

A. Federal Urban Housing Policy

1. Aimed at low-income people
 - 1) Mostly back-fired
 - a) Often made the problem worse
 - 2) Government aware of housing conditions
 - b) Bad conditions cause problems
2. 40s-60s
 - 1) Government invested in Urban Renewal
 - a) Slums clearance
 - i) Demolish them
 - ii) Move people out
 - iii) Federal/local cooperation
 - US would fund city to set up housing authority
 - HA would take money to clear slums and become landlord

B. Public Housing

1. Goal was to make slums into modern neighborhoods
 1. Pruitt-Igoe complex in St. Louis
 - a) New modern place in a place that used to be slums
 - b) Vertical neighborhoods
 - 2) Characteristics
 - a) Dense populations
 - i) Vertical buildings with common places
 - b) Efficiency
 - i) Concentrated high rise buildings
 - ii) Cleanliness
 - 3) Considered urban miracles at first
 - a) Social-engineering exercise
 - i) Racial/class integration
 - ii) Contact hypothesis might work
 - iii) HA assigned unites according to socioeconomic background
 - But people didn't want to integrate
 - Whites left because they didn't want to live with blacks
 - iv) Demand for housing
 - Pressure on authorities to assign based on income
 - Turbid families, mostly have to be single moms
 - b) Anyone who was married had to leave
2. Housing got less money
 - 1) No married men allowed → working women had less money → federal government gave less money → HA running out of money → cut back on maintenance
 - 2) Open passage ways boarded up
 - a) Residents often threw things
 - b) Looks like a prison
 - i) Ended up being scary places
 - ii) Vandalized by kids

- iii) Gangs took control and defended territory
 - iv) Isolated poor people
 - Urban architecture design = hell
 - Idea of vertical cities became warehouse for poor
 - 3) Romney became secretary of UH
 - a) Saw all the housing problems of 1969
 - i) Implemented Open Community Policy
 - Never happen and quit
- 3. Gautreaux v. Chicago housing authority
 - 1) Gautreaux was a community organizer
 - a) Joined with ACLU lawyer to address housing
 - i) Lawsuit for Chicago HA because it resulted in segregation
 - Violated 14th and civil rights
 - ii) It did promote discrimination
 - b) Circuit court said
 - i) CHA couldn't make any more development
 - ii) Also no more high-rise buildings
 - 2) HUD had to change housing policies
- 4. Hills v. Gautreaux (1976)
 - 1) Court agrees with Gautreaux
 - a) Federal government had to change public housing
 - i) No more high rises and high density
 - ii) Also couldn't obviously be public housing
 - Had to blend in
 - 2) HUD made Gautreaux assisted housing program
 - a) Issue rent certificates so families can pay rent
 - i) Only for areas 30% less black
 - ii) Section 8 housing problem
 - Rent subsidy
 - Government gives voucher to resident to rent
 - Only if landlord is willing to accept it: they can hate it because they hate poor people or they like it because rent always comes on time from HA

C. Mobility as policy goal

- 1. Moving to opportunity
 - 1) Hope VI program
 - a) Federal/local government have to move housing to low density
 - b) Eliminate high density
 - i) Revitalize projects to be mixed income neighborhoods
 - ii) Kent said neighborhoods should have mixed income
 - Get rich/middle class/poor people to live with each other
 - c) NH subsidizes so not everyone pays the same rate
 - i) If someone is rich, it's privately owned
 - 2) Controversy with Hope VI
 - a) Problem is that you lose a lot of housing units

- i) You displace a lot of people
 - Falls disproportionately on black/poor
 - b) Gentrification
 - i) Process of renewing/building urban areas for affluent people to replace poor
 - 3) Moving to opportunity program
 - a) Social experiment before Hope VI
 - i) Recruit PH residents in 5 cities
 - Asked people if they want section 8
 - Use random drawings
 - ii) Experiment
 - Control: people did get it
 - One group got vouchers to go anywhere
 - Another group got vouchers and other benefits for benefits → track results over 20 years from 1994
 - b) Policy lessons
 - i) People who signed up had been crime victimized 5x more likely
 - ii) Positive effects
 - Lower poverty
 - Lower crime victimization
 - Lower criminal activity
 - Better health outcome
 - iii) Negative effect
 - Little income gain
 - No employment improvement
 - No education improvement
2. Lewis and Sinha (2007)
 - 1) Experiment
 - a) Question: residential/income mobility of low-income families
 - b) DV: residential/economic mobility
 - i) Measure income before/after
 - c) IV: income, race, mobility and education
 - 2) Findings
 - a) Poverty dropped
 - b) People experienced income gain but it leveled off
 - i) If you're extremely poor, it helps
 - ii) People moving to less segregated neighborhoods
 - 3) What should governments do with urban poverty
 - a) Reduce federal subsidies