8	25.4	17.7	14.7	14.2	27.9
Economic attachments--own property, own business	1.8	1.4	-	3.8	2.1	2.4	2.8	-
Economic pressure (rent, etc.)	4.0	2.9	6.2	3.8	4.1	2.4	3.3	8.5
Personal attachments--friends, relatives	42.1	47.8	26.7	48.3	41.2	33.9	51.9	38.0
Race situation	8.2	7.2	9.7	9.6	8.1	14.7	5.7	-
Vague or other reasons	13.2	14.4	14.4	7.7	13.7	12.7	11.3	18.6

TABLE 3--Continued

R-3: Difficulties anticipated if re-located	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	192
No difficulties expected	196	62	32	39	63	21	27	15
Trouble and expense of finding another place that is suitable or can afford	1,102	297	168	121	516	215	178	123
Expense of moving and furnishing a new place	188	31	14	65	78	64	7	7
Loss of income--from rental property, other source	65	19	5	-	41	14	27	-
Increased distance to work, to other facilities	248	65	46	14	123	49	54	20
Hardships due to illness or infirmity of an occupant	46	25	14	-	7	-	7	-
Changing schools for children, loss of other benefits for children	162	58	14	34	56	7	20	29
Separation from relatives and friends	247	88	33	34	92	29	48	15
Finding a tolerant neighborhood (ethnic minorities)	63	19	9	5	30	8	7	15
Other difficulties, and vague reasons	114	43	28	29	14	-	7	7
Can't accept idea of moving	24	12	-	5	7	7	-	-

TABLE 3-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No difficulties expected	10.8	12.0	12.2	15.3	8.1	6.4	9.9	8.2
Trouble and expense of finding another place that is suitable or can afford	61.0	57.6	64.4	47.8	66.5	66.9	65.3	67.8
Expense of moving and furnishing a new place	10.4	6.0	5.4	25.4	10.1	19.9	2.5	4.1
Loss of income--from rental property, other source	3.6	3.6	1.8	-	5.3	4.3	9.9	-
Increased distance to work, to other facilities	13.7	12.5	17.6	5.7	15.9	15.3	19.8	11.0
Hardships due to illness or infirmity of an occupant	2.5	4.8	5.4	-	0.9	-	2.5	-
Changing schools for children, loss of other benefits for children	9.0	11.3	5.4	13.4	7.2	2.1	7.4	15.8
Separation from relatives and friends	13.7	17.0	12.6	13.4	11.9	8.9	17.4	8.2
Finding a tolerant neighborhood (ethnic minorities)	3.5	3.6	3.6	1.9	3.9	2.5	2.5	8.2
Other difficulties, and vague reasons	6.3	8.4	10.8	11.5	1.8	-	2.5	4.1
Can't accept idea of moving	1.3	2.4	-	1.9	0.9	2.1	-	-

TABLE 3--Continued

P-4: Possible benefits if relocated	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units . . .	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
No benefits expected	305	33	56	57	159	60	72	27
Possibility of getting bigger, better, more suitable living place	639	222	89	66	262	94	65	103
Possibility of paying less rent	73	20	16	30	7	-	7	-
Possibility of escaping from present bad housing situation	255	105	32	51	67	31	14	22
Possibility of selecting community with better physical conditions --cleanliness, light, air	424	131	63	61	169	54	71	44
Possibility of selecting community with better social conditions	342	72	42	25	203	91	57	55
Possibility of living closer to work, other facilities	149	33	37	35	44	16	14	14
Possibility of living closer to relatives or friends	65	26	5	20	14	7	7	-
Possibility of living in a "better" or "nicer" neighborhood --traits not specified	161	52	16	10	83	55	28	-
Possibility of escaping from Negroes, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans	137	85	16	5	31	31	-	-
Other reasons, and vague reasons	75	13	16	10	36	15	14	7
Can't accept idea of moving	24	12	-	5	7	7	-	-

TABLE 3-A--Continued

R-4: Possible benefits if re-located--Continued	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No benefits expected	16.9	6.3	21.6	22.4	20.5	18.7	26.5	15.1
Possibility of getting bigger, better, more suitable living place	35.4	43.1	34.2	25.9	33.8	29.2	23.9	56.8
Possibility of paying less rent	4.0	3.8	6.0	11.9	0.9	-	2.6	-
Possibility of escaping from present bad housing situation	14.1	20.4	12.1	19.9	8.6	9.7	5.2	12.3
Possibility of selecting community with better physical condition--cleanliness, light, air	23.5	25.4	24.1	23.9	21.8	16.7	26.1	24.0
Possibility of selecting community with better social conditions	18.9	13.9	16.1	10.0	26.2	28.4	20.9	30.1
Possibility of living closer to work, other facilities	8.2	6.3	14.1	13.9	5.7	5.1	5.2	7.5
Possibility of living closer to relatives or friends	3.6	5.0	2.0	8.0	1.8	2.3	2.6	-
Possibility of living in a "better" or "nicer" neighborhood--traits not specified	8.9	10.1	6.0	4.0	10.7	17.1	10.4	-
Possibility of escaping from Negroes, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans. Other reasons, and vague reasons	7.6	16.4	6.0	2.0	4.0	9.7	-	-
Can't accept idea of moving	4.2	2.5	6.0	4.0	4.6	4.7	5.2	4.1
	1.3	2.5	-	2.0	0.9	2.3	-	-

TABLE 3--Continued

R-5: Willingness to live in public housing	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public streets	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Will not live in public housing	1,054	307	137	63	547	257	186	104
Will live in public housing, but only if can choose place	290	90	43	79	78	19	20	39
Will live in public housing, even without choice of place	463	119	81	112	151	45	67	39

TABLE 3-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Will not live in public housing	59.0	59.5	52.3	24.9	70.7	80.0	68.1	57.0
Will live in public housing, but only if can choose place	15.7	17.4	16.5	31.1	9.8	5.9	7.2	21.5
Will live in public housing, even without choice of place	25.3	23.1	31.2	44.0	19.4	14.1	24.6	21.5

TABLE 3--Continued

R-6: Preferred location of public housing	Reasons for clearance				Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182
Jane Addams	41	22	5	7	7	-	7	-
Other Near West	152	48	33	45	26	-	13	13
Near South Side	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Side	20	-	-	7	13	-	-	13
Far South Side	20	-	-	7	13	13	-	-
North Side	38	20	5	13	-	-	-	13
Northwest Side	19	-	-	-	19	6	-	-
Southwest Side	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Will not live in public housing	1,054	307	137	63	547	257	186	104
Will live in public housing without choice	463	119	81	112	151	45	67	39

TABLE 3-A--Continued

Total Occupied Living Units	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Jane Addams	2.3	4.2	1.9	2.8	0.9	-	2.6	-
Other Near West	8.4	9.3	12.6	17.7	3.4	-	4.8	7.1
Near South Side	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Side	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Far South Side	1.1	-	-	2.8	1.7	-	-	7.1
North Side	1.1	-	-	2.8	1.7	4.0	-	-
Northwest Side	2.1	3.9	1.9	5.1	-	-	-	-
Southwest Side	1.0	-	-	-	2.4	1.9	-	7.1
Will not live in public housing	59.0	59.5	52.3	24.9	70.7	80.0	68.1	57.0
Will live in public housing without choice	25.3	23.1	31.2	44.0	19.4	14.1	24.6	21.5

TABLE 3--Continued

R-7: Preferred housing project	Reasons for clearance					Community facilities clearance			
	Total clearance	Slum clearance	Deleterious clearance	Environmental clearance	Total	Parks and public schools	Racine street widening	Shopping and institutional	
Total Occupied Living Units	1,807	516	261	254	776	321	273	182	
Julia C. Lathrop Homes	11	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	-
Frances Cabrini Homes	11	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	-
Jane Addams Houses	71	17	7	23	24	8	16	-	-
Robert H. Brooks Homes	5	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
Lawndale Gardens	23	-	7	16	6	-	-	-	6
Wentworth Gardens	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trumbull Park Homes	5	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
Maplewood Courts	8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harrison Courts	13	-	-	5	30	-	8	-	22
Ogden Courts	7	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Loomis Courts	42	-	7	5	-	-	-	-	-
Archer Courts	5	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
LeClaire Courts	40	8	7	5	20	6	-	14	-
Racine Courts	6	-	-	-	6	6	-	-	-
Grace Abbott Homes	8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harold L. Ickes Homes	6	-	-	-	6	6	-	-	-
Wells Extension	8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Rockwell Neighborhood	5	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
Roosevelt - Blue Island	15	-	-	-	15	6	9	-	-
Monroe & Campbell	5	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-
Near West Side - no specified project	290	120	61	79	30	-	22	8	-
South Side - no specified project	14	-	-	-	14	-	-	14	-
North Side - no specified project	42	-	7	-	35	19	16	-	-
Northwest Side - no specified project	100	32	14	11	43	13	16	14	-
Southwest Side - no specified project	7	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Will not live in housing project	1,054	307	137	63	547	257	186	104	-

APPENDIX A.

- I. SAMPLING PROCEDURE
- II. SITE OCCUPANT SCHEDULE
- III. INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS

APPENDIX A.

I. SAMPLING PROCEDURE

APPENDIX A.

I. SAMPLING PROCEDURE

At the time of the structure survey, a listing was made of all living units in each structure in the survey area. After the Community Conservation Board designated which structures were suggested for clearance, the listings for the clearance structures were assembled and treated as the "universe" from which the sample was to be drawn. Inasmuch as it was desired to obtain some information about each of the clearance programs, as well as about the total clearance program, it was necessary to sample the living units in each clearance group at a rate that would provide adequate data for that group within the limited budget (the budget called for 300 interviews). The sample was drawn systematically, taking every *n*th living unit in each clearance group. The sampling fraction, and the number of sample cases for each of the four major programs were as follows:

<u>Clearance program</u>	<u>Sampling fraction</u>	<u>Number of sample cases</u>
Slum clearance	1 in 5	104
Deleterious clearance	1 in 4	74
Environmental clearance	1 in 4	65
Community facilities clearance	<u>1 in 6</u>	<u>130</u>
Total	1 in 5 (approx. average)	373

The universe that was sampled (the listings) indicated that the structures contained 1,854 living units, whereas the inspection reports indicated that there were 1,908, or 54 more living units than the sampling universe indicated. It was assumed that the correct figure was 1,908, but that the percentages obtained for the universe of 1,854 were representative.

Of the 373 cases in the sample, completed interviews were obtained for 345. This is a completion rate of 92 per cent, which is adequate to assure that the biases from nonresponse are small. In summary, the universe was sampled at a rate that assured fairly precise results, and the degree of completeness was such that the sampling attained its objective.

The standard error of any proportion reported for one of the clearance groups may be computed by the formula

$$s_p^2 = (1-f) \frac{p \cdot q}{n-1} \quad , \text{ where}$$

s_p^2 is the square of the standard error

p is the proportion for which the standard error is being computed

q is 100 per cent minus *p*

n is the number of cases in the sample (see above)

f is the sampling ratio (e.g., a one in five sample has a value of *f* .20)

The standard error of any proportion reported for the clearance area as a whole may be computed from the formula

$$s_p^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum \frac{N_h^2 (N_h - n_h)}{N_h - 1} \frac{p_h q_h}{n_h} \quad , \text{ where}$$

N is the total number of cases in the universe

N_h is the total number of cases in each clearance group

n_h is the total number of cases in the sample drawn for each clearance group

p_h is the proportion of cases in each clearance group having a given trait

q_h is 100 per cent minus p_h

APPENDIX A.

II. SITE OCCUPANT SCHEDULE

4. Is there a bathtub or shower you can use in this building?

Yes* No (CIRCLE CODE 3 BELOW AND SKIP TO Q.5)

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B AND CODE BELOW

A. is it inside this unit, or is it in some other part of this building?

Inside Outside

B. Is it just for you and the people who live here in this apartment with you, or do you share the (bath)(shower) with people outside this apartment?

Exclusive use of bath or shower.	14-1
Share use of bath or shower.	2
No bath or shower facilities	3

5. Have the walls of your living-room been painted or papered within the past two years? If so, at whose expense -- yours or the landlord's?

Yes, at tenant's expense	15-1
Yes, at landlord's expense	2
Yes, occupied by owner	3
No	4

6. IF VACANT, CIRCLE CODE 5 OR 6 AS APPROPRIATE. ASK EVERYONE ELSE:

Do you (Does the family here) own or rent this (apartment)(house)? (IF OWNED, PROBE: Are you the sole owner, or is it a cooperative ownership?)

<u>OCCUPIED:</u>	Occupied by sole owner	16-1
	Occupied by cooperative owner.	2
	Renter-occupied.	3*
	Occupied rent-free	4**
<u>VACANT:</u>	Vacant, for rent	5*
	Vacant, other.	6

*IF "RENTER-OCCUPIED" OR "VACANT, FOR RENT," ASK A, B, C, AND D:

**IF "OCCUPIED RENT-FREE," ASK D:

A. How much is the rent per month? \$ _____ per month

B. Is it rented furnished or unfurnished? Furnished Unfurnished

C. How much per month does the household pay (do the occupants usually pay) for each of these utilities? (ENTER "NOTHING" IF INCLUDED IN RENT)

Heat.	\$ _____	per month
Electricity for lighting.	\$ _____	per month
Gas or electricity for cooking.	\$ _____	per month
Water	\$ _____	per month

D. Are you related to the owner? 17-

Yes No 18-

19-

20-

7. We'd like a list of all the people -- adults and children -- who live here.

A. Who is the head of the household, and how is each person who lives here related to him?

ENTER NAME OF HEAD: _____

B. How old is _____? (ENTER AGE ON LAST BIRTHDAY)

C. Is _____ single, married, widowed, divorced, or separated?

D. Is _____ working, going to school, both, or neither?

E. (IF EMPLOYED) What kind of work does _____ do?

F. Where does he work? (Where is that located?) (IF "WORKS ALL OVER": Where does he report?)

G. Would you tell me in which one of these general groups _____'s total yearly income fell --

before taxes -- in 1956? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD.) Does that include all of (his)(her)(your)

income -- I mean wages, salary, tips, interest, rents, or money from any other sources? Is

this what (he)(she)(you) was (were) supposed to get before withholding taxes?

(NOTE: IF ANYTHING IS OMITTED, OR IF INCOME WAS GIVEN AFTER TAXES, GET CORRECTED FIGURE AND

ENTER TWO-DIGIT CODE FROM THE CARD.)

FOR PERSONS 14 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER

Line No.	Relationship to household head	Family status (A)	Sex	Age (B)	FOR PERSONS 14 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER		1956 Gross income (G)
					Marital status (C) S M W D Sep X	Work or school (D) W S B N X	
1	Head				1 2 3 4 5 X	1 2 3 4 X	
2					1 2 3 4 5 X	1 2 3 4 X	
3					1 2 3 4 5 X	1 2 3 4 X	
4					1 2 3 4 5 X	1 2 3 4 X	
5					1 2 3 4 5 X	1 2 3 4 X	
6					1 2 3 4 5 X	1 2 3 4 X	

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28
	29
	30
	31
	32

8. ASK FOR EVERY HOUSEHOLD HEAD AND CODE IN EVERY CASE:

In what country were you born?

U.S.* Foreign-born _____
(SPECIFY COUNTRY)

*A. (IF "BORN IN U.S.") Where were your (head's) parents born?

Father born in _____

Mother born in _____

B. ASK EVERYONE:

What language do you and your family speak here at home?

Primary language

C. IF TWO OR MORE LANGUAGES SPOKEN:

Which language does the family speak most of the time?
(CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX ABOVE)

	Mexican	33-1
	Puerto Rican.	2
	Other white -- native-born.	3
	Other white -- foreign-born	4
	Negro	5
	Chinese or Japanese	6
	Other (SPECIFY) _____	7

CODE
IN
EVERY
CASE

9. A. How long have you (head of household) lived in this building?

B. How long (have you)(has he) lived in the Near West Side area?

C. How long (have you)(has he) lived in Chicago?

	<u>A.</u> <u>In building</u>	<u>B.</u> <u>In area</u>	<u>C.</u> <u>In Chicago</u>
Less than 12 months.	34-1	35-1	36-1
12-23 months	2	2	2
2-3 years.	3	3	3
4-5 years.	4	4	4
6-10 years	5	5	5
11-15 years.	6	6	6
16-20 years.	7	7	7
21-25 years.	8	8	8
More than 25 years	9	9	9

10. Suppose you had to (move out of your apartment)(sell your house).
Where would you want to move -- to some place else on the Near
West Side, to the West Side, the North Side, the South Side, or
to the suburbs?

Elsewhere on the Near West Side. . .	37-1*
Other West Side.	2*
North Side	3*
South Side	4*
Suburbs.	5*
Can't decide	6

*A. (UNLESS "CAN'T DECIDE") Why would you rather live there? (What
advantages would there be to living in that neighborhood?) (What
do you like about it?)

11. A. Suppose you had to (move out of your apartment)(sell your house).
What problems or difficulties would you be faced with? (What
kinds of things would present problems?)

B. What advantages or benefits might it have for you? (Even though
it would create problems, how might you benefit?)

12. Well, suppose you had to move out, and you were offered the opportunity to move into a low-rent public housing project. Would you be willing to take an apartment in a housing project if you could decide which one you'd move into?

Yes*

No

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B.

A. Which housing project would you choose? (ENTER NAME OR LOCATION)

B. Would you take an apartment in a public housing project other than the one you'd like to get into?

Yes

No

41-

42-

13. From time to time NORC does follow-up studies in which we like to come back and talk to people we've interviewed before. If we were to come back to see you five years from now and found that you had moved, who would always know where you live? I'd like the name of a friend or relative who would always know how to get in touch with you. And may I have (his)(her) address?

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

Is _____ a friend or a relative? (How is he related to you?)

Relationship to respondent _____

LINE NO. OF INFORMANT: _____
(See Question 7)

DATE OF INTERVIEW: _____

44-

SEX: Male 43-1
Female 2

TIME OF INTERVIEW: _____ M.

45-

INTERVIEWER'S SIGNATURE: _____

APPENDIX A.

III. INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

NEAR WEST SIDE CONSERVATION SURVEY

Site Occupant Schedule

INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS

Purpose of the Survey.

The Community Conservation Board has identified certain structures that are so substandard or deficient that the families living in them may possibly have to be moved into other quarters while the building is being rehabilitated or torn down and replaced with a modern building. The law requires that such relocation shall not be a hardship to the families involved. The City of Chicago is responsible for providing help in finding new, adequate quarters.

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information from a sample of the families that may be moved. This will furnish information with which to plan the total relocation program.

Information To Be Obtained.

You are to obtain the following information about the households assigned to you:

- (a) Number of rooms, facilities, rent, and other information about the living units;
- (b) A list of the persons who live in the unit, with their principal characteristics;
- (c) Certain attitudes including where the family would like to move and problems that will arise.

Sponsorship.

The survey is being conducted by the National Opinion Research Center for the Community Conservation Board of Chicago.

Confidential Nature of the Survey.

All information collected in this survey is CONFIDENTIAL. You must not divulge any information you obtain, or allow your schedules to be read, by anyone but the NORC staff.

Introducing Yourself.

Introduce yourself and explain your mission somewhat as follows:

"Good morning. I'm Elizabeth Smith of the National Opinion Research Center. We're working on a survey, and I'd like to ask you a few questions."

Keep your introduction as brief as possible. If the respondent is suspicious, show him your identification. Assure him that the entire interview will take only ten or fifteen minutes.

In some cases you will be asked specific questions about the purpose of the study and its sponsorship; in other cases you may find it wise to tell a bit more about the survey to help gain admittance. But don't spend a great deal of time "selling" your respondent, for you may simply arouse his suspicions and suggest reasons for refusing to talk to you. In any case, here are some questions you may be asked and the kinds of answers we suggest:

Who are you doing this for?

I work for the National Opinion Research Center, and we're doing this survey for the Community Conservation Board of the City of Chicago.

What good will it do?

We're trying to get information about housing conditions and people's needs, so that the City can do a better job of helping people who need help.

Why me?

We're interviewing a sample of the people who live around here. First we listed all the places that people live, and then the statisticians in the office figured out where we had to go to get a good cross-section of the people who live here. They don't give us names, but we have to interview the people who live at each house or apartment they tell us to. I'm not allowed to substitute the people who live in some other house or apartment, because then our sample wouldn't be any good.

Will I have to move?

or

Will they tear my house down?

That's something I don't know. We have nothing to do with the action to be taken. I understand that many of these buildings will be replaced, but the final decision hasn't been reached. It's our job to get the facts about the kinds of problems people will face IF they have to move, so that the Community Conservation Board can plan more intelligently. I'm afraid that's all I know. If you want more information, it might be a good idea to call the Community Conservation Board (telephone number: Delaware 7-5252, ext. 397). Mr. Frank Kirk can tell you a lot more about this than I can.

Identification of the Living Unit.

Full identification of the living units to be interviewed have been entered on the schedules in the office. Make certain that you locate this living unit and interview a person living in it. No substitutions are permitted. In scientific sampling, it is necessary to interview only the units that fall into the sample, even if it means calling back until someone is found at home.

Locating the Assigned Living Units.

If you have any trouble finding a living unit assigned to you, check the goldenrod Living Unit Listing Form (Survey 394, F-2) for the appropriate building. A separate listing form has been completed for each structure. Check the structure number entered in the top portion of your questionnaire (columns 8-10) and then consult the listing sheet bearing the same structure number. One living unit has been listed on each line of the goldenrod form. Check the living units on the lines immediately before and after the one you are trying to locate, to help you to identify the unit you are seeking. Remember that "right" and "left" refer to the side which is on your right or left as you face the main entrance of the building from the outside; similarly "front" and "back" should be interpreted as the front or back, facing the main entrance from outside the building.

If living units were skipped: When you interview occupants of your sample living units, you may sometimes find living units which the inspector missed when he originally listed the segment. What appeared--from external appearances --to be a one-family home may actually be a three-family home. What appeared to be one living unit may have been converted to two smaller apartments or may actually be a rooming house. When you look for the "second floor apartment," you may find that there are actually three apartments on the second floor and that the lister thought there was only one.

Add skipped units to the list. Whenever you approach a sample living unit for an interview and find that there are two or more living units--not one--which were thought to be only one, add these additional listings to the goldenrod form AFTER THE RED LINE. Use one line for each additional living unit.

Get interviews in skipped units that fit description of a sample unit. Conduct an interview in each extra living unit you found at the precise address at which you were to obtain an interview. Before conducting these additional interviews, however, check carefully to make certain that the "extra" units were not previously listed on separate lines of the listing sheet. If there are more than three units which fit the description of a sample living unit, add the units to the listing but consult your supervisor before conducting any interviews at that address.

This rule applies only to cases in which the living unit listed on a sample line proved to be ambiguous. The following examples are offered to clarify the correct procedure:

- (1) Sample line calls for interview at 791 Main Street, but you find a 3-family building at this address. Add the second and third floor apartments to the listing (and label the one previously listed as "first floor") and get interviews at all three.
- (2) Sample line calls for interview at 789 Main Street, 2nd floor, but you find three apartments on the second floor. Add the additional two apartments to the listing and interview the occupants at all three. (If there were four or more apartments on the second floor, you would get no interviews, but would first consult your supervisor.)

- (3) Sample line calls for interview at 787 Main Street, 2nd floor but not at 787 Main Street, 1st floor. In walking up the stairs you see a rear apartment on the first floor that the lister missed and a rear apartment on the second floor that the lister missed. You should add both missed living units to the listing, and you would interview at both second floor apartments (since the second floor was listed on a sample line) but you would not interview at either apartment on the first floor (since the first floor was not listed on a sample line).

Assign a new living unit number to the skipped units. If you find any skipped living units where you should conduct interviews, fill out the top of a blank questionnaire (white F-1) with the correct identifying data. For Living Unit No., enter the line number on which you listed the skipped living unit preceded by the letter "M." For example, enter "M-19" if you listed the rear apartment on the second floor on line 19.

If the original listing was so poor that you cannot follow the above instructions with confidence, write out a full description of the situation and consult your supervisor. Do not conduct interviews unless you are reasonably certain that you have the right living unit.

If sample living units are non-existent. If you find that the lister thought that a garage with curtains was a living unit, write across the top of the questionnaire for that living unit the notation, "No living quarters--garage only," or "No living quarters--2nd floor is part of same living unit as 1st floor," or whatever is the case. If what the lister thought was a two-family home is actually a single family house, the first apartment listed will be considered the living unit, while the subsequent listing within the structure must be considered non-existent; this would mean that an interview would be taken if the first floor apartment fell on a sample line, but not if the second floor apartment listing fell on a sample line. When in doubt, consult your supervisor.

Whom To Interview.

You may interview any adult member of the family--i.e., any person living in the assigned living unit who is able to provide the information with "reasonable" accuracy. If an individual can give you most but not all of the information you need, you may find it necessary to make a call-back or to call another member of the household to complete the data. For example, if a wife can answer all questions but says her husband doesn't tell her his income, get the rest of the data from her and arrange to get in touch with the husband to get the income. If, however, the wife doesn't know the exact income and indicates that her husband would have trouble guessing, too, try to get her best estimate.

Completing Schedules for Vacant Living Units.

Questions 1 through 6 must be completed for every vacant living unit. Try to get the janitor, the landlord, or some other authorized person to let you inside the vacant unit and to give you the answers to the questions which you cannot obtain through inspection. If there is no such person on the premises or nearby, try to determine which other person in the structure may be able to give you the necessary information. For example, the occupant of the second floor left apartment is likely to have an apartment identical to the third floor left apartment, and he might be the logical person to ask for the information. If you can find no one who can give you the necessary information, consult your supervisor.

Non-interview Cases.

If, for any reason, you cannot complete an interview for a sample living unit, write up a full description of the situation, and attach it to the questionnaire for that unit. Turn both your write-up and the questionnaire over to your supervisor and wait for further instructions.

Refusals. Indicate who refused and why. Give full names if possible. Also indicate the relationship of the person refusing to the household head.

Break-offs. Handle in the same way as refusals.

Not at home after repeated calls. Indicate the approximate time of day and the day of the week when you tried to find someone at home. Give any information you can get from neighbors about the family's living habits and tell us what you suggest we try in order to get the interview.

Language problems. If no one in the living unit speaks English and you cannot find someone in the same structure who can interpret for you, report what language is spoken and also tell us when we will be most likely to find an eligible respondent at home.

Other reasons for non-interview. If you can't get an interview for some other reason, give us a full description of the problem including all the facts that you think will help us to get the interview.

Materials You Will Need.

Please check your kit and make certain that you have all of the following:

1. Assignment Sheet--Form No. 3--listing all living units assigned to you
2. Living Unit Listing Forms--goldenrod Form No. 2--for every structure in your assignment
3. Questionnaires--F-1--with identifying data completed for every unit which appears on your Assignment Sheet.
4. Blank questionnaires to use for interviews in sample living units that the lister may have missed
5. Income card to use in Question 7
6. Interviewer Pay Vouchers--Form No. 4
7. Non-interview Report Forms--pink Form No. 5

THE QUESTIONS

QUESTION 1: Number of rooms. Count only whole rooms, such as kitchens, bedrooms, dining-rooms, living-rooms, permanently enclosed sun porches of substantial size, finished basement or attic rooms, recreation rooms, or other rooms suitable or used for living purposes; and rooms used for office purposes by a person living in the living unit. Count as a separate room a kitchen, a kitchenette, or "half-room" which is partitioned off from floor to ceiling; but count as only one room a combined kitchenette and dinette separated only by shelves or cabinets.

Do not count: Bathrooms, strip or pullman kitchens, halls or foyers, alcoves, pantries, laundries, closets or storage space, unused basement or attic rooms not suitable for living quarters, rooms subleased for office purposes by a person not living in the living unit, and rooms designed or converted for business use.

Count all rooms in the living unit. Include rooms for lodgers if such rooms are part of the living unit you are enumerating. If there are several living units in a house, make sure that the rooms you are counting are only for the living unit you are enumerating. All rooms that are suitable for living quarters, even though they are not being used at the time of enumeration, must be included.

Handling shared rooms: In the case of kitchens (or other rooms) shared by occupants of two or more living units, include the kitchen as a room in the living unit to which it is most readily accessible.

QUESTION 2: Water supply.

Hot and cold water: In order for a unit to be classified as having both hot and cold water, it is not necessary that the hot water be available at all times. In some cases hot water may be available only during the heating season. The unit should, nevertheless, be reported as having both hot and cold water. On the other hand, if there is inside the unit a sink with both hot and cold water taps, but the hot water heater has been broken for a long time and is not likely to be repaired in the near future, then indicate cold water only--the hot water facility is present but is not operable.

QUESTIONS 3 AND 4: Toilet and bathing facilities.

In order to be coded as "for exclusive use," these facilities must be located inside the living unit and not shared with anyone. All other facilities are "shared."

If the respondent reports that he shares the bath or toilet with another family with whom he shares the dwelling unit, however, code "exclusive use." He is coded "share use" only if the persons with whom he shares such facilities live in some other dwelling unit. If you should encounter the unusual case in which the respondent and his family have the exclusive use of bath or toilet located outside his own dwelling unit (but within the structure), record a full description of the situation and do not code the reply.

QUESTION 5: Interior decoration.

This question is intended to determine the regularity of maintenance. If the respondent has not lived in the living unit for two years, estimate from the appearance of the paper or paint. If it is soiled, faded, chipped, or cracked with apparent age, code as "No." If the tenant painted or papered but received a reduction in rent for a month or so, code as "At landlord's expense."

QUESTION 6: Tenure or rent.

Occupied by owner: A dwelling unit is "occupied by owner" if the owner or co-owner is one of the persons living in the unit (or absent from the household for a short period of time, such as a family member in the armed forces or temporarily working away from home), even if he has not fully paid for the unit or has a mortgage on it. Consider an apartment unit in a building that is owned cooperatively as occupied by cooperative-owner if the owner of the apartment lives in it.

Occupied by renter: A unit is "occupied by renter" if any money rent is paid or contracted for.

Occupied rent-free: Units "occupied rent-free" are those which are not occupied by the owner and for which no money rent payment is made or contracted for. Such units are usually occupied rent-free in exchange for services rendered, or sometimes the right to occupy the unit is the gift of a relative or friend who does not live in the unit. For example, a caretaker or janitor who receives the use of a house or apartment as part of his salary, occupies the unit rent-free. Do not consider a unit as "occupied rent-free" if any rent at all is paid, even though this rent is nominal--e.g., if a janitor occupies an apartment for which he pays only half the rent paid for similar apartments in the structure, report the unit as "renter-occupied" rather than as "occupied rent-free."

Monthly rent: Enter the rent contracted for, regardless of whether it includes furniture, heating fuel, electricity, cooking fuel, water, or other services sometimes supplied. If rent is reported on other than a monthly basis, convert the amount to a monthly rate--multiply weekly rents by $4\frac{1}{3}$, semi-monthly rents by 2, etc. Report the sum to the nearest dollar--omit fractions of a dollar.

An apartment is rented as "furnished" if the landlord supplies bed, some living-room furniture, and breakfast or dining furniture--even though the tenant may add to this or store it and substitute his own furniture.

Utilities: Be careful to get monthly figures. Most utilities bills in Chicago cover a two-month period. Be sure the respondent is reporting the average monthly cost, not the average bill. Also be sure that the figure for "heat" is the average, not the typical, bill in the winter when bills are higher than usual--a 12-month average.

QUESTION 7: Absolute accuracy is essential in this question. Use one line to enter information about each person living in the household. Every person whose usual place of residence is in this DU must be listed here--even though he may be away from home temporarily. This includes lodgers, distant relatives, or anyone else who regards this household as his usual place of residence. For each person listed, obtain and record Items A through G, except where certain items are inapplicable for a given individual.

Some definitions involving family status:

A family is a group of two or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption, and living together in the same household.

The primary family consists of the head of the household and all other persons living in the household who are related to the head by blood, marriage, or adoption. This includes in-laws, grandchildren, nephews, and nieces of the head, as well as his spouse and children.

A secondary family consists of a person who is not related to the head (such as a lodger, a servant, etc.), who lives in the household along with his spouse, children, or other relatives who are not related to any member of the primary family. A secondary family rents a room or other minor portion of the dwelling unit but does not really share the entire dwelling unit on a fifty-fifty basis.

A second family in a joint household must be clearly distinguished from a secondary family. Where the living unit is shared by two independent families--such as two friends, each with his own family in the living unit--sharing the living unit as equals, one family is arbitrarily designated as the primary family, and the other is classified as a second family in a joint household. Additional independent families are classified as third families, etc.

A sub-family is a grouping within any kind of family. If a son, daughter, brother, or other relative of the household head is married, widowed, or divorced, and his spouse or child is living with him in the household, this person and his immediate family group (spouse and/or children) constitute a sub-family.

A primary individual is a person who is not a member of a family in the living unit but who is the head of the household.

A secondary individual is a person who is not the head of the household and who is not a member of any family group within the household.

How to list occupants: Instead of listing people by name, enter their relationship to the head of the household. Be careful, however, to enter the full name of the household head in the space provided near the top of the page. The household head is the chief breadwinner of the primary family (see above). For married couples living together, the husband is automatically defined as the household head.

If the head's son or daughter (or a sibling) is married and lives, together with his spouse or a child, in the parent's household, report the spouse or child in terms of relationship to the person who has the more immediate relationship to the head; for example, report "son's wife" or "son's daughter" rather than "daughter-in-law" or "granddaughter." Similarly, if a lodger or other person not related to the head is married or has a child, and if the spouse or child lives in the household, report as "lodger's wife" or "servant's child," etc.

In short, the relationship to the head should be listed in such a way that we can immediately see each occupant's relationship to every other occupant of the living unit. For example, here are the right and wrong ways to list one kind of household:

<u>RIGHT</u>	<u>WRONG</u>
Head	Head
Head's wife	Head's wife
Head's daughter	Head's daughter
Head's daughter's husband	Head's son-in-law
Head's daughter's daughter	Head's granddaughter
Head's son	Head's son
Head's father	Head's father
Head's mother	Head's mother
Lodger	Lodger
Lodger's wife	Lodger

The first example makes every relationship within the dwelling unit clear. When we look at the second example, however, we can't tell whether the son-in-law is the husband of the daughter recorded on Line 3 or whether he is the husband of a daughter who is serving a lifetime prison sentence, or whether the granddaughter is the child of the daughter, son, or son-in-law.

A. Family status of household members. In the column headed "Family status," you must classify each person according to the code which appears below. The actual coding may be postponed until after the interview, but you must take pains during the interview to clarify every relationship so that you have the information which will permit you to handle the coding. To insure that these data are correct, follow this procedure:

1. List all members of one sub-family in sequence and draw a bracket to show who is included in the sub-family.
2. List all sub-families within a family grouping before listing unrelated individuals or secondary families.
3. Handle each secondary family in the same way as you did the primary family.
4. Code each individual as follows:

- Primary family, not member of a sub-family 1
- Primary family, member of a sub-family 2

- Member of a secondary family 3
- Member of a second-family in a joint household 4
- Member of a third-family in a joint household 5

- Primary individual, head of household but not member of family 8
- Secondary individual, unrelated individual not related to
head of any family in the living unit 9

Applying the definitions. The following examples will help to clarify the definitions and show how to code family status for each person listed:

Example 1: John Doe, his wife Jane, and their three children have their own apartment, but John's mother lives with them. This is an uncomplicated kind of living unit, typical of most, and the proper listing is:

<u>Line</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Relationship to</u> <u>household head</u>	<u>Family</u> <u>status</u>
1	Head	1
2	Head's wife	1
3	Head's son	1
4	Head's daughter	1
5	Head's daughter	1
6	Head's mother	1

This is a normal family, with no sub-groupings within it. Therefore, everyone is coded "1" for primary family but not a member of a sub-family. If John's father as well as his mother lived with him, his parents would constitute a sub-family (married couple) and would be coded "2."

Example 2: Robert Jones, his wife, mother-in-law, his widowed daughter and her two children, and the Smiths who rent out the spare room, live together. The following is the proper listing:

<u>Line No.</u>	<u>Relationship to household head</u>	<u>Family status</u>
1	Head	1
2	Head's wife	1
3	(Head's daughter	2
4	(Head's daughter's son	2
5	(Head's daughter's son	2
6	Head's wife's mother	1
7	(Lodger	3
8	(Lodger's wife	3

The Joneses' daughter and her two sons comprise a sub-family. The mother-in-law is a member of the primary family, but she has no spouse and no unmarried minor children living with her; therefore she is not a member of a sub-family. The Smiths are a secondary family because they are related to each other but are not related to any member of the primary family and merely rent a room--i.e., they are not coded "4" because they do not really share the apartment.

Example 3: Two families, each consisting of a married couple and child, share a house. Jim Thorpe, his wife, and son found the house, but the Thorpes share the house, share the use of the kitchen, split the cost of rent and utilities, and no one knows whom to designate as the head of the household. They also have a lodger, who acts as baby-sitter in return for her room. In this case the interviewer arbitrarily designates one family as the primary family, and the other automatically becomes the second family in a two-family household:

<u>Line No.</u>	<u>Relationship to household head</u>	<u>Family status</u>
1	Head	1
2	Head's wife	1
3	Head's daughter	1
4	Head of 2nd family	4
5	Wife of 2nd head	4
6	Son of 2nd head	4
7	Lodger	9

Example 4: Elderly Mrs. Blaine, a widow who owns her home, shares it with a young couple and their infant son. The young Colemans are not related to Mrs. Blaine, but they share the kitchen and the rest of the house with her. Here is the proper listing:

<u>Line No.</u>	<u>Relationship to household head</u>	<u>Family status</u>
1	Head	8
2	Head of family	4
3	Wife of family head	4
4	Son of family head	4

Even though there is only one family (the young Colemans), they are a second family in a two-family household. They cannot be considered a secondary family because they share the house on a coordinate basis with Mrs. Blaine. They cannot be considered the primary family because the family group does not include the head of the household.

B. Age at last birthday. For each individual, enter age as a two-digit number--i.e., enter "00" for children under one year of age, "01" for those over one year old, etc. Enter "99" for any person 99 or over.

C. Marital status. Circle the appropriate column for each person 14 or over:

- S --- Single (never married, now or previously)
- M --- Currently married and spouse is alive
- W --- Widowed and not remarried
- D --- Divorced and not remarried
- Sep - Separated from spouse. Do not include cases where marriage is still intact and spouse is temporarily absent--e.g., a woman whose husband is in the service and is expected to return home should be coded "M" rather than "Sep."
- X --- Person is under 14 years of age

D. Attending school, is working. Circle the appropriate column for each person 14 or over:

- W --- Working for wages, salary, or profit, but not attending school
- S --- Attending school
- B --- Both working and attending school (including both full-time and part-time involvement in both or either)
- N --- Neither working nor attending school
- X --- Person is under 14 years of age

E. Occupation. Enter the kind of work the person does and the kind of place in which he works. Do not confuse his occupation with his industry. For example, enter "shipping clerk, stockyards." Enter "school teacher in private college." Enter "salesclerk in department store." If you cannot obtain a clear job title, get a clear description of the person's duties and note this in the margin, clearly labelling the person to whom it applies. For industry, give the kind of business (for example, "retail grocery"), not the company name (i.e., not "A & P").

F. Place of work. Enter the location, not the name of employer. For example, enter "47th and Ashland," "State and Madison," etc. If a street intersection cannot be listed, give approximate location by reference to neighborhoods in the city, such as "North Lawndale area." For suburban places of work, list the incorporated suburb nearest the place of work. If an individual works all over the area, or if you cannot get one location for some other reason, enter the clearest possible explanation of the circumstances. For example:

"Works for railroad on run between Chicago and New York. Reports to office at Polk and Dearborn Streets."

"Salesman, visits offices all over South Side and South suburbs. Uses own home as office."

G. Income. For each person 14 and over, enter the person's income during 1956. In asking about income, hand the respondent the income card and ask Question 7 G, first for the head. Then ask similar question for each other person 14 or over. Make sure the respondent is reporting "total income" and not "take-home pay" and is giving all income--tips, bonuses, dependency allotments, etc., as well as wages, salary, etc. Enter the appropriate two-digit code from the income card.

The income to be entered is income before taxes, social security, and other deductions. It should include all money income received by the individual--wages or salary, piece-rate payments, commissions, tips, bonuses, gifts from employers, profits from own business, fees, royalties, alimony, annuities, pensions, dependency allotments from persons in the armed services, contributions and gifts from persons not members of the household, dividends, interest, insurance receipts (i.e., receipts from paid-up endowment policies or the life insurance of a deceased person), income from the rental of property or from roomers and/or boarders, social security benefits, unemployment compensation, veterans' benefits, workman's compensation, etc. "Income" includes practically all money received by the person (plus money earned by him but not received). There are, however, a few types of money receipts which are not to be considered as income:

- (a) Allowance--money given to cover living expenses by one member of a family to another in the same household.
- (b) Borrowing--money borrowed from a bank, finance company, relatives, or other sources.
- (c) Capital gains and losses--money received from the sale of a capital asset by persons who are not in the business of selling such commodities: (1) the sale of stocks and bonds by persons who are not securities dealers; (2) the sale of a house by a person who is not a dealer in real estate; (3) the sale of a private automobile by a person who is not a car dealer.
- (d) Lump-sum payments--money received in one lump sum from insurance policies, estates, trusts, inheritances, gifts, etc.; but regular or periodic receipts from these sources are income.
- (e) Pay "in kind"--pay "in kind" is not included as income, even though received as payment for work performed.
- (f) Refunds--refunds of money for merchandise purchased but returned, refunds of money deposited as an option for the right to purchase, refunds of overpayment of taxes, etc.
- (g) Withdrawals of savings--money obtained from the withdrawals of bank deposits, the sale of U.S. savings bonds, or other assets; only the interest received from bank deposits, bonds, or loans is income.

In some cases, "income" includes money not actually received--i.e., amounts deducted (from wages) for taxes, social security, etc. Thus, "take-home" pay is not total wages or salary. The respondent may often report the "take-home" pay--that is, wages or salary, minus deductions for withholding tax, retirement pay, union dues, war bonds, etc. If "take-home" pay is reported, the deductions should be added to it and the total counted as wage or salary income. If the respondent knows only the amount of "take-home" pay, it may be necessary to itemize the deductions in order to get an estimate of the total before deductions.

Business income is net money income or profit from the operation of a business, consisting of total (or gross) money receipts, less the business expenses: (1) Total money receipts is the value of all goods sold or services rendered; include the value of any net inventory increase. (2) Business expenses include cost of merchandise purchased, rent, heat, light, and power expenses of the business quarters, depreciation of machinery and other business property, decrease in the value of inventory, wages and salaries paid to employees, business taxes, interest on the business mortgages and debts. Capital expenditures, such as the purchase of new buildings or machines or permanent improvements of existing buildings or machinery should not be considered as expenses; only the annual depreciation on such improvements or purchases is expense. Personal expenses for such things as food, shelter, personal taxes, life or health insurance, improvement of living quarters, or purchase of bonds, should not be considered as business expenses.

Income must be on an annual basis. Where the respondent knows only weekly wages or monthly salary, multiply by the number of weeks or months during which the person was employed at this rate in 1956. Do not simply multiply weekly wages by 52, without making sure that the person was (or will be) employed at the specified wage for the entire year. This is particularly important in the case of individuals in the building trades, who are frequently employed only part of the year--who may even, in fact, work only part of the time during the building season. The entry is to be in terms of the codes shown on the income card.

QUESTION 8: Race and nativity. Unless there is definite evidence to the contrary, assume that all members are the same race or of the same nativity as the respondent. Where you determine that the family is actually of mixed race, describe the situation in full and do not circle any of the "race" entries. In coding, follow these rules:

Mexican--Include persons born in Mexico and those whose parents were born in Mexico. If the head and his parents are native-born, but Spanish is spoken in the home, it will be necessary to determine the original place of origin; if Mexico, code "Mexican."

Puerto Rican--Include persons born in Puerto Rico and those whose parents were born in Puerto Rico. If the head and his parents are native-born, but Spanish is spoken in the home, it will be necessary to determine the original place of origin; if Puerto Rico, code "Puerto Rican."

Chinese or Japanese--Include persons born in China or Japan and those whose parents were born in China or Japan. If the head and his parents are native-born, but Chinese or Japanese is spoken in the home, it will be necessary to determine the original place of origin; if China or Japan, code "Chinese" or "Japanese."

Other white--foreign-born--Foreign-born persons who are not Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Oriental, shall be included here.

Other white--native-born--Include all other white persons born in the United States.

Negro--Code by observation. Do not ask respondent whether he is a Negro.

Other (SPECIFY)--When in doubt how to code a given person's race or nativity, code here, and write out a full description of the situation.

QUESTION 9: Be sure to ask all three parts of the question and to code each part in the proper column. Replies should be given in terms of continuous residence to the present. If a person formerly lived in the neighborhood, moved away, and recently returned, count only the time since the return.

QUESTION 10: In this question (and in Questions 11 and 12) you may have to remind the respondent that you did not say he would have to move but are merely asking what would happen if a move were necessary. If necessary, remind the respondent that this survey is being conducted to help anticipate problems, so that the planners can do a better job of meeting people's problems when re-location becomes a reality--but remember that those interviewed may not be required to move.

** THE NEAR WEST SIDE DEFINED **

For purposes of this survey, the Near West Side is defined as the area bounded by Kinzie on the North, 16th Street on the south, the Chicago River on the east, and Talman Avenue on the west.

Don't accept a "Can't decide" answer on the first part of Question 10 unless you have probed and find respondent has a real conflict on where he would like to move. If necessary, probe: "Well, as things look to you now, where do you think you'd go?" or "I guess nobody really knows until the time comes, but what's your best guess? Where would you want to move?" In either case, repeat the five alternatives.

In Question 10 A, do not accept vague answers like "It's a good place to live," "I just like it," or "My family likes it," and guard against circular answers like "Of all the places in Chicago, I like this neighborhood the best." We want to know specifically what kinds of things he likes about the neighborhood. Probe: "What do you like about it?" or "What kinds make you like it better than other neighborhoods?" or "Can you give me some examples of the kinds of things that you like about the _____ Side?"

QUESTION 11: Again, watch for vague answers like "I'd have an awful lot of trouble," or "It would be just terrible." The amount of trouble is a subjective judgment, and we can't tell how people use the term. It's important for us to know whether this respondent looks on a projected move as difficult because "we can barely manage to pay the rent as it is, and we'd never find another place as cheap as this," or "It's hard to give up the place where you've lived most of your life and where all three of your kids was born--it's got memories." The first reply involves a clear financial hardship, while the second involves an emotional tie which is an equally real and important problem for many persons. You'll find--if you probe--some respondents concerned about the difficulties of finding the kind of apartment they want, some who are resistant to any kind of change, some who will raise other kinds of difficulties we can't anticipate. That's why most initial answers to this question must be probed.

Similarly, watch for vague responses to 11 B. If a respondent has just regaled you with a long list of difficulties, this does not preclude the possibility that there are also positive advantages to be derived. You may have to reassure a person that "I know how you feel, but can you think of any way at all that you might benefit if you had to move out while this place was being fixed up or replaced?"

QUESTION 12: Your respondent may already be familiar with Chicago housing projects, but you may present the list and the map showing the location of various projects. Again, reassurances that no one is going to force him to move into a housing project may be in order. Similarly, you may have to point out that you are a "researcher" and can't get him an apartment in a housing project.

QUESTION 13: This information is needed if we ever wish to conduct follow-up studies on what happens to the people in a relocation site. Too often, residents move out of the area as soon as the word is passed that the area is slated for a relocation project. Unless we have some way of locating these people in the future, meaningful research is impossible. Reassure your respondent that this information is confidential, but get the information.