

A REPORT ON FEDERALLY FUNDED REGIONAL HOUSING
OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOW-INCOME RENTERS IN THE
BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN AREA

Prepared by the Task Force on Low and
Moderate Income Housing and the HUD
Committee of Baltimore Neighborhoods, Inc.

August, 1980

Baltimore Neighborhoods, Inc.
319 East 25th Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
301/243-6007

SUMMARY OF THE POSITION OF BALTIMORE NEIGHBORHOODS, INC.

Baltimore Neighborhoods, Inc. has examined the Regional Section 8 portion of the Areawide Housing Opportunities Program (AHOP), and sees it as a valuable tool for open housing and increased mobility of low and moderate income families, black and white. Therefore BNI urges an expansion of the program locally and throughout the nation.

BNI makes this recommendation based on its experience since 1959 as a metropolitan open housing agency. It has a great interest in helping to expand, on a metropolitan-wide, fair-share basis, the supply of housing available to low and moderate income persons. BNI is concerned that the benefits of open housing and increased mobility be available to low and moderate income persons as well as to middle and upper income people.

BNI realizes that there is always room for improvement in any program, has made several suggestions in this regard, but maintains that any constraint or lack of choice in housing location is due to the severe lack of housing for low and moderate income persons and not because of any defect in the design or administration of the Regional Section 8 program.

BNI's investigation does not conclude that AHOP is part of a conspiracy against black people or poor people.

BNI recognizes that certain critics of AHOP have raised valid concerns about other issues. To raise these issues in direct reference to AHOP only makes it more difficult to make a fair appraisal of the AHOP program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	
II.	Addressing the Issues	
	A. Does AHOP force people out of the City?.....	2
	B. Is the movement of people only out of the City?	3
	C. Is there a need for increased services and transportation?.....	4
	D. Is AHOP a conspiracy to force poor city Blacks to other jurisdictions?.....	5
	E. Where are the Baltimore City Regional Sec. 8 Families Relocating....	8
	F. Are City residents who move to Baltimore County satisfied?.....	10
	G. What are the major constraints on choice of housing?.....	11
	H. Are the recommendations of the Kerner Report intended to suppress uprisings?	11
III.	Summary and Conclusions.....	13
IV.	Recommendations	14
V.	Response to the Demands of the Coalition to Save Urban Communities	15
VI.	Appendices	
	Table I Respondents' Satisfaction.....	18
	Table II Respondents' Leasing in Community of First Choice	19
	Table III Best Features of Respondents' Units	19
	Table IV Worst Features of Respondents' Units	20
	Table V Respondents' Present Housing an Improvement.....	21
	Table VI Respondents' Rating of Section 8 Staff	21
	Table VII Respondents' Difficulty in Finding Housing	21
	Table VIII Respondents' Reasons for Not Leasing in Community of First Choice	22
	Table IX Units Provided in Baltimore City to Assist Very Low Income Residents in the City 1969-79	23
	Letter from City Housing Program to Section 8 Applicants, AHOP Application	24

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Definition of the Regional Section 8 Program of the Areawide Housing Opportunities Program (AHOP).

The Regional Section 8 program must be understood against the background of the general Section 8 program. This program was created by the Federal Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, primarily to replace public housing. It, however, provides assistance to moderate as well as low income families. Under it the tenant pays up to 25% of his/her adjusted income for rent, with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) paying the difference between this amount and the actual rent of the unit. Because many Section 8 units are in existing apartments, with HUD stating a preference that approximately 20% of the units in apartments be assisted, the program encourages a scattering of assisted households. Between 1976 through 1979, 6,666 Section 8 units were provided in the Baltimore Region, with 3,737 provided for use in Baltimore City and 2,929 in the five surrounding counties ("A Listing of Low and Moderate Income Housing In the Baltimore Region," The Regional Planning Council, January, 1980.) The allocation for each jurisdiction each year is determined jointly by the Regional Planning Council (RPC) and HUD based on the needs of each jurisdiction and the principle that each jurisdiction should provide its fair share of assisted housing to meet the Region's needs.

In 1978 the Areawide Housing Opportunities Program was begun. It constitutes an addition to the general Section 8 program described above.

AHOP consists of several different programs, including the Regional Section 8 program. AHOP uses "bonus" money awarded to the Regional Planning Council derived from additional Section 8 funds, Community Development Block Grant funds, and 701 Planning funds. It "addresses areawide housing assistance needs and goals in accordance with the program objective of providing for a broader geographical choice of housing opportunities for low income households outside areas and jurisdictions containing undue concentrations of low-income and minority households." (FR, Vol. 43, No. 10, Monday, Jan. 17, 1979). It increases the number of assisted units available in the Region, as well as provides support activities such as counselling and relocation assistance. These funds are not regularly allocated but are awarded on a competitive basis to regions that have an area-wide housing plan. HUD approved the Baltimore Region's Plan in 1978.

B. Challenges to the Areawide Housing Opportunities Program

These challenges have consisted chiefly of allegations that AHOP forces poor Blacks to live in other jurisdictions and that a national conspiracy, beginning with the report of the Kerner Commission in 1968, exists to reduce the number of Blacks in the cities, thereby reducing possibilities of uprisings, diffusing the Black political power base, and making room for Whites to reinvest in City housing. Assertions are made that services to residents moving to other jurisdictions under this program are inadequate.

The Board of Baltimore Neighborhoods, Inc. (BNI) believes that the Regional Section 8 program plays an important role in providing housing choice for low and moderate income persons and minorities. It instructed its Task Force on Low and Moderate Income Housing and its HUD Committee to study this issue, to address the challenges to the program, and to make recommendations. The remainder of this report consists of the results of the work of the Task Force in carrying out these instructions. The report was adopted by the BNI Board at its August, 1980 meeting.

II. ADDRESSING THE ISSUES

A. Does AHOP Force People Out of the City?

AHOP DOES NOT FORCE PEOPLE, INCLUDING POOR INNER-CITY BLACKS, OUT OF BALTIMORE CITY. ONLY APPLICANTS ON THE CITY'S SECTION 8 WAITING LIST WHO STATED A DESIRE TO MOVE TO ANOTHER JURISDICTION WERE CONSIDERED FOR REGIONAL CERTIFICATES. REGIONAL CERTIFICATES AND OTHER SECTION 8 CERTIFICATES HAVE BEEN ALLOCATED FOR THE USE OF CITY DISPLACEDS TO USE IN THE CITY. AS OF JUNE 30, 1980 EIGHTY OF THE CITY'S REGIONAL SECTION 8 CERTIFICATES WERE USED IN THE CITY.

The Task Force concluded that the program does not force people out of the City, based on the following observations:

1. The formal procedure for identifying those applicants on the City's Section 8 waiting list who wished to move to another jurisdiction included no "either/or" ultimatum. There was no indication given to prospective certificate holders that Regional Section 8 certificates would be easier to get than Existing Section 8 certificates. Applicants were asked to check the jurisdiction in which they wished to reside (See form and cover letter in the Appendix).

The manner in which the initial selection of applicants for AHOP was conducted appears to have made a real choice possible. All persons on the City Section 8 waiting list (and other jurisdictions as well) were sent letters asking if they were interested in moving to a jurisdiction other than their present location. They were asked to check the appropriate block on a card and if they indicated a wish to move, to give a reason. They were not told that Regional certificates were easier to get than local certificates. Of the 20,971 persons on the City Section 8 waiting list at the time, 10,506 cards were not returned, 3,240 were returned by the post office as undeliverable, and 7,045 were returned by the applicants. Of these 7,045, 3,033 checked Baltimore City only and 4,012 persons checked another jurisdiction (3,500 checked Baltimore County). (RPC "Quotes" June, 1980). The 4,012 persons served as a pool from which to issue Regional certificates or be put on the Regional waiting list. These applicants also remained on the City's Section 8 list. Should a client be unable to find a unit by the time his/her Regional certificate expired, he/she would go to the bottom of the Regional list, but would not lose his/her place on the City's list.

The Task Force believes that choice possibilities were maximized by this procedure. The acute shortage of assisted housing, not the Regional program, is chiefly responsible for any pressure to move felt by clients. Presently, a client could face the possibility of a City certificate being unavailable. All applicants, Regional or local, go on very long waiting lists. Presently, as new persons apply, they are asked to indicate the jurisdiction they wish to consider and are put on the appropriate waiting list.

2. Regional and Section 8 units are set aside specifically for the City displaceds to use in the city.

While there are many factors contributing to displacement, AHOP was not found to be one of them. In regard to the charge that poor City residents are displaced from their homes by public or private action and forced to move outside the City, the following facts are relevant: as of June 30, 1980 there were 340

Regional certificate holders from Baltimore City. Eighty remain in Baltimore City. Of these, 28 received city units because of displacement. In addition, the city has asked for and been promised by HUD 170 certificates to aid displaced persons from Somerset Court to find City housing.

There is another way in which City Section 8 clients have moved to Baltimore County. Since the latter has no housing authority, the City may use its authority within a 10 mile radius of the City. All City certificate holders are told they can use their certificates either in the city or in Baltimore County. As of June 30, 1979 183 City Section 8 certificate holders resided in Baltimore County. Some facts about this group are:

TABLE I
FAMILIES MOVING INTO BALTIMORE COUNTY USING CITY SECTION 8 CERTIFICATES
(as of 6/30/79)

<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Elderly, disabled and handicapped</u>	<u>Families</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
60	123	57	126	183

29 of these assisted "in place"

Current practice is to give a City certificate holder who moved to Baltimore County a Regional certificate.

It may happen, again due to the acute assisted housing shortage, that some persons in the local Existing Section 8 program have felt compelled to take a County unit. Although the clients are told that they may use their certificates in either jurisdiction, if they cannot find a unit in the City where the management accepts Section 8, or which is up to Code, is at or below the Fair Market Rents, or is the right sized unit for the family, the County may be their only alternative. The reverse situation may also occur.

B. Is the Movement of People Only Out of the City?

THE REGIONAL SECTION 8 PROGRAM PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOW AND MODERATE INCOME PERSONS TO MOVE INTO THE CITY AS WELL AS OUT OF IT. AS OF JUNE 30, 1980, THIRTY TWO FAMILIES, 21 OF WHICH WERE BLACK, HAD MOVED INTO BALTIMORE CITY FROM OTHER JURISDICTIONS (MOSTLY BALTIMORE COUNTY) ON REGIONAL CERTIFICATES. (Source: RPC printout as of June 30, 1980)

TABLE II

FAMILIES MOVING INTO BALTIMORE CITY USING REGIONAL SECTION 8 CERTIFICATES
(as of 6/30/80)

Moving to Baltimore
City from:

Annapolis	2	(1 Black)
Anne Arundel Co	4	(2 Black)
Baltimore		
City	80*	
Baltimore		
County	23	(15 Black)
Carroll Co.	0	
Harford Co.	1	(1 Black)
Howard Co.	2	(2 Black)
	<hr/>	
	32	(21 Black)

* already in City using
Regional certificates

C. Is There a Need for Increased Services and Transportation?

THERE IS A NEED FOR INCREASED SERVICES AND TRANSPORTATION TO THOSE SERVICES BY SECTION 8 TENANTS LIVING IN BALTIMORE COUNTY. DISTANCE FROM SERVICES WAS INDICATED AS A DISADVANTAGE OF THEIR PRESENT HOUSING BY 20% TO 24% OF RESPONDENTS SURVEYED. THE PERCENTAGE WAS VERY SIMILAR WHETHER THE RESPONDENTS WERE PREVIOUS CITY DWELLERS OR HAD ALREADY LIVED IN BALTIMORE COUNTY.

BNI in its study of low and moderate income housing in Baltimore County soon to be released, analyzed surveys mailed by the Regional Planning Council to Regional certificate holders in Baltimore County and mailed and analyzed surveys to other Section 8 tenants living in the County.

Replies from the three groups of Section 8 tenants surveyed by the Task Force to two questions relevant to this concern are tabulated below.

"What do you like best about your present apartment or house?"
(Q.14)

	Regional Certificate Holders in Baltimore <u>County</u>		City Certificate Holders in Baltimore <u>County</u>		County Certificate Holders in Baltimore <u>County</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
More convenient to shopping and other services (day care, health care, etc.)	13 (of 49)	27%	16 (of 41)	49%	23 (of 58)	40%

"What do you like least about your present apartment or house?" (Q.15)

	Regional Certificate Holders in Baltimore County		City certificate Holders in Baltimore County		County Certificate Holders in Baltimore County	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Too far away from services I need (shopping, day care, health care, etc.)	10 (of 49)	20%	10 (of 41)	24%	12 (of 58)	21%
TOTAL living in Baltimore County	312		183		855	

Although 20% to 25% of the Regional and City Section 8 tenants cited distance from services as a negative feature, an even larger percentage checked their present neighborhood as convenient. Possibly these divergent results may be explained by the location of the units and kinds of services needed by the respondents.

D. Is AHOP a Conspiracy to Force Poor City Blacks to Other Jurisdictions?

AHOP IS NOT A CONSPIRACY TO FORCE POOR CITY BLACKS TO OTHER JURISDICTIONS, BUT RATHER IS A SMALL SCALE PROGRAM TO INCREASE CHOICE. THE FEDERAL REGULATIONS ESTABLISHING THIS PROGRAM STATE THIS CHOICE EXPLICITLY. THE NUMBER OF CITY REGIONAL SECTION 8 CERTIFICATES IS SUCH A SMALL PERCENTAGE OF THE CITY'S SECTION 8 WAITING LIST (3.3%) THAT IT COULD NOT EFFECTIVELY RELOCATE LARGE NUMBERS OF PERSONS. OVER THE YEARS THE NUMBER OF ASSISTED UNITS PROVIDED FOR USE IN THE CITY BY CITY RESIDENTS IS 22 TIMES GREATER THAN THE NUMBER PROVIDED FOR CITY RESIDENTS TO USE OUTSIDE THE CITY. THE NUMBER OF REGIONAL CERTIFICATES CONSTITUTE ONLY 16% OF THE ASSISTED UNITS PROVIDED FOR CITY RESIDENTS TO USE IN THE CITY IN 1978 AND 1979, THE YEARS SINCE THE REGIONAL PROGRAM HAS BEEN IN OPERATION. THE FORMULA BY WHICH SECTION 8 UNITS ARE ALLOCATED EACH YEAR TO THE CITY WEIGHS LOCAL NEED MORE THAN FAIR SHARE DISTRIBUTION GOALS. PRELIMINARY 1980 CENSUS FIGURES SHOW TOO LARGE AN INCREASE IN THE PROPORTION OF BLACKS IN BALTIMORE CITY TO BE EFFECTIVELY COUNTERBALANCED BY THE REGIONAL PROGRAM SO AS TO SERIOUSLY ERODE THE BLACK POLITICAL BASE. THE COUNTIES ARE INCAPABLE OF ABSORBING VERY LARGE NUMBERS OF LOW AND MODERATE INCOME PEOPLE FROM OTHER JURISDICTIONS DUE TO THE LOW VACANCY RATE AND OTHER FACTORS.

No evidence has been found to support the conspiracy allegation. On the contrary a number of facts support the idea that AHOP is a program designed to give choice to low and moderate income families, not to force massive relocation.

1. The Regional Section 8 program presently can serve only a small percent of those on the Section 8 waiting list (677 units out of 20,791 or 3.2%) and obviously is not relocating large number of the city's poor.

2. The City has provided far more additional units to assist tenants in the City (14,955 units 1969 through 1979) than are provided through AHOP (667 units or 4.5% of the units to be used in the city), which points to a much greater local commitment than to a Regional distribution commitment. The City has

obviously demonstrated a past commitment to local needs over the years. If one compares only local units provided 1978 and 1979 with AHOP (since AHOP began officially in 1978, but units are still being leased out of this allocation) AHOP constitutes only 16% of the local units allocated in these two years.

3. The formula by which assisted units are allocated to each jurisdiction by the Regional Planning Council and HUD weights local need more than fair share or Regional distribution requirements: 71% for local need and 29% for fair share distribution.

4. Preliminary 1980 figures show an increased, not a decreased proportion of Blacks in Baltimore City from 46.4% in 1970 to 57% in 1980, which trend appears to be continuing, and present and anticipated Regional allocations are too small to affect this trend in any way that could erode this increased political base of City Blacks.

5. Most of the loss in City population between 1970 and 1980 is attributable to white middle and upper income persons leaving the City and has not been counterbalanced by the relatively small number of persons recently re-investing in the City's housing.

6. Due to the very low rental vacancy rate in the Counties surrounding the City, the reluctance of many landlords to participate in Section 8, the large number of County units having rents above the Fair Market Rental Rates, and the County's stated opposition to building new developments of more than 50 subsidized units for families, the County cannot, nor will it, in the near future, accommodate large numbers of Section 8 residents from Baltimore City.

7. Since the conspiracy is alleged to have begun at the time of the Kerner Report (Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968, Otto Kerner) which is also the time HUD was created, the City's units for housing assistance from 1969 through 1979 (11 years) were tabulated. The source was "A Listing of Low and Moderate Income Housing in the Baltimore Region, January, 1980," The Regional Planning Council. All programs helping very low income persons (Public Housing Conventional Public Housing Vacant, Public Housing Used, Public Housing Turnkey, Rent Supplement, Rental Assistance Payments, Section 8 Existing, Section 8 New and Section 8 Rehab and Moderate Rehab) were included. Excluded were Sec. 236, 221-d-3 and 202 since they do not benefit very low income persons, and home ownership programs. However, Rent Supplement, Rental Assistance Payments and Section 8 are often awarded to persons living in a Section 236, 221-d-3 or 202 development. These units have been included.

Between 1940 and 1963 the City built 10,280 units of Conventional Public Housing for families. In 1967 and 1968, 428 units of assisted housing for very low income people were added.

Since 1969, 120 Section 8 units were assigned to Sec. 221-d-3 development for families and 69 units were assigned to a Section 202 development for the elderly. There was no information in the source used as to when they are allocated. These units have arbitrarily been tabulated as of 1979. All other Rental Assistance Program (RAP), Section 8 and Rent Supplement units provided

to persons in Section 236, 202 and 221-d-3 developments from 1969 on have been tabulated by the year in which the building was constructed because there is no information as to the year they were actually provided.

The following table lists the number of units allocated in the City for very low income persons by year, divided into assistance for elderly only and for families. The Appendix contains a detailed tabulation according to the various programs.

TABLE III
ASSISTED UNITS ALLOCATED FOR USE IN BALTIMORE CITY (1969-1979)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Assisted Units for very Low Income Persons provided in Balto. City</u>	<u>Units for Elderly only</u>	<u>Units for Families</u>
1969	410	0	410
1970	579	161	418
1971	1,557	708	849
1972	606	0	606
1973	1,312	509	803
1974	1,364	925	439
1975	596	325	271
1976	2,208	1,238	970
1977	1,995	610	1,385
1978	1,113	333	780
1979	3,026	1,896	1,319
TOTALS	14,766	6,705	8,250

TABLE IV

UNITS ALLOCATED FOR USE IN JURISDICTIONS IN THE REGION OTHER THAN BALTIMORE CITY
(1969 - 1979)

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Total Assisted Units for Very Low Income Persons 1969-79</u>	<u>% of Region's Totals</u>	<u>Units for Elderly Only</u>	<u>Units for Families</u>
Anne Arundel County including Annapolis	2,424	11%	779	1,645
Baltimore County	1,696	8%	668	1,028
Carroll County including Westminster	340	2%	250	90
Harford County including Aberdeen and Havre de Grace	970	5%	214	756
Howard County	962	5%	271	691
TOTALS	6,392	30%	2,182	4,210
Baltimore City	14,955	70%		
GRAND TOTAL	21,347			

A total of 14,955 units of housing assistance were provided for very low income City residents to use in Baltimore City. These figures do not include the 677 Regional Section 8 certificates allocated in 1978. These Regional units constitute only 4.5% of the local units provided over the past eleven years. Total units provided for City persons to use in the City for 1978 and 1979 were 4,328. The Regional certificates are only 16% of these. The Regional units were allocated in 1978 and are still being rented in 1980. It seems obvious that the City's allocations for its own people to use in the City so far outweigh its Regional allocations (22 to 1) that the charge that large numbers of poor City residents are being moved out by the Regional program is unsubstantiated.

Examination of units provided to the five other counties and four cities shows the great imbalance between the city and the rest of the Region in this regard. (See Table IV)

If one adds to the 21,347 units provided in 1969-79, the Baltimore City 10,280 units of conventional public housing built in the City between 1940 and 1963, the 428 units supplied in the City in 1967 and 1968 and the 672 units provided in Annapolis between 1942 and 1968, the grand total for the Region, 1940 through 1979, is 32,727 units. For this longer period, Baltimore City has supplied 25,664 of the Region's total of 32,727 or 78%, while the other jurisdictions have supplied 7,064 units or 22%. It should be noted that these figures include assistance available to very low income households and do not include programs principally benefitting moderate income households. Sec. 8 is available to moderate as well as very low income persons.

The City has a larger need for assisted housing than does the rest of the Region, and it is appropriate that it should receive more assisted units. The rest of the Region has been providing relatively scanty assisted housing opportunities for its own citizens or for persons from other jurisdictions who might need or want to move to it.

In 1972 the Area Housing Council's Plan for the Baltimore Region (approved by RPC in 1972 and revised and approved in 1977) documented the fact that the Counties were not providing their "fair share" of the households needing assistance in the Region. The Plan was developed in part to remedy this imbalance by providing a formula for the allocation of assisted units each year to the various jurisdictions. The formula was not based solely on the need to achieve a fairer Regional distribution of assisted households but also recognized that local need had to be a factor in the allocation of assisted units. The Plan formula weighted local need at 71% and fair share requirements at 29%. Thus the formula allowed local need greatly to outweigh Regional fair share requirements. For this reason, the City with its much greater need, always receives more of the assisted units than the other jurisdictions, but not as many units as it would without the fair share component. The fact that local need outweighs fair share requirements in allocating assisted units each year argues that the RPC and HUD are not sacrificing local need to the goal of dispersing poor people throughout the Region.

E. Where are the Baltimore City Regional Section 8 Families Relocating?

MOST CITY RESIDENTS USING REGIONAL CERTIFICATES ARE RELOCATING IN BALTIMORE COUNTY (62%) AND IN THE CITY ITSELF (24%). IN BALTIMORE COUNTY THE DISTRIBUTION

OF REGIONAL CERTIFICATE HOLDERS SURVEYED IS FAIRLY BROAD, BUT THERE ARE CLUSTERS IN MIDDLE RIVER, OWINGS MILLS, RANDALLSTOWN, LOCHEARN AND REISTERSTOWN, WITH VERY FEW ASSISTED TENANTS IN THE NORTH CENTRAL AREA OF THE COUNTY.

The present location of Regional City certificate holders in all other jurisdictions is shown in the following tabulation. (source: RPC printout of Regional Section 8 program 6/30/80). 340 Regional certificates have been leased to date to City residents.

TABLE V
LOCATION OF REGIONAL CITY CERTIFICATE HOLDERS
(as of 6/30/80)

Jurisdiction	Total No. entering each Jurisdiction		No. Black		No. White		No. Elderly & handcpd		No. Families	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Annapolis	1	.4	0	0	1	3.0	0	0	1	.3
Anne Arundel Cty	17	5.0	14	4.5	3	10.0	1	2.0	16	6.0
Balto. City*	80	24.0	71	23.0	9	29.0	18	31.0	62	22.0
Balto. County	212	62.0	194	63.0	18	58.0	38	67.0	174	61.0
Carroll Cty.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford Cty	2	.6	2	.5	0	0	0	0	2	.7
Howard Cty	28	8.0	28	9.0	0	0	0	0	28	10.0
	<u>340</u>		<u>309</u>		<u>31</u>		<u>57</u>		<u>283</u>	

*includes set aside for displaced and handicapped persons.

If this present locational trend continues, most city Regional tenants will find housing in Baltimore County and in the City using the certificates set aside for displaced and handicapped persons.

The Task Force has tabulated the zip codes of residence of the 49 Regional tenants in its sample living in Baltimore County. Thirty-four of them came from the City. The 49 are located in the following zip codes:

TABLE VI
LOCATION OF 49 REGIONAL CERTIFICATE HOLDERS SURVEYED LIVING IN
BALTIMORE COUNTY

Middle River	21220	13	(27%)	Randallstown	21133	7	(14%)
Dundalk	21222	1	(2%)	Cockeysville	21030	1	(2%)
Parkville	21234	1	(2%)	Essex	21221	1	(2%)
Owings Mills	21117	8	(17%)	Loch Raven area	21239	3	(6%)
Reisterstown	21136	5	(10%)	Rosedale	21227	2	(4%)
Gtr. Lochearn	21207	6	(12%)	Catonsville	21228	1	(2%)

The tabulation shows that most AHOP tenants reside in four western zip codes (Owings Mills, Reisterstown, Randallstown, and Lochearn) and one eastern zip (Middle River). These trends are similar to those reported in Baltimore County's Housing Assistance Plan. The finding most important for the Task Force is that there is a reasonably broad dispersal with many persons not living close to the City line. Blacks are not being re-ghettoized or "forced" into certain areas. The north central area is sparsely inhabited by Section 8 tenants.

F. Are City Residents Who Move to Baltimore County Satisfied?

THE LEVEL OF SATISFACTION OF SECTION 8 TENANTS IN BALTIMORE COUNTY IS HIGH. A SAMPLE OF PERSONS LIVING THERE ON REGIONAL CERTIFICATES SHOWED THAT 53% WERE VERY SATISFIED, & 25% WERE SOMEWHAT SATISFIED. CITY SECTION 8 CERTIFICATE HOLDERS IN THE COUNTY WERE NOT AS WELL SATISFIED (20% VERY SATISFIED AND 37% SOMEWHAT SATISFIED). LOCAL CERTIFICATE HOLDERS WERE THE MOST SATISFIED OF ALL (69% VERY SATISFIED AND 17% SOMEWHAT SATISFIED).

As part of its study of assisted housing in Baltimore County, the Task Force surveyed Regional Section 8 certificate holders living in Baltimore County (49 replies) the jurisdiction to which 212 out of the 260 (82%) City Regional certificate holders have moved. The Task Force also surveyed City certificate holders living in Baltimore County on City certificates (41 replies) and a sample of Baltimore County Existing Section 8 certificate holders (58 replies).

Replies to the survey indicated a high level of satisfaction for all three groups of Section 8 tenants living in Baltimore County, with Regional certificate holders displaying greater satisfaction than City certificate holders living in the County. About half of both the Regional and City groups report not having moved to the community of their first choice. Liking the new neighborhood better than the old neighborhood, better schools, and convenience were the items most often checked by both the Regional and City tenants living in Baltimore County. Transportation, distance from friends and relatives and from services were the three things least liked by both the Regional and City certificate holders living in Baltimore County. Both groups felt strongly that the move had affected their housing for the better. Staff were rated as very helpful by a large proportion of both groups.

See the Appendix Tables I through VI for detailed tabulations.

The survey did not ask whether respondents had felt forced to move or whether they had felt they had no choice. Scattered spontaneous comments to this effect were made by both Regional and City certificate holders. Six of the 49 Regional respondents made comments about being forced or having no choice, but one person commented she liked the opportunity to move out of the City. Two of the City certificate holders indicated a feeling of no choice, but one other said the move got her out of a bad house and bad neighborhood. None of the Baltimore County Existing Sec. 8 tenants spontaneously indicated a feeling of being forced.

G. What are the Major Constraints on Choice of Housing?

THE MAJOR CONSTRAINTS ON HOUSING CHOICE ARE NOT THE AHOP PROGRAM BUT THE ACUTE SHORTAGE OF ASSISTED HOUSING AND LANDLORDS' RELUCTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROGRAM, AS REVEALED IN THE SURVEYS. NINETY PERCENT OF REGIONAL CERTIFICATE HOLDERS IN THE COUNTY REPORTED HOUSING DIFFICULT TO FIND (EITHER VERY, OR SOMEWHAT). WHEN ASKED IF THEY LEASED IN THE COMMUNITY OF THEIR CHOICE, 37% OF THOSE WHO DID NOT CHECKED LANDLORDS' UNWILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE AS THE REASON.

The surveys analyzed by the Task Force showed that 35% of the Regional certificate holders living in Baltimore County found housing very difficult to find and 45% found it somewhat difficult to find; comparable figures for the City certificate holders living in the County were 39% and 32%. Of the Regional certificate holders in the County 47% of the sample said they did not lease a unit in the community of their first choice; 54% of the City certificate holders living in the County also did not lease in the community of their first choice. When asked for reasons the Regional group and the City group both checked landlords' unwillingness to participate as the most common reason (37% and 41%). These findings support the Task Force's conclusion that difficulty in finding was a great constraint on the clients' choice. See Appendix Tables VII, VIII and IX for complete tabulations.

Another constraint on housing choice stems from HUD's Project Site Selection Criteria, promulgated in 1972. One important purpose of these regulations was to promote a wider distribution of assisted housing and greater choice outside of areas of minority and low income concentration. One criterion prohibited the building of assisted units in areas of low income or minority concentration. This principle soon was contested by those who felt that areas needing assisted housing were often ones of minority and low income impactation.

The end result of this policy is that clients may have fewer housing choices in areas of minority or low income concentration, such as some inner city areas, but more housing choices in suburban areas. Again, this constraint is not attributable to the Regional Section 8 program.

However, it should be kept in mind, as previous figures have shown, the City contains a much larger number of assisted units than does the rest of the Region. In addition, more private units affordable by low and moderate income persons are available in the City than elsewhere. These units are relied upon by all those besides the 9% or 10% of City residents who receive housing assistance. The City Department of Housing and Community Development, in its relocation program to assist displacees, maintains an inventory of affordable units in the city's private rental market, to which it refers displacees. This kind of assistance is not publicized widely enough.

H. Are the Recommendations of the Kerner Report Intended to Suppress Uprisings?

THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE KERNER REPORT ARE NOT INTENDED TO SUPPRESS UPRISINGS. THE REPORT SPECIFICALLY CAUTIONS AGAINST SUCH AN INTERPRETATION AND SUGGESTS MANY PROGRAMS TO ALLEVIATE THE CONDITIONS OF POOR BLACKS. THE WELL-DOCUMENTED RESISTANCE OF SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES TO BLACKS AND POOR PEOPLE AND WHITE RACISM IN GENERAL HAVE BEEN AND ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT SINGLE CAUSE OF RESTRICTED OPPORTUNITIES FOR BLACKS.

The charge has been made that the recommendations of the Kerner Report were motivated by a national desire to suppress justified uprisings. The Task Force asserts that, on the contrary, the Kerner Report recommendations are based on the desire to remove the conditions which cause the uprisings. The Kerner Report identifies White racism as the most important cause and makes a number of recommendations similar to those of the Coalition to Save Urban Communities.

As stated in a summary, the Report cautions that "programs not be viewed as short-termed anti-riot efforts, (or) as merely today's stop-gap remedies for cooling already inflamed situations. These programs will have little chance of succeeding unless they are part of a long range commitment to action designed to eliminate the fundamental sources of grievance and tension." (B. Ritchie, The Riot Report, 1969 p. 198).

Some recommendations of the Kerner Report similar to those of the Coalition are:

"Expand opportunities for ghetto residents to participate in the formulation of public policy and the implementation of programs affecting them through improved political representation. Creation of institutional channels for community action, expansion of legal services, and legislative hearings on ghetto problems." (Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Bantam Books, 1968, p. 16).

Develop neighborhood action task forces with government and community members to promote citizen participation in decision making;

Establish effective grievance response mechanisms;

Sponsor meetings of legislative bodies and ghetto residents.

In addition, the Report makes many recommendations for improving the police department and police-community relations, the court system, education, social services ("Provide more adequate social services through neighborhood centers and family-planning programs," Ibid, p 27), housing programs, and for inner city enrichment and at the same time opportunities for integration.

If one looks for evidence for a theory that there is a national conspiracy to manipulate poor people out of the cities, one finds rather more evidence for a conspiracy that prevents poor people from living in jurisdictions outside the cities and forces them to live in the cities. Most suburban jurisdictions have either done very little to encourage low income housing or have done much to discourage it. In this endeavor they have been greatly helped by sharply rising land and house prices (thus making it very unlikely that there will be any housing available to accommodate large numbers of low income persons).

Meanwhile many new job opportunities are occurring in areas outside the cities. Suburban areas are likely to have more money per capita for schools and social services. More low income people should have the benefit of these resources.

Furthermore an unhealthy and discriminatory situation is developing in America in which our country is dividing into two apartheid communities; suburban with most of our middle to upper income population, and the central cities with most of our poor population. In 1969 the Kerner Report recommended that the nation pursue at the same time strategies to improve non-white communities and to integrate white communities. Actually, not enough of either has been done.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. AHOP does not force people, including poor inner-city Blacks, out of Baltimore City. Only applicants on the City's Section 8 waiting list who stated a desire to move to another jurisdiction were considered for Regional certificates. Regional certificates and other Section 8 certificates have been allocated for the use of City displacees to use in the City. As of June 30, 1980 eighty of the City's Regional Section 8 certificates were used in the City.

B. The Regional Section 8 program provides opportunities for low and moderate income persons to move into the City as well as out of it. As of June 30, 1980, thirty two families, 21 of which were Black, had moved into Baltimore City from other jurisdictions (mostly Baltimore County) on Regional certificates.

C. There is a need for increased services and transportation to those services by Section 8 tenants living in Baltimore County. Distance from services was indicated as a disadvantage of their present housing by 20% to 24% of respondents surveyed. The percentage was very similar whether the respondents were previous City dwellers or had already lived in Baltimore County. About one fifth of the community leaders interviewed specifically referred to assisted tenants' needing more services and/or transportation to them.

D. AHOP is not a conspiracy to force poor City Blacks to other jurisdictions, but rather is a small scale program to increase choice. The Federal regulations establishing this program state this choice explicitly. The number of City Regional Section 8 certificates is such a small percentage of the City's Section 8 waiting list (3.3%) that it could not effectively relocate large numbers of persons. Over the years the number of assisted units provided for use in the City by City residents is 22 times greater than the number provided for City residents to use outside the City. The number of Regional certificates constitutes only 16% of the assisted units provided for City residents to use in the City in 1978 and 1979, the years since the Regional program has been in operation. The formula by which Section 8 units are allocated each year to the City weights local need more than fair share distribution goals. Preliminary 1980 Census figures show too large an increase in the proportion of Blacks in Baltimore City to be counterbalanced by the Regional program so as to seriously erode the Black political base. The counties are incapable of absorbing very large numbers of low and moderate income people from other jurisdictions due to the low vacancy rate and other factors.

E. Most City residents using Regional certificates are relocating in Baltimore County (62%) and in the City itself (24%). In Baltimore County the distribution of Regional certificate holders surveyed is fairly broad, but there are clusters in Middle River, Owings Mills, Randallstown, Lochearn and Reisterstown, with very few assisted tenants in the north central area of the County.

F. The level of satisfaction of Section 8 tenants in Baltimore County is high. A sample of persons living there on Regional certificates showed that 53% were very satisfied, and 25% were somewhat satisfied. City Section 8 certificate holders in the County were not as well satisfied (20% very satisfied and 37% somewhat satisfied). Local certificate holders were the most satisfied of all (69% very satisfied and 17% somewhat satisfied).

G. The major constraints on housing choice are not the AHOP program but the acute shortage of assisted housing and landlords' reluctance to participate in the program, as revealed in the surveys. Ninety percent of Regional certificate holders in the County reported housing difficult to find (either very, or somewhat). When asked if they leased in the community of their first choice, 37% of those who did not checked landlords' unwillingness to participate as the reason.

H. The recommendations of the Kerner Report are not intended to suppress uprisings. The Report specifically cautions against such an interpretation and suggests many programs to alleviate the conditions of poor Blacks. The well-documented resistance of suburban communities to Blacks and poor people and white racism in general have been and are the most important single cause of the restricted opportunities for Blacks.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That AHOP be continued and expanded, with the provisions that additional supports are added to aid clients' free choice, to increase local opportunities for assistance, and to assist clients in finding suitable housing and in dealing with problems which cause distress to them and sometimes to the communities in which they live.

2. That the counties increase support services in areas where assisted tenants live.

3. That Baltimore City continue to encourage private developers to undertake Section 8 rehabilitation and new construction in areas undergoing reinvestment with consequent displacement of Blacks, thus directly providing assisted housing in these areas in which property values are rising.

4A. That Baltimore City expand its relocation resources program to the agency's full capability in which private rental units are inventoried and used as a referral for displaced, establishing the vacancy rate, and maintaining an ongoing survey of vacancies at suitable rental rates, and publicizing this program.

B. That HUD relax site selection criteria in areas of minority and low income impact where displacement is taking place, if the City's survey of vacancies shows an inadequate supply of private affordable rental units.

5. That Baltimore City, the surrounding counties, and the Regional Planning Council conduct an educational program to acquaint citizens with the assisted housing programs, to encourage landlords and managers to participate in the programs, and to encourage cooperative efforts with the Homebuilders Association of Maryland, especially to increase Section 8 tenants in the areas where they are not locating.

6. That the Regional Planning Council reactivate the Area Housing Council to act as a review board which includes recipients of assisted housing, technical specialists, and agency representatives to monitor housing assistance programs.
7. That increased allocation of federal funds be sought for housing assistance to help alleviate the acute housing shortage for low income persons.

V. RESPONSE TO THE DEMANDS OF THE COALITION TO SAVE URBAN COMMUNITIES

The Task Force was requested by the BNI Board to respond to the challenging list of demands presented to the Regional Planning Council Board meeting on June 20, 1980, by the Baltimore Coalition to Save Urban Communities. The Task Force's response is as follows:

Demand #1: "Cancellation of Areawide Housing Opportunity Program (AHOP)!"

BNI has concluded that this program is beneficial and should not be cancelled for reasons presented in this report.

Demand #2: "Appointment of equal low income and Black representation on Regional and City Planning Councils and subcommittees."

BNI agrees that there should be increased representation of lower income and black persons on these bodies.

Demand #3: "Use of Section 8 - if at all - within Baltimore City."

BNI has concluded that there is a reasonable balance between local needs and fair share requirements to justify the continuation of offering City residents a choice of living in other jurisdictions. The Task Force acknowledges that there is a grossly insufficient number of Section 8 certificates available, of landlords willing to participate in the program, and of units available below the fair market rents in all jurisdictions, thus requiring tenants to make hard choices. For the reasons already given, the Task Force believes that permitting only local certificates would not remedy these conditions.

Demand #4: "Halt destruction of city's public housing and poor neighborhoods and displacement of poor inner city residents."

This demand does not seem to be directly related to AHOP. While it has merit and warrants serious discussion, a separate context is indicated.

Demand #5: "Better publicity and public examination of low income housing programs."

BNI supports this demand because of the great need for public awareness and scrutiny of all housing programs to insure maximum citizen input.

Demand #6: "Public interviews of persons already moved to counties 'by neutral oversight team.'"

The Task Force has surveyed Section 8 tenants living in Baltimore County, the jurisdiction to which 212 out of 260 (82%) City Regional certificate holders have moved. The Task Force also surveyed City certificate holders living in Baltimore County on City certificates and a sample of Baltimore County local Existing Section 8 certificate holders.

Assuming that Demand #6 is related to such items as tenant satisfaction, problems with present housing, problems with services and feelings of being forced to live in the County, several Task Force survey items are relevant. These have been summarized in Section II F.

The Task Force does not feel that additional surveys are necessary because it believes that the ones completed have been reasonably impartial. We understand that other groups such as the Urban League and the Regional Planning Council are planning surveys of Regional Section 8 tenants.

Demand #7: "Creation of public advisory board for all low income housing programs."

BNI supports this demand and suggests a detailed study of the purposes and composition of such a board. (See Recommendation #6).

Demand #8: "Release of all federal, state, city documents dealing with AHOP and related low income housing programs."

BNI agrees that all such documents should be made available except those that would infringe on the privacy of the clients.

Demand #9: "City Council hearing on historical and ongoing effects of AHOP and other low income housing programs on poor people."

This comment applies to Demands # 9, 10 and 11. BNI understands that hearings are planned and wishes to support them in any way possible. It is essential to examine the direct and indirect consequences of housing programs and their administration upon the people they are designed to assist.

Demand #10: "City Council hearing into role played by Baltimore City planning council under AHOP and related low income housing programs."

Demand #11: "City Council hearing into use of HCD Community Block Grant and UDAG monies."

Demand #12: "Evaluation of low income access to community corporations serving various poor communities in Baltimore City and metro area."

BNI supports this demand, recognizing the need to utilize informed citizen input to the maximum extent possible.

Demand #13: "City Council enactment of rent control."

This does not seem to be directly related to AHOP. While it has merit and warrants serious discussion, a separate context is indicated.

Demand #14: "Congressional investigation of HUD's involvement in the development of U.S. low income housing programs."

While this idea has merit and warrants serious discussion, a separate context is indicated.

Demand #15: "Provide wide ranging human services for low income communities developed by relocating residents to the counties; ensure that 'grassroots' public guidance be given in the design and follow through of those services."

While BNI recognizes that the number of low income families relocating is small and does not find new communities being developed, nevertheless it is appropriate to encourage jurisdictions to develop social services commensurate to meet the needs of this population. Grassroots input into the implementation of such services is essential.

VI. APPENDIX

TABLE 1
RESPONDENTS' SATISFACTION

Would you say that you are satisfied or not satisfied with the apartment or house you moved into (your present location)? (Q. 11)

	Regional Certificate Holders in Balto. Co.		City Certificate Holders in Balto Co.		Existing Sec. 8 certificate Holders in Balto. Co.	
	n = 49*		n = 41		n = 58	
very satisfied	26	53%	8	20%	40	69%
somewhat satisfied	12	25%	15	37%	10	17%
somewhat dissatisfied	5	10%	14	34%	5	9%
not at all satisfied	4	8%	3	7%	3	5%
No answer	2	4%	1	2%	0	0
TOTAL # in County	312		183		855	

* 34 moved from Baltimore City

The highest level of "very satisfied" was reported by Baltimore County Existing Section 8 residents, the next by Regional Residents, and the lowest by City residents. Combining "very and somewhat" satisfied shows Baltimore County Existing Section 8 to be 86%, the Regional program, 78% and the City program in Baltimore County, 57%.

The conclusion is that the level of satisfaction is high for all 3 groups, but City tenants who could have used their certificates in either jurisdiction show by far the lowest level of satisfaction. One can only speculate about the reasons. Perhaps the extra counselling provided in the Regional program helped the tenants find a unit and neighborhood more suitable to them; perhaps this group had a greater initial preference for the County; perhaps many City certificate holders had moved to the County as a last resort because they had been unable to find housing in the City.

TABLE II
RESPONDENTS' LEASING IN COMMUNITY OF FIRST CHOICE

Did you lease in the community of your first choice? (Q. 7)

	Regional Certificate Holders in <u>Balto. Co.</u>		City Certi- ficate Holders in <u>Balto. Co.</u>		Existing Section 8 Certificate Holders in <u>Balto. Co.</u>	
	n = 49		n = 41		n = 58	
Yes	20	41%	17	41%	37	64%
No	23	47%	22	54%	15	26%
Had no community preference	3	6%	2	5%	3	5%
no answer	3	6%	0	0	3	5%
TOTAL # in County	312		183		855	

The proportion of "no" is greater for both the Regional and City tenants. This question is somewhat ambiguous since community could have been interpreted as a neighborhood and not as a jurisdiction. But the "yes" and "no" answers are almost equal for both groups indicating that 41% found housing in the community of their first choice.

TABLE III
BEST FEATURES OF RESPONDENTS' UNITS

What do you like best about your present apartment or house? (Q.14)

	Regional		City		County	
	n = 49		n = 41		n = 58	
Better transportation	8	16%	2	5%	9	16%
Nearer to work or other job opportunities	5	10%	3	7%	2	3%
Nearer friends/relatives	7	14%	5	12%	14	24%
More convenient to shopping & other services	13	27%	16	39%	23	40%
Like neighborhood (or neigh- bors) better than old neighborhood	22	45%	19	46%	23	40%
Lived in area previously	2	4%	4	10%	9	16%
Better schools	19	39%	14	34%	8	14%
Pay less rent	23	47%	19	46%	24	41%
Size of apartment (more room, etc.)	29	59%	20	49%	29	50%

Liking the neighborhood better was the item most often checked by Regional and City certificate holders (aside from lower rent payments). Better schools was next for Regional certificate holders while convenience was second for City holders and better schools was third for City certificate holders.

TABLE IV
WORST FEATURES OF RESPONDENTS' UNITS

What do you like least about your present apartment or house? (Q. 15)

	<u>Regional</u>		<u>City</u>		<u>County</u>	
	n = 49		n = 41		n = 58	
Transportation not as convenient	20	41%	12	29%	14	24%
Further away from present job or other job opportunities	6	12%	6	15%	9	16%
Further away from friends or relatives	15	31%	10	24%	10	17%
Too far away from services I need (shopping, day care, health care, etc)	10	20%	10	24%	12	21%
Do not like neighborhood or neighbors	2	4%	5	12%	8	14%
Miss my old neighborhood/ neighbors/friends	8	16%	5	12%	4	7%
Feel I do not fit in the neighborhood	2	4%	1	2%	6	10%
Did not find the type of housing I wanted	9	18%	9	22%	2	3%
Size of apartment (too small, etc)	3	6%	4	10%	3	5%

Regional certificate holders ranked transportation, distance from friends and relatives and from services as their chief dislikes. City certificate holders also rated these three as their chief dislikes.

TABLE V
RESPONDENTS' PRESENT HOUSING AN IMPROVEMENT

Did moving to this unit improve your housing? (Q. 13)

	<u>Regional</u> n=49		<u>City</u> n=41		<u>County</u> n=58	
Yes	43	88%	30	73%	42	72%
No	4	8%	1	2%	3	5%
About the same	1	2%	6	15%	8	14%
No Answer	1	2%	4	10%	5	9%

NOTE: time of residence is less under Regional program, proportion of elderly may not be the same in all three programs, and some in the County were assisted in place.

All three groups answered "yes" overwhelmingly.

TABLE VI
RESPONDENTS' RATING OF SECTION 8 STAFF

Please rate the staff in the Section 8 offices (Q.18)

	<u>Regional</u> n = 49		<u>City</u> n = 41		<u>County</u> n = 58	
Very helpful	36	73%	32	78%	53	91%
Somewhat helpful	8	16%	8	20%	3	5%
Not helpful	4	8%	0		1	2%
No answer	1	3%	1	2%	1	2%

TABLE VII
RESPONDENTS' DIFFICULTY IN FINDING HOUSING

In general, would you say it was difficult or not difficult to find a place to live? (Q. 4)

	<u>Regional</u> n = 49		<u>City</u> n = 41		<u>County</u> n = 58	
Very difficult	17	35%	16	39%	26	45%
Some difficulty	22	45%	13	32%	16	28%
Very little difficulty	6	12%	5	12%	4	6%
No difficulty	4	8%	7	17%	9	16%
No answer	0		0		3	5%

TABLE VIII
RESPONDENTS' REASONS FOR NOT LEASING IN COMMUNITY OF FIRST CHOICE

If you did not lease in the community of your first choice, why not? (Q. 8)

	<u>Regional</u>		<u>City</u>		<u>County</u>	
Could not find information about units there	1	2%	2	5%	2	3%
Units I looked at were not within the rent limits	8	16%	8	20%	7	12%
Landlords were not willing to participate in this program	18	37%	17	41%	12	20%
Could not find the right size unit	3	6%	3	7%	0	
Units I looked at were too far away from transportation	14	29%	6	15%	4	7%

TABLE IX

UNITS PROVIDED IN BALTIMORE CITY TO ASSIST VERY LOW INCOME RESIDENTS IN THE CITY

<u>Year Built</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Pub. Hse. Conv.</u>	<u>Pub. Hse. Vacant</u>	<u>Pub. Hse. Used</u>	<u>Pub.Hse. Turnkey</u>	<u>Rent Suppl.</u>	<u>RS,RAP or Section 8 in assisted developments*</u>	<u>Sec. 8 New</u>	<u>Sec. 8 Exist.</u>	<u>Sec. 8 Moderate Rehab.</u>
1969	410	0	2	54	35	318	1	0	0	0
1970	579	0	88	163	161	46	121	0	0	0
1971	1,557	945	438	4	0	109	61	0	0	0
1972	606	0	196	0	0	125	285	0	0	0
1973	1,312	152	210	0	357	0	593	0	0	0
1974	1,364	0	101	0	533	0	730	0	0	0
1975	596	304	135	0	0	0	157	0	0	0
1976	2,208	0	82	0	1,462	0	74	0	590	0
1977	1,995	0	98	0	0	0	782	0	1,115	0
1978	1,113	232	120	0	0	0	434	0	327	0
1979	3,026	363	203	0	570	0	184	828	247	631
TOTAL	14,766	1,996	1,673	221	3,118	598	3,422	828	2,279	631

(source: Regional Planning Council, Listing of Low and Moderate Income Housing in the Baltimore Region, January, 1980)

*In Sec. 236, 221-d-3, 202 and 221-h developments, which are primarily for moderate income households or elderly persons.

CITY OF BALTIMORE
Willian Donald Schaefer, Mayor

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
M.J. BRODIE, Commissioner
*Housing Assistance Payment Program
Room 36 - Equitable Building
127 East Fayette Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202*

Dear Section 8 Applicant:

The Section 8 office now has a limited number of certificates for families who want to move outside Baltimore City. Families who are eligible will be able to move into any of the following counties: Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, or Howard.

If you are interested, please fill out and return the enclosed post-card as soon as possible. If you do not wish to move out of the city, write it on the post card and your name will stay on the Section 8 waiting list.

Please telephone 396-4086 if you have any questions.

Sincerely yours,

W. Warren Brooks
Program Coordinator

Enclosures

As a Section 8 applicant, I would like to move to another locality.
I would like to move to: (Check one box only)

Baltimore City	Baltimore County	Annapolis
Anne Arundel County	Carroll County	Westminster
Harford County		Howard County

I want to move because _____

Name: _____

Street: _____

City _____ County _____ Zip Code _____

Baltimore Neighborhoods Inc.

319 East 25th Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
243-6007

What are BNI's Goals:

1. To maintain viable interracial communities;
2. To create an open housing market;
3. To fight prejudice and discrimination;
4. To expand the rights of tenants and improve tenant-landlord relations.

How does BNI help Integrated Communities?

By fighting blockbusting, racial steering, racial harassment. For example, BNI stands ready to help in cases where the coming of integration is causing racial tension and/or harassment of the newcomers. A member of the BNI staff will visit the neighborhood, explain the law, help calm fears, and help protect the rights of the newcomers.

For neighborhoods already integrated or integrating BNI has published a manual "Neighborhoods and Integration" on how to maintain stability.

How does BNI work for an Open Housing Market?

The Federal and Maryland Fair Housing laws forbid discrimination in the sale or rental of housing on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin or sex. State law also forbids discrimination on the basis of marital status or physical or mental handicap.

BNI monitors the practices of the housing industry in this area and has published a number of studies showing the extent of non-compliance.

BNI is a partner with the Greater Baltimore Board of Realtors and the Real Estate Brokers of Baltimore in the Baltimore Plan for Affirmative Marketing in Real Estate. BNI staffs the Plan which seeks to encourage the affirmative marketing of real estate and also to inform minorities of their rights under the law.

BNI also works with and monitors the activities of federal and state agencies which have a responsibility to end discrimination in housing and to help create an open housing market.

How does BNI handle Complaints of Discrimination?

The complainant will be asked to provide a written statement. Through testing and other means BNI tries to confirm or disprove the allegations. If confirmed, BNI will help the complainant file a complaint with an appropriate agency or find him a volunteer lawyer who will file a civil suit. BNI on its own initiative also files complaints.

What is BNI doing in the field of Tenant-Landlord Relations?

BNI receives hundreds of calls each year from tenants with problems. Complaints may involve advice, information and the use of volunteer lawyers. Qualified tenants may be referred to Legal Aid. BNI publishes for Baltimore City "A Guide To Laws Covering Tenant-Landlord Relations in the City and the State," and similar guides for the surrounding counties.

In the area of legislation BNI's Executive Director serves on the Governor's Landlord-Tenant Laws Study Commission. BNI has helped to coordinate support for laws improving the rights of tenants drafted by the Commission.

BNI helps to organize individual tenant associations and is also working to set up a metropolitan tenant movement.

What Geographic Area does BNI Serve?

BNI works in the whole Baltimore metropolitan area—Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and adjacent areas of Anne Arundel, Howard, Carroll and Harford counties. BNI members and volunteers come from all parts of this area.

**A Private Non Profit
Civil Rights Agency
Working For
Fair Housing and
Tenants' Rights
In The Baltimore
Metropolitan Area**



A United Way Agency