

TENANT MOBILITY AND ADJUSTMENT UNDER THE
1970 UNIFORM RELOCATION ACT

by

Gary R. Allen
Research Economist

and

Michael A. Perfater
Research Analyst

(The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this report are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the sponsoring agencies.)

Virginia Highway & Transportation Research Council
(A Cooperative Organization Sponsored Jointly by the Virginia
Department of Highways & Transportation and
the University of Virginia)

In Cooperation with the U. S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

Charlottesville, Virginia

February 1978

VHTRC 78-R38

GENERAL GUIDANCE AND ADVICE ON THE RESEARCH REPORTED HEREIN HAS
BEEN PROVIDED BY THE ECONOMICS RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- MR. T. A. NEWBY, Chairman, Purchasing Agent, VDH&T
- MR. G. W. ALEXANDER, Assistant District Engineer, VDH&T
- MR. R. J. BOYD, JR., Personnel Officer, VDH&T
- MR. A. S. BROWN, Assistant Secondary Roads Engineer, VDH&T
- MR. D. L. EURE, Programming & Scheduling Engineer, VDH&T
- MR. C. O. LEIGH, Maintenance Engineer, VDH&T
- MR. W. A. MCFARLANE, Deputy Attorney General for Transp., VDH&T
- MR. D. D. MCGEEHAN, Research Analyst, VH&TRC
- MR. J. P. MILLS, JR., Traffic and Safety Engineer, VDH&T
- MR. T. B. OMOHUNDRO, Fiscal Manager, VDH&T
- MR. E. T. ROBB, Assistant Environmental Quality Engineer, VDH&T
- MR. W. P. TUCKER, Right-of-Way Engineer, VDH&T
- MR. J. T. WARREN, Management Services Officer, VDH&T
- MR. J. E. YEATTS, Assistant Location & Design Engineer, VDH&T
- MR. B. C. YOWELL, Realtor Officer, FHWA

PREFACE

On the basis of the results of a previous study by the authors, it was recommended that changes in either the provisions of the 1970 Uniform Relocation Act or the manner in which it is implemented should be made in that portion of the Act dealing with owners rather than in the portion relating to tenants. However, that recommendation overlooked the fact that the procedure of paying relocation housing payments (RHPs) to tenants in a lump sum allows for the possibility of circumvention of the intent of the law with respect to the use of RHPs for decent, safe, and sanitary (DSS) replacement housing. Concern over the rapid vacation of DSS housing after receipt of the lump sum rental payment has been expressed most recently by the participants in the 1977 Region III FHWA Right-of-Way Seminar in Dover, Delaware. The results of this present study, although case specific, provide evidence that the problem might not be as severe as conjecture leads one to believe. The authors urge the reader to view this study from two standpoints. First, from the evidence it provides about the likely behavior patterns of tenant displacees with comparable socioeconomic characteristics in other states; and, secondly, from the methodological approach used for studying the influence of the lump sum payment procedure on tenant displacee adjustment.

1954

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Relocation procedures under the 1970 Act appear to be a significant influence neither on the length of residence in the original replacement housing nor upon a decision to move from it. Approximately 81.0% of the study respondents lived in the replacement housing at least two years and 64.0% were in the replacement five years after relocation. These figures are comparable with mobility patterns of Virginia's general population.
2. Rental cost is not a significant influence on the decision of tenants to move from replacement housing. Only 12.5% of those who moved cited cost as a factor.
3. Tenant displacees do not, as a rule, move shortly after relocation. Only 12.5% moved in the six-month period immediately following their relocation. Twenty-five percent of the group that moved stayed in their replacement at least three years.
4. Rent levels at the time of the study were only moderately higher than at the time of relocation. Among the 56.0% of respondents whose rent increased, the 1977 mean rent of \$140 was \$25 higher than the mean rent level at the time of relocation. Thus, it is not surprising that rent level did not precipitate early moves by tenant displacees.
5. The manner in which replacement housing payments (RHPs) are paid to tenants (whether in a lump sum or annually) has no significant effect on either mobility (that is, how long a tenant remains in the replacement) or on how the RHP is used. Specifically, tenant displacees who receive lump sum RHPs are no more likely to remain in the replacement for only a short period of time than are those who receive the RHP in annual installments. Further, the displacee who receives a lump sum RHP is as likely to use it exclusively for rent as is the displacee who receives the RHP in annual installments.
6. Lump sum RHPs were received by approximately 37.0% of respondents, while 53.0% received four annual installments. The average RHP was \$2,300, well below the \$4,000 maximum allowable RHP for tenant displacees. Of the respondents, 29.0% said that the RHP received covered their rental increases for at least four years after relocation. This figure includes those who had no

increase in rent. These findings suggest that the \$4,000 maximum RHP is only in rare cases insufficient.

7. RHPs were used by about 76% of the respondents to help cover rent. Only 18% said none of the RHP was used for rent. Thirty-six percent of the respondents used part of the RHP to purchase a durable good such as a car or land. Furthermore, significant but weak relationships exist between occupation and age and the way RHPs are used. The unskilled, the retired, and the older displacees place the RHP into their general budget more frequently than do other groups. Moreover, the way in which the RHP is used has no significant effect on the mobility of the displacee after relocation. That is, use of the RHP for nonrent items does not impinge upon the decision to remain in or move from the original replacement housing. These findings suggest that concern on the part of practitioners as to how RHPs are being used by displacees is, for the most part, unwarranted.
8. Respondents indicated a preference for the lump sum payment procedure, although the margin of preference (58%) was not as high as the authors had expected. This tends to confirm those findings which suggest that the payment procedure is rather unimportant to tenants.
9. Migration from DSS replacement dwellings to non-DSS dwellings shortly after relocation and receipt of RHPs does not appear widespread among tenant displacees.
10. The authors conclude that the payment of lump sum RHPs to Virginia tenants is no less desirable from the standpoint of providing incentives consistent with the intent of the 1970 Act than is the payment of RHPs in annual installments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings from the study led the authors to make the following recommendations. Recommendation 3 pertains exclusively to the 1970 Act and is, therefore, addressed to the Federal Highway Administration.

1. It is recommended that no change be made in the Department's procedure for the lump sum disbursements of RHPs. Not only is the lump sum procedure less costly to administer, it is no less desirable from the standpoint of providing incentives consistent with the intent of the 1970 Act than is the payment of RHPs by annual installments.
2. It is recommended that the Department continue to provide tenant displacees the option of receiving RHPs in either a lump sum or in equal annual installments. In those instances where annual installments are chosen, the efficacy of a continual monitoring of these cases by the Department is questionable.
3. In view of the fact that this study finds payments adequate for tenant displacees in Virginia, it is recommended that consideration be given to changing the current RHP limits for tenants only after the completion of a study involving the amount of RHPs being paid in other states. While the evidence from this study strongly suggests that current limits are adequate for Virginia, the authors feel that generalizing this point relative to the nation as a whole is inappropriate.

1958

TENANT MOBILITY AND ADJUSTMENT UNDER THE
1970 UNIFORM RELOCATION ACT

by

Gary R. Allen
Research Economist

and

Michael A. Perfater
Research Analyst

INTRODUCTION

In a previous study by the authors, ⁽¹⁾ displacees, both owners and renters, were queried about the social and economic impact relocation had had upon them and many aspects of their lifestyle. The purpose of that research was to determine the degree to which the relocation program administered by the Virginia Department of Highways & Transportation consistently achieves the goals set forth in the 1970 Act. In that study many cross tabulations were made between attitudes and tenure and several statistically significant relationships were noted. In general, owners were found to have more negative attitudes about the relocation program and fairness of treatment by the Department, and opinions more critical of Department personnel than did tenants. This finding led the authors to conclude that contemplated changes in the 1970 Act or the manner in which it is implemented should be directed toward that portion of the Act dealing with owners rather than the portion relating to tenants. However, while in that investigation the attitudes of relocated tenants seemed to reveal that they generally were satisfied with their relocation experience, the study did not deal with the difference in incentives that tenant relocatees face with respect to the manner in which relocation payments are made.

1960

Indeed, little attention has been given to the adjustment of renters during the four-year period immediately following their relocation. Since the rental replacement housing payment (RHP) is generally based upon the difference between the amount the tenant actually pays for a comparable replacement unit for the four years following relocation and 48 times his average monthly rental before relocation, the question of tenant adjustment during this period is of interest to the relocating agency. More specifically, because RHPs are disbursed in a lump sum (a maximum of \$4,000), there is a possibility that the tenant relocatee may acquire and remain in decent, safe, and sanitary (DSS) comparable housing only long enough to qualify for the payment. Unlike the home owner displacee, the renter does not have to spend the RHP on housing to receive compensation, and thus may take advantage of a windfall gain by moving from the replacement dwelling into less costly, sometimes non-DSS housing shortly after relocation. While it can be argued that home owners might follow a similar pattern of behavior, the costs -- legal fees, closing costs, realtors' fees -- are likely prohibitive.

Consequently, the Virginia Highway & Transportation Research Council, in cooperation with the Virginia Department of Highways & Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration, undertook the study reported here. The report includes the findings, conclusions, and recommendations derived from an analysis of the data obtained during the study as well as some information obtained in the previously cited research.

OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The overall purpose of the research was to investigate the mobility and adjustment of tenants who had been relocated by the Department and who had received a lump sum relocation payment, and to suggest the extent to which the lump sum disbursement procedure is cost-effective and is consistent with the intent of the 1970 Act. The group of tenants contacted was compared to those who received periodic payments to ascertain any differences that might exist in the adjustment patterns for the two groups. Specifically, the objectives were to --

1. examine the tendency of tenant displacees to move from their replacement housing

- during and after the four-year period subsequent to relocation;
2. determine the average length of residence in the replacement housing;
 3. determine, for the group of renters who moved after relocation, whether the housing in which they currently reside is DSS and whether their housing during the four years subsequent to relocation was DSS;
 4. examine the appropriateness of the current lump sum disbursement procedure as opposed to periodic payment and monitoring; and
 5. obtain some inferential information about the adequacy of this payment.

Since the previously cited study dealt with displacee attitudes in detail, this report will present little attitudinal information and will deal mostly with specific questions answered by tenant displacees concerning the incentives they faced because they received the relocation payment in a lump sum. The results of the study provide insightful information regarding the adequacy of the four-year period of computing payments to tenants and regarding the sufficiency of the current payment limit. The study dealt with tenant relocations occurring throughout Virginia during the period from July 1, 1972, through December 31, 1974.

METHODOLOGY

Telephone Interviews

Between July 1, 1972, and December 31, 1974, 211 tenant households were relocated by the Virginia Department of Highways & Transportation. All of these were selected to be interviewed by telephone. Because of deaths, data errors, and improper original classification, 49 were eliminated from the survey, which left 162 to be contacted. Telephone numbers could be ascertained for 52 households. Fifty households were administered a ten to fifteen minute interview by one interviewer over a period of about four weeks (Appendix A).

Questionnaires

The 110 households which could not be contacted by telephone were sent a questionnaire containing the same questions as the interview schedule with a request to complete and return it in an enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope. One follow-up letter was sent to those persons not responding within two weeks. Postal tracers were also utilized to determine the most current addresses. Thirty-five people on the mailing list could not be located. Twenty-two completed questionnaires were received. The interview and questionnaire groups were combined for analysis to yield a total response rate of 72/162, or 44%.

In addition to the aforementioned data gathering techniques, the authors also conducted arm's length inspections of 17 of the 25 dwellings occupied by tenant respondents who had moved since being relocated by the Department. This inspection was made to assist in accomplishing objective 3. Photographs were taken of each of these dwellings from as many angles as possible to ascertain, to the extent possible from their exterior appearance, whether they were non-DSS.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION

The Respondents

About 50% of the respondents were above 50 years of age and about 24% were above 63 (Table 1). Slightly more than 61% of the respondents were employed, 3.3% were unemployed, and 26% were retired. Forty-four percent of the households were classified as rural and the remainder urban. About 40% of the respondents reported an annual family income of \$5,000 or less. The mean annual income was about \$6,800, and 18% of the respondents were on some sort of fixed income. Twenty-six percent had lived in non-DSS housing prior to relocation. Furthermore, 68% of those responding to the present survey had participated in the study conducted by the authors in 1975.

The Nonrespondents

Since participation in the study was optional, there is a possibility that the sample was biased. An analysis of the nonrespondents showed, however, that the distributions of key

TABLE 1

Characteristics of Respondents at Time of Interview
(N = 72)

Category	Percentage of Respondents
Age	
Under 31	15.3
31 - 40	12.5
41 - 50	19.4
51 - 62	26.4
63 - 70	11.1
Over 70	12.5
No Response	2.8
Employment Status	
Employed	61.1
Unemployed	8.3
Retired	26.4
No Response	4.2
Total Annual Family Income	
\$ 0 - 5,000	40.2
5,001 - 8,000	20.8
8,001 - 11,000	11.1
11,001 - 15,000	11.1
15,001 - 20,000	1.4
Over \$20,000	2.8
No Response	12.6

socioeconomic variables were quite similar for the respondents and nonrespondents. This analysis, along with the analysis made in the authors' previous study (the reader will remember that those included in the current sample population were also part of the earlier sample population), revealed little difference in the distributions of age and employment status between respondents and nonrespondents. There was a slight difference in the income distributions in that the mean income of respondents was about \$600 more than that of nonrespondents. In addition, slightly more of the responding households than of the nonresponding ones were classified as rural. Specifically, for the respondent group 44% were urban and 56% were rural; the figures for the nonrespondent group were 59% urban and 41% rural.

In summary, differences in the distributions of basic socioeconomic characteristics between the respondent and nonrespondent groups were almost negligible. The slightly higher response rate among the higher income, more rural group should not, therefore, invalidate the findings based upon the sample.

ANALYSIS

In the methodology section, it was indicated that the overall purpose of the research was to investigate the mobility and adjustment of tenants relocated by the Department who had received a lump sum relocation payment, and thereby to suggest the extent to which the lump sum disbursement procedure is consistent with the intent of the 1970 Act. Among those who are charged with implementing the 1970 Act, the practitioners, it is not arguable that one major intention of that legislation is to place tenant displacees in DSS housing; likewise, it is not arguable that the 1970 Act embodies a second intention that displacees reside in DSS housing for some reasonable period after relocation. For one to argue that the latter is not the case begs the question of why RHPs are computed on the basis of a specified time period (currently four years), rather than simply being disbursed as a lump sum payment to all displacees for "inconvenience". Further, any denial of the intent of the 1970 Act regarding DSS replacement housing is inconsistent with the requirement that the displacee must reside in DSS housing in order to receive the RHP. The embodiment of these major intentions into the 1970 Act thus provides obvious focal points from which to examine tenant adjustment. Consequently, the authors analyzed tenant adjustment from

two major standpoints: Tenant mobility and current housing quality. The results of an examination of the disbursement procedure are also included in the analysis section of the report.

Tenant Mobility

Questionnaire Results

Generally tenants as a group are more mobile than home owners. This behavioral pattern is not difficult to explain, particularly because mobility is a function of key socioeconomic variables such as income, age of head of household, marital status, and education. The authors' concern in this discussion is not the absolute mobility of tenant displacees, but rather the influence, if any, which relocation has on mobility. Among the respondent group, 65% (47) were residing in their original replacement housing at the time of the survey. The validity of these sample results is strengthened by considering the following: Of the 162 households making up the sample population, 37% (60) had moved from the original replacement housing, while among the 72 households that responded to the survey, 35% (25) had not remained in the original replacement housing. Furthermore, an examination of the general socioeconomic characteristics of the Virginia populace offers strong suggestive evidence that tenant displacees certainly have no greater tendency to be mobile, that is, to have short average lengths of residency, than the general population. For example, among the general population of Virginia, only 51% were living in the same house in 1970 that they occupied in 1965.(2)

The evidence from both questionnaire responses and statistical tests of cross tabulations supports the conclusion suggested above; specifically, that relocation occasioned by the construction of a highway project is not a significant influence upon the length of time a tenant displacee remains in replacement housing nor upon a decision to move. Questionnaire results indicate, for example, that among the respondents, 64% (47) had remained in the replacement housing more than three years after relocation. Among the other 25 respondents, approximately half had remained in the replacement dwelling at least two years. Thus, as Table 2 shows, 80.6% of all respondents lived in their replacement housing no less than two years.

TABLE 2

Length of Occupancy in Current Dwelling
(N = 72)

Categories	Absolute Frequency	Percentage of Respondents
less than 6 mos.	5	6.9
6 mos. - 1 yr.	3	4.2
1 - 2 yrs.	6	8.3
2- 3 yrs.	12	16.7
more than 3 yrs.	46	63.9
TOTAL	72	100.0%

Of the 25 respondents who moved, 50.0% stayed in the replacement at least one year, 25.0% stayed at least three years, and only 12.5% moved in the first six months after relocation. Although the authors included no attitudinal questions in the interviews, these statistics strongly suggest that tenants who responded to the survey were quite satisfied with their replacement housing. Nevertheless, practitioners desire information about motives for moving. Responses to questions regarding reasons for moving were consistent with the authors' earlier suggestion concerning the inconsequential effect of the payment procedure on mobility. More specifically, 12.5% (3) of those who moved cited budget limitation as the cause. The reasons cited by the remainder who moved (22) were so varied and case specific that categorical groupings did not materialize.

Although questionnaire results indicated that the rental cost of replacement dwellings was not a significant factor in tenant mobility, the authors examined data on monthly rent to substantiate these results. Table 3 presents the distribution of current rental payments for the respondents. A comparison of this distribution with that for rent paid initially in the replacement dwelling revealed that for 56.0% of the respondents,

TABLE 3
Current Monthly Rent
(N = 72)

Rent Category in Dollars	Percentage of Respondents
49 or less	1.4
50 - 75	19.4
76 - 90	9.7
91 - 110	15.3
111 - 125	8.3
126 - 140	8.3
141 - 160	9.7
161 - 175	2.8
176 - 200	4.2
201 - 231	0.0
232 - 250	2.8
251 - 275	0.0
276 - 300	1.4
301 or greater	1.4
No Response	15.3

the mean monthly rent of \$140 was more than the rent paid when the displacee originally moved into the replacement.* Furthermore, 14.0% (10) of the respondents were paying the same rent and 10% (7) were faced with smaller rental payments than when they were relocated. The distribution of rental increases presented in Table 4 shows that the mean increase in rent between relocation and the survey (for some respondents, this was five years) was \$25. The reasonableness of this increase is clarified by considering the following. At a conservative estimate, real estate costs may be assumed to rise 6% per year. Under such an assumption, an apartment renting originally for \$120 would, in three years, cost about \$143 per month, or \$3 more than the average rent paid by the respondent group. Thus, it is not surprising that the mobility of tenant displacees does not appear to have been significantly affected by housing costs.

TABLE 4

Increase in Monthly Rent Since Relocation
(N = 72)

Increase in Dollars	Percentage of Respondents
No increase	18.1
10 or less	11.1
11 - 15	6.9
16 - 20	6.9
21 - 25	4.2
26 - 30	6.9
31 - 35	4.2
36 - 40	1.4
41 or greater	16.7
No response	23.6

*At the time of relocation tenants paid, on average, about \$120 for their replacement housing.

Results of Cross Tabulations

Cross tabulations were designed to test for statistical evidence of a relationship between mobility and payment type (lump sum or annual disbursements). While the tests proved, in general, that no such relationship exists, specific supportive evidence of this conclusion is the content of the discussion which follows.

The cross tabulation results were consistent with the evidence presented earlier that rental increases after relocation do not precipitate moving from the replacement dwelling. The cross tabulations between the distribution of respondents presently at the replacement, both by the absolute rent level and by the rent increase since relocation, were statistically insignificant. While high rent or large increases in rent were hypothesized to have been associated with a reluctance to remain in the replacement, no such pattern emerged. Moves occurred with no significantly different probability regardless of the level of rent or increase in rent. Furthermore, among the people who had moved from the replacement dwelling, the authors found that the only people who cited cost as the reason for moving had moved after three years of residence in the replacement.

The second item in support of the authors' conclusion that the disbursement procedure is unrelated to tenant mobility is that the manner in which tenants are paid has no significant impact on their behavior. In particular, how tenant displacees receive their RHP has no effect on how they use the money. That is, while the authors hypothesized that those who received their RHP in a lump sum would be less likely to use the money for their rental payment than those receiving the RHP in four smaller installments, cross tabulations required that the hypothesis be rejected. Seventy-six percent of the respondents (55) used at least a portion of the RHP for their increased rent due to relocation; however, among this group, the proportion who received the annual payment and who used the RHP for rent was not significantly different than the proportion that would have been expected to do so on the basis of chance. Not only does the payment procedure not affect the use of the payment, it does not appear to influence the length of time a tenant remains in the replacement dwelling. While one might reasonably argue that receiving the RHP in a lump sum, which for the respondents averaged \$2,300, would be a weaker incentive to remain in the replacement housing than annual payments, statistical evidence doesn't support that argument for Virginia tenant displacees. In fact, among the group who did not move at all, 40% (19) received the RHP

in a lump sum and 47% (22) received the RHP in annual installments. The distributions were not, however, significantly different. While the authors expected that those receiving lump sum payments would have moved quicker, cross tabs showed no significant pattern between length of time in the replacement dwelling and the method of payment. Finally, the authors examined the extent to which receipt of the lump sum payment influences the decision of tenants to purchase a home. Only 7 of the respondents, or 9.7%, purchased homes after relocation into tenant housing. The payment procedure was insignificantly influential in this choice.

The third item of interest regarding the statistical cross tabulations is that the use to which the RHP is put seemingly is unrelated to the length of residence in the original replacement. Cross tabs between the use of the RHP and length of stay in the replacement dwelling did not prove statistically significant. Although 36.0% of the respondents used the RHP to purchase consumer durables such as a car or land, and 19.4% used the money for necessities other than rent, these individuals remained in the replacement housing for periods not significantly shorter than those individuals who used the RHP for rent exclusively.

As the authors indicated in the discussion of the questionnaire results, no dominant reason appeared to explain the moves of tenant displacees from replacement housing. Additional statistical tests for the influence of age, occupation, and income also failed to uncover important explanatory variables. Briefly, then, the group of tenant displacees who moved after their initial relocation appeared to be influenced in that decision by a myriad of very case specific reasons, none of which were related to identifiable aspects of the lump sum disbursement mechanism. The following sections regarding specific questions about the disbursement procedure and about the quality of housing now occupied by those who had moved since relocation lend additional support to this conclusion.

RHP Disbursement Procedure

While the evidence discussed in the previous section on tenant mobility was insufficient to support a hypothesis that the mobility of tenant displacees is influenced by whether the RHP is paid in a lump sum or by annual installments, only scant information on the disbursement of the RHPs was

presented. This section will fill that gap in information.

About 38.0% (27) of the respondents received the RHP in a lump sum; 52.8% (38) of them received four annual installments; and 9.7% (7) received the RHP in no more than two payments. Payments received by the respondents averaged \$2,300, even though the maximum legal rental supplement is \$4,000. The former figure is consistent with the \$2,100 estimate from an earlier relocation study conducted by the authors.⁽¹⁾ The case for increasing the maximum allowable RHP to tenants is, from the authors' perspective, rather weakened by considering two facts. First, the legal maximum is not being paid to the majority of displacees; and second, as was discussed earlier, the patterns of mobility of tenant displacees are only weakly influenced, if at all, by the amount of payments received. This evidence notwithstanding, previous study indicated only scattered dissatisfaction with payments among tenants.⁽¹⁾

A related, though separate issue, is whether the increases in rent during the period following relocation were covered by the RHP. While it is not the intent of the 1970 Act to reimburse displacees for changes in rent after their relocation, 29.2% (21) responded that their RHP completely covered such normal rent changes for at least four years after relocation. The disbursement procedure bore no significant relationship to these responses, however.

The use of RHPs by tenant displacees has been of obvious interest to practitioners largely because tenants, unlike displaced home owners, technically need not spend the RHP on housing to receive it. While circumvention of the law through moving to non-DSS housing shortly after receiving the RHP is indeed possible, the evidence discussed in the section on housing quality below suggests that such activity by tenant displacees is uncommon. Regarding use of the RHP, 75.4% (55) of the respondents used at least part for the increase in rent occasioned by relocation; only 18.1% (13) used the RHP exclusively for other things. It is interesting that among the latter group, the tendency to regard the RHP as insufficient was much higher than among the former group. The RHP was used by respondents in other ways as well, although the disbursement procedure didn't significantly affect use. Table 5 presents a frequency distribution of responses to the question, "In what way, other than rent, was the RHP used?" The largest category proved to be the purchase of a durable good, like a car, or land; 25.0% (14) used at least a portion

of the money for necessities, such as food and clothing; while almost as many, 23.0% (13), simply placed the RHP into their general budget and were not sure of its use. One may reasonably argue that the use of the RHP is influenced by socioeconomic variables and, in fact, cross tabulations tend to confirm that supposition. At the 90% level of confidence, professionals, craftsmen, and the unemployed used the RHP to purchase durable items much more frequently than did the unskilled or retired. These last two groups more frequently placed the RHP into their general budget and had less recall as to the specific use of the payment. Age was also found to influence the use of the RHP, although a typical pattern of use by age did not emerge. Further tests for significant relationships between the level of rent or increases in rent and the manner in which the RHP was used revealed none.

TABLE 5

Non-Rent Uses of Relocation Housing
Payment by Tenants
(N = 72)

Use of Payment	Percentage of Respondents
Placed in General Budget	23.0
Purchased Land or Car	47.0
Necessities (Food, clothing, etc.)	25.0
No Response	5.0

Respondents were asked to indicate the type of RHP disbursement procedure, lump sum or annual installment, they preferred. While the authors had *a priori* expected an overwhelming response in favor of the lump sum procedure, 32% (23) of the respondents stated that, were they to be relocated again, they would prefer annual payments. Ten percent had no preference.

The objectives of this study required an examination not only of the tendency of tenant displacees to move after relocation, but also, to the extent that data permit, of the quality of the housing into which displacees move after relocation. More simply, is there evidence of displacees moving from DSS replacement housing into non-DSS housing?

Two difficulties arise in trying to answer this question. First, a designation of decent, safe, and sanitary housing requires that numerous criteria for the exterior as well as the interior of the housing be met. However, the authors were limited in their examination to an arm's length inspection of the physical condition of the exterior of the dwellings. The implication of this limitation is that only those dwellings which from the exterior appear to be non-DSS are categorized as being so; there is no guarantee, however, that a dwelling which appears to be DSS from an exterior inspection meets DSS criteria for the interior. Therefore, the data presented are representative, in the strictest sense, of a lower limit on the number of non-DSS dwellings into which displacees moved after relocation by the Department. The second difficulty pertains to the fact that 35 of the households in the sample population of 162 moved from the replacement dwelling but left no forwarding address or trace by which they could be contacted. For this group, the authors have only weak data from which to make inferences about their behavior. Assuming the choice about housing quality by those tenant displacees who move after relocation is largely dependent upon socioeconomic characteristics (income, education, occupation, age), it may be argued that if the group of 35 who could not be located do not exhibit socioeconomic characteristics different from those of the group for whom the authors had addresses, they would choose housing similar to that chosen by the group located. Fortunately, the socioeconomic characteristics of the two groups were not significantly different. Therefore, the authors infer, with reservation, that the choice of housing quality by the 35 who could not be located may to some extent be gauged by results from arm's length inspections of a sample of the respondents who moved after relocation.

The homes of 15 of the 25 respondents who moved were visually inspected and photographed. Two of these dwellings were judged as non-DSS by exterior appearances. Thus, the large majority of the respondents who moved from the original

1974

replacement dwelling remained in what reasonably can be argued to be DSS housing. Among the displacees who moved but could not be located, the authors can at best only conjecture that their pattern of behavior isn't significantly different from that of those surveyed. A conclusion that widespread migration into non-DSS housing does not occur is strengthened by the results presented earlier, particularly the finding that very few displacees move within one year of being relocated.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, G. R., and M. A. Perfater, "Relocation Due to Highway Takings: A Diachronic Analysis of Social and Economic Effects", Virginia Highway & Transportation Research Council, Charlottesville, Virginia, September 1976.
2. 1970 Census of Population, Vol. 1, Part 48, Table 50.

1976

APPENDIX A

A SURVEY OF TENANTS RELOCATED BY THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

Please answer all questions that apply to your case and drop in mailbox -- no postage required. (This information will be kept strictly confidential)

1977

- 1. Have you previously responded to a questionnaire from the Highway Research Council concerning your being moved by the highway department? (circle one) (1) yes (2) no
2. Do you rent your present dwelling or do you own it? (circle one) (1) rent (2) own (3) neither
3. What is your current address? number street city
4. How long have you lived at this address? (circle one) (1) more than 3 years (2) 2 to 3 years (3) 1 year to 2 years (4) 6 months to 1 year (5) less than 6 months
5. Is this the same place the highway department helped you settle in? (circle one) (1) yes (2) no
IF YOU ANSWERED YES TO QUESTION 5, DO NOT ANSWER QUESTION NUMBERS 6 and 7.

- 6. How long did you stay in that first place? months years
7. What caused you to move?

IF YOU OWN YOUR HOME, SKIP QUESTIONS 8, 9 and 10.

- 8. How much rent do you pay monthly? \$
9. How does that rent compare with what you paid when the highway department moved you? (circle one) (1) It is more now (2) It is less now (3) It is the same
10. If what you now pay is not the same as when the highway department moved you, by how much per month is it different? \$

IF YOU RENT YOUR HOME, SKIP QUESTIONS 11 and 12.

- 11. Did being relocated have anything to do with your buying a home? (circle one) (1) yes (2) no
12. Please explain
13. How did you get the money the highway department gave you to help cover the cost of increased rent? (circle one) (1) lump sum (2) yearly payments (3) received no payment (4) lump sum and yearly payments
14. Did you use the money to pay for increased rent? (circle one) (1) yes (2) no
15. Was this money sufficient to cover this increase for a period of 4 years? (circle one) (1) yes (2) no
16. In what other ways was the money helpful?

- 17. Would you have preferred to receive your money in 4 equal yearly payments or in one lump sum of the same amount? (circle one) (1) lump sum (2) annual payments
18. Why do you feel that way?

- 19. What is your occupation?
20. What is your age?
21. What was your total family income in 1976? (circle one)
(1) \$0 - \$5000 (4) \$11001 - \$15000
(2) \$5001 - \$8000 (5) \$15001 - \$20000
(3) \$8001 - \$11000 (6) over \$20000

- 22. Please enter below any additional comments you would like to make.

THANK YOU - PLEASE FOLD AND MAIL



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
HIGHWAY & TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH COUNCIL

JACK H. DILLARD, HEAD
VIRGINIA HIGHWAY & TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH COUNCIL

June 27, 1977

BOX 3817 UNIVERSITY STATION
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA 22903

IN REPLY PLEASE REFER TO FILE NO. 9-47-83

Dear

The Virginia Highway and Transportation Research Council is helping the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation evaluate its program of assistance to those persons who have been relocated because of highway construction. As one of the persons who has been relocated, your opinion of the program and your experiences during and after your relocation are important to us. To enable you to express your opinion, we are furnishing you the enclosed questionnaire.

We ask that you please fill out this questionnaire as carefully and completely as possible and simply drop it in the mail. We will use the information you provide to help determine what changes, if any, should be made in the current relocation program.

We appreciate your cooperation and assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Handwritten signature of Michael A. Perfater in cursive.

Michael A. Perfater
Research Analyst

Handwritten signature of Gary R. Allen in cursive.

Gary R. Allen
Research Economist

GRA/bat
Enclosure