# **COPYRIGHT / USAGE**

Material on this site may be quoted or reproduced for **personal and educational purposes** without prior permission, provided appropriate credit is given. Any commercial use of this material is prohibited without prior permission from The Special Collections Department - Langsdale Library, University of Baltimore. Commercial requests for use of the transcript or related documentation must be submitted in writing to the address below.

When crediting the use of portions from this site or materials within that are copyrighted by us please use the citation: *Used with permission of the University of Baltimore*.

If you have any requests or questions regarding the use of the transcript or supporting documents, please contact us: Langsdale Library Special Collections Department

Special Collections Department 1420 Maryland Avenue Baltimore, MD 21201-5779 http://archives.ubalt.edu

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT NO.	2	
CASE NOMJG 95 - 309	1	
IDENTIFICATION:		
ADMITTED:	19.94	

# Public Housing and Racial Segregation in Baltimore

by

# Karl Taeuber

Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Sociology, University of Wisconsin

April 29, 2003

Karl Taeuber E-mail: ktaeuber@fwisc.edu Phone: 608-251-0974 Mail: 1911 Vilas Ave, Madison, WI 53711

# Public Housing and Racial Segregation in Baltimore

# Contents

1	I. Conclusions
6	II. Six Decades of Racially Segregated Public Housing
10	III. Background: Residential Segregation before Public Housing
16 17 18 20 21 22 24 25 27 28	<ul> <li>IV. Public Housing during the Era of Official Segregation, 1940-1954 <ul> <li>A. Racially-Designated Public Housing Projects, 1940-1954</li> <li>1. New Deal Projects, 1940-1943</li> <li>2. War Housing Projects, 1942-1945</li> <li>3. Urban Renewal Projects, 1952-1954</li> <li>4. Imposed Racial Transition: Fairfield Homes</li> </ul> </li> <li>B. Effects of Segregated Public Housing on General Residential Segregation <ul> <li>1. Negro Projects</li> <li>2. White Projects</li> <li>3. Changes in City-Wide Residential Segregation during the 1940s</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
31 33	4. Metropolitan Effects of Public Housing in the Segregation Era V. Segregation Despite "Desegregation," 1954-1970
35 36 39 39	<ul> <li>A. "Desegregation" and the Racially Designated Projects <ol> <li>Negro Projects</li> <li>White Projects</li> </ol> </li> <li>B. New Public Housing, 1955-1970 <ol> <li>Public Housing in the Postwar Years</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
42 47 49 49	2. New Projects for Families 3. Scattered-Site Housing 4. Projects for the Elderly C. Waiting Lists, Tenant Assignment, and Declining Numbers of Whites
61 64	D. "Desegregation" As a Racially Structured Process E. Segregated Public Housing and General Residential Segregation, 1940-1970
71 72 73 74 77 80 84 85 89 92	<ul> <li>VI. Public Housing, 1970-2002: Continuing Segregation <ul> <li>A. Changes in Public Housing, 1971-2002</li> <li>1. New Projects for Families, 1971-1980</li> <li>2. New Scattered-Site Projects, 1967-1995</li> <li>3. New Projects for the Elderly, 1973-1985</li> <li>4. System Shrinkage: Project Closings and Demolitions, 1987-2001</li> <li>B. Segregated Public Housing and General Residential Segregation, 1940-2002</li> <li>1. Segregated Public Housing Public Housing Projects, 1940-2002</li> <li>2. General Residential Segregation, 1940-2002</li> <li>3. Segregated Public Housing and General Residential Segregation: Linkage</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
02	Sources

## Tables

Table 1. Reference Table: All Public Housing Projects, 1940-2002

Table 2. Percentage Negro for Family Projects at Selected Dates, 1954-1970

Table 3. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 1970

Table 4. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 1981

Table 5. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 1991

Table 6. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 2002

### Maps

Map 1. Reference: Locations of Family and Elderly Public Housing Projects

Map 2. 1940

Map 3. 1950

Map 4. 1960

Map 5. 1970

Map 6. 1980

Map 7. 1990

Map 8. 2000

Map 9a. Scattered Sites 1967-1974, with 1970 Census Tracts

Map 9b. Scattered Sites 1975-1984, with 1980 Census Tracts

Map 9c. Scattered Sites 1985-1995, with 1990 Census Tracts

Map 9d. Scattered Sites, All Units 1967-1995, with 1990 Census Tracts

Map 9e. Scattered Sites, All Units 1967-1995, with 2000 Census Tracts

Public Housing and Racial Segregation in Baltimore

# I. Conclusions

1

For this report I analyzed the nature and extent of racial segregation of the public housing system in Baltimore City. I reviewed site selection practices and tenant selection and assignment practices of the Housing Authority of Baltimore City (HABC), an agency of Baltimore City that is regulated and largely funded by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). I assessed the effects of the policies and practices of these federal and local government agencies on racial segregation of Baltimore's public housing. Based upon the documents I have reviewed from HABC, HUD, other government agencies, scholars, and private organizations; data I have analyzed from HABC, the U.S. Census Bureau, and other agencies; and statistical analyses I have performed, I have formed the following conclusions.

- 1. Baltimore's public housing system is racially segregated and has been racially segregated since its inception. Official policies of racial discrimination practiced by federal and local government agencies created a totally segregated public housing system from its inception to 1954, and this official segregation is a direct cause of the current racial segregation. To the extent that actions have been taken since 1954 to disestablish this segregation, the actions have not been effective. To the contrary, actions taken by federal and local government agencies since 1954 with respect to site selection and tenant assignment have perpetuated and intensified the racial segregation.
- 2. The public housing projects built before 1954 and officially designated for Negroes remained exclusively black to the present. No attempt was made to desegregate them. No actions ever taken by federal and local government agencies changed their status as uniracial black projects.
- 3. The public housing projects built before 1954 and officially designated for whites never experienced stable integration. Four of these projects underwent a deliberate racial transition and became uniracial black projects. Two projects that opened as designated-white projects continued to be majority white for the next fifty years, even though there were many other housing projects with no white tenants and there were white tenants on the waiting list. These disparities resulted from the segregative housing practices of federal and local government agencies.
- 4. The public housing system served roughly equal numbers of Negro and white families in 1954. Because of segregative siting and tenant assignment practiced by federal

and local government agencies, occupancy of public housing became heavily black by 1970 and today is nearly exclusively black.

- 5. During the years 1940-1954, federal and local government agencies sited, constructed, maintained, and operated 14 public housing projects with more than 7,000 units. Each of the 14 projects was designated for, and occupied solely by, a particular race, Negro or white. All of the Negro projects were sited in areas of minority concentration, or, in the case of Cherry Hill, in an isolated vacant land site. Some of the white projects were sited in non-minority concentrated areas. Other white projects were sited in racially mixed areas but the sites were cleared of black occupants. These practices by federal and local government agencies ensured separation of the races into segregated projects and segregated neighborhoods.
- 6. Racially-motivated siting and occupancy practices for public housing, implemented by federal and local government agencies during the years 1940-1954, had a segregative effect on the general residential population of Baltimore. In particular, the siting of all-Negro projects in Negro concentrated areas was intended to contain the Negro population within areas deemed acceptable for Negro housing. Because of site location, site clearance, and 100% Negro occupancy, each project produced an increase in the percentage of Negro residents in the immediate area, thus intensifying residen-tial segregation. The siting of some Negro projects and some white projects near the borders between existing areas of Negro and white concentration was intended to reinforce the racial boundaries and impede the migration of Negro residents into nearby all-white or mostly-white neighborhoods.
- 7. In 1954, following the Supreme Court decision in *Brown*, HABC adopted a policy purportedly calling for "desegregation" of public housing. That policy, as conceived and implemented, was not intended to and in practice did not desegregate any of the former designated-Negro projects. All have remained 99-100% black. Nor was that policy intended to desegregate the white projects located in white residential areas, which remained 100% white until 1966-67 despite a majority-black waiting list. The actual effect of the "desegregation" policy adopted in 1954 was to continue and reinforce segregation in public housing. Federal and local government agencies failed completely to accomplish the disestablishment of the pre-1954 explicit segregation.
- 8. Practices of federal and local government agencies in siting new projects during the period 1955-1970 failed to further desegregation but instead exacerbated the already existing racial segregation. Seven new projects were sited in minority-concentrated areas and opened with at least 97% black occupancy. All seven reached 100% black occupancy by 1970 and continued to be uniracial black to the present or until closed and demolished. The first scattered site projects were built during this period, located in minority concentrated areas in the heart of the ghetto or in tracts within the known paths of ghetto expansion, and occupied solely by black tenants.
- 9. Tenant selection and assignment policies practiced by HABC under HUD oversight further exacerbated the already pervasive racial segregation. Projects originally designated Negro before 1954 continued to be 100% black 1955-1970. Despite continuing tenant move-outs that created many hundreds of vacancies in these projects, and de-

spite the presence of many whites on the waiting list for public housing, no white families ever moved into any of these uniracial black projects. Each and every black outmover was replaced by a black in-mover. Projects originally designated white before 1954 received one of two treatments during the following 15 years. The three uniracial white projects that were located in white residential areas (Claremont, Brooklyn, and O'Donnell) were protected from any black move-ins until the late 1960s, and two of these projects (Brooklyn and O'Donnell) remained majority white well into the 1990s. At the other four projects originally designated white, which were located near areas of minority concentration, black tenants were deliberately introduced by HABC during the mid-1950s. Nearly all move-ins thereafter were blacks, with the consequence that by 1970 all four projects were 80-100% black.

- 10. The "freedom of choice" policy, used after 1954 for tenant selection and assignment, did not, as practiced, further desegregation but instead operated to exacerbate existing conditions of racial segregation. Federal and local government agencies did nothing to correct this. In the late 1960s, HUD policies changed and the agency issued a requirement that housing authorities drop "freedom of choice" policies. However, HABC obtained a waiver from HUD that permitted continuation of segregative tenant selection and assignment practices into the 1990s.
- 11. During the years 1971-1995, HABC continued its segregative practices for site selection and occupancy. Of nine new family projects, seven were placed in overwhelm-ingly black census tracts and have had 99-100% black occupancy since opening (or until demolition). Two new projects, Broadway and Hollander Ridge, opened with and retained a small minority of whites among their tenants; these projects had elderly buildings in addition to the family units. Broadway, was placed in a racially mixed census tract on the border of an area of minority concentration, across the street from one of the original Negro projects, Douglass Homes. Hollander Ridge was placed in an isolated zone at the city boundary. In all, eight of the nine projects that opened after 1970, containing 1,169 new units of public housing, were designed and built as extensions to pre-1954 designated-Negro projects, or were purposefully built in close proximity to such projects. The foreseeable result was that the racial occupancy of the family units thus sited mirrored the uniracial black occupancy of the older adjacent projects. This siting intensified segregation at the existing projects and created enlarged clusters of racially identifiable housing projects.
- 12. The scattered-site housing program presented an opportunity for federal and local government agencies to achieve a substantial amount of desegregation of public housing, but the opportunity was wasted. More than 2,800 scattered site units were brought into service from 1967 through 1995. Because this program used ordinary row housing and small buildings, the "projects" could be scattered throughout the city -- not concentrated at a few sites. With only a handful of exceptions, this housing was sited in minority-concentrated areas and neighborhoods already in racial transition. Because 98% of the tenants placed in scattered site housing were black, this housing program reinforced and intensified general residential segregation.
- 13. During the years 1970-1985, 16 housing projects containing nearly 3,000 units were built for the elderly and disabled. Under policies and practices of federal and lo-

cal government agencies, these projects were sited and occupied differently from the projects for families. The elderly projects were more dispersed around the city, on average nearly a mile farther from the city center than family projects, and were not sited exclusively in minority-concentrated or isolated parts of the city.

- 14. Statistical analyses, using segregation indexes and other measures applied to census and HABC data, bear out my conclusions. The dissimilarity index measures the degree to which black and white tenants were unevenly distributed among housing projects. During the period of *de jure* racial designation, the index score for family projects was 100, indicating total segregation. During the first 16 years after 1954, when HABC claimed to be operating on a "desegregation basis," the index score for family projects fell only 14 points, to 86. This is a very high score, far from the zero point of no segregation, and far above the levels achieved in the early 1970s by many school districts that vigorously pursued a racial redistribution of pupils among schools. By 2002, nearly five decades after the *Brown* decision, the index score for family projects had fallen only 7 more points, to 79. Based upon my extensive experience and research using the dissimilarity index, a score of 79 indicates a very high level of segregation and, in a context where desegregation has purportedly taken place, represents an extraordinary failure to actually accomplish real desegregation.
- 15. Statistical analyses also document the extreme degree to which black residents of family public housing have been placed in uniracial residential environments. At all dates from 1940 through 2002, the average racial composition of the projects in which black tenants of family public housing lived was at least 94% black. In 2002, the average was 97% black, barely distinguishable from the 100% black that prevailed before 1954.
- 16. In 1991, when nearly all the family projects were still in service, the average racial composition of the census tracts in which black tenants of family public housing lived was 90% black. By contrast, the average racial composition of the census tracts in which white tenants of family public housing lived was only 43% black. In HABC family public housing, the average white resident lived in a majority-white neighborhood, while the average black resident lived in an overwhelmingly black neighborhood.
- 17. The original projects designated for Negroes were placed closer to the city center than were the projects designated for whites. In 1950, the average distance for black tenants was 1.6 miles while the average distance for white tenants was 2.7 miles. During the years after 1954, many new projects were built, some far from the city center, but the average black tenant living in a family public housing project in 1970 was still only 1.6 miles from the city center. In 1991, despite the opening of Hollander Ridge at the far edge of the city, this average distance was slightly higher, 1.9 miles. For white tenants of family public housing, however, new project construction after 1954, together with segregated patterns of occupancy, resulted in substantial dispersal away from downtown. For white tenants, the average distance from the city center increased from 2.7 miles in 1950 to 3.7 miles in 1970 and 4.0 miles in 1991. In 1991, therefore, white tenants of family public housing projects lived twice as far from the city center as black tenants.

- 18. The current segregation in public housing is not accounted for by demographic changes in the neighborhoods surrounding the projects or in the metropolitan Baltimore housing market as a whole. All of the projects that today have 99-100% black occupancy, or that were 99-100% black before demolition, were sited in areas that were already predominantly black, were in the path of expected black migration, or were in isolated areas. From its origin in the 1930s as a totally segregated federal and local government program, and throughout its history, public housing in Baltimore has never had any effective desegregation of its own system and has never set a model for, or exerted a positive influence on, lessening general residential segregation. Far from merely passively reflecting vague demographic forces, the public housing system has acted to reinforce, accelerate, and extend patterns of general residential segregation in Baltimore City and the metropolitan area.
- 19. The current segregation in public housing is also not accounted for by demographic and economic forces outside the control of HUD, Baltimore City, and HABC that resulted in a mainly black waiting list. The paucity of white applicants was caused by federal and local government policy decisions and practices, including the former *de jure* imposition of project-by-project racial segregation; the siting of family projects near existing all-black projects and in areas being incorporated into the ghetto; the failure to place projects in white areas or in areas with mixed occupancy that had a chance for stable integration; the steering of black tenants into projects, old and new, that were within or close to the black ghetto; the clinging to "freedom of choice" tenant selection and assignment and the manner in which that policy was practiced; the use of public housing as a priority relocation resource for urban renewal displacees who were planned to be and were in fact overwhelmingly black; and racially discriminatory actions of FHA and other agencies that promoted an unprecedented massive suburbanization of white families into rigidly regulated all-white enclaves located at the fringes of the city and in the surrounding counties.

Public Housing and Racial Segregation in Baltimore

# II. Six Decades of Racially Segregated Public Housing

Baltimore was a public-housing pioneer among the nation's cities, opening the first New Deal public housing project in 1940. From 1940 to 2002, the Housing Authority of Baltimore City (HABC) built 31 projects for families (12,760 dwelling units), rehabilitated row housing and apartments for family housing at scattered sites (more than 2,800 units), and built 16 projects for elderly and disabled persons (2,951 units). HABC has been a powerful force in Baltimore's residential housing market, responsible for location and occupancy of more than 18,500 dwelling units. Basic information on these projects is provided in Table 1 and locations are shown on Map 1.

Table 1. Reference Table: All Public Housing Projects, 1940-2002

# Map 1. Reference: Locations of Family and Elderly Public Housing Projects

In this report I analyze racial segregation in public housing in Baltimore City from 1940 to 2002 and assess connections between segregation in public housing and segregation in the general housing market. My sources are project occupancy data from HABC, demographic data from U.S. censuses, government documents, scholarly works, and news reports. Maps, tables, and statistical indexes portray the degree of racial segregation in public and private housing at successive dates and facilitate examination of the linkages.

Baltimore opened 12 public housing projects, 1940-1945, with more than 6,000 dwelling units. Housing authorities, acting in accord with federal, state, and city policies, imposed total racial segregation on these projects. Six projects designated for whites had 3,300 dwelling units and six projects designated for Negroes had 2,700 units. Character-

istics and locations of these projects are described in Section IV, together with analyses of their effects on general housing segregation

The term Negro was used by HABC and the Census Bureau until the mid-1970s. I use Negro when that is the historically appropriate term and *Black* for recent times.

*Jim Crow* racial practices were the official policy of HABC until 1954. The twelve original projects and two new projects that opened in the early 1950s were racially designated and totally segregated. After the Supreme Court's *Brown* decision in May 1954, the Housing Authority dropped formal racial designation and adopted a "freedom of choice" plan for tenant assignment. During the next 16 years, HABC opened nine more projects, adding nearly 5,000 units of public housing. Trends in racial occupancy of all public housing projects, 1954-1970, are analyzed in Section V. These analyses demonstrate that "desegregation," as implemented in Baltimore through "freedom of choice" and other practices, failed to remove racial segregation from public housing. *Jim Crow* practices continued. In 1970, Baltimore's public housing was highly segregated and served a mostly black clientele.

Analyses of project data for the years 1970-2002, reported in Section VI, document that racial segregation persisted for another 32 years. These three decades were a time of enormous change in many facets of public housing. Eight family projects were opened, family housing at scattered sites grew to nearly 3,000 units, sixteen projects for the elderly were opened, and many high-rise projects and associated low-rise buildings were demolished. Despite all these structural changes, most of the public housing in Baltimore continued to have 100% black occupancy. The remaining whites were concentrated in just a few projects.

#### Section II. Six Decades of Racially Segregated Public Housing

All of the family housing projects originally racially designated for Negroes retained their uniracial identity to 2002 (or until demolition). Nearly all of the new family units that opened after 1954 were assigned to black tenants. Of the family housing projects originally designated for whites, all but three underwent a total racial transition in the 1950s and 1960s and became 99-100% black. The three exceptions, Brooklyn, O'Donnell, and Claremont, were originally designated for whites and sited in white residential areas where they were isolated from other projects. In 2002, these three pre-1954 projects had become majority black, but they remained the location for 221 of the 229 white families then living in family public housing projects. The other 17 family projects in service in 2002 housed a grand total of eight white families.

After 1980, no new family public housing projects were developed, but the program for housing families at scattered sites continued to expand. In 2002, one-fifth of the family housing units operated by HABC were in the scattered-site program. Virtually all of these units were "scattered" within the black ghetto, and 98% of the tenants were black.

In public housing projects for the elderly, 86% of the units in 2002 were assigned to black tenants. Half of the elderly projects had 90-100% black occupancy, but one project, Primrose Place, was majority white.

When HABC dropped its policy of mandatory segregation in 1954, public housing served roughly equal numbers of Negroes and whites. During the next sixteen years, public housing became, in fact and in image, a program for Negroes. A few projects continued to have white tenants, but most projects became all Negro. In 1970, 85% of Baltimore's public housing residents were Negro.

By 1970, federal legislation and Supreme Court decisions barred racial discrimination in all public housing and most private housing. After 1970, HABC added thousands

#### Section II. Six Decades of Racially Segregated Public Housing

of additional units of racially segregated public housing to its inventory, with new family projects, new scattered-site units, and new elderly projects.

Public housing in Baltimore began in the early 1940s as a racially segregated program with a majority-white clientele. During 62 years of operation, no substantial desegregation ever occurred. At every date during the existence of family public housing, most projects were racially identifiable, in the sense that all or nearly all of their tenants were of a single race. What did change was the racial balance in the system. The original twelve projects included six for whites and six for Negroes. After 1954, the "freedom of choice" method of assigning tenants, together with the procedures followed for location and operation of new projects, converted the system to one where nearly all the tenants were black. No project that opened totally black ever housed more than a token number of whites. Most projects that were once all white or mostly white experienced a transition to totally or mostly black. HABC's policies and practices after 1954 did not eliminate racial identifiability from projects but instead brought a transformation of the total system to nearly uniracial status. In 2002, 97% of tenants of family projects and scattered-site housing were black. Public housing had become a racially segregated government program for a black clientele.

Public Housing and Racial Segregation in Baltimore

# III. Background: Residential Segregation before Public Housing

Public housing constitutes part of the total housing stock of Baltimore City. Racial segregation of public housing occurs within the context of an urban area that has a high degree of general racial residential segregation. There has always been a strong correspondence between racially segregated public housing and racially segregated neighborhoods. This poses a historical chicken-and-egg question that needs careful examination. Does the racial segregation of public housing merely reflect the racial ghettoization of the general housing market, or has the history of racial discrimination in public housing influenced and intensified housing segregation throughout the Baltimore region? In this section, I begin to address this complex question by analyzing the nature and extent of housing segregation in Baltimore in 1940, just before the opening of the first public housing project.

The pre-1940 background can be provided with a quick historical sketch. In 1752, Baltimore was a tiny settlement with only 25 dwellings. The new settlement quickly attracted more industries, workers, and residents. Rapid population growth continued for two centuries as Baltimore developed into one of the nation's major industrial cities.

Population of Baltimore City			
1790	14,000		
1840	102,000		
1890	434,000		
1940	859,000		

Most of the residents of pre-abolition Baltimore were free whites, but there were also many Negro slaves and some free Negroes. After the Civil War and emancipation, Baltimore City used *Jim Crow* laws and policies to continue white domination and sustain an extensive system of racial segregation.

By the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Baltimore was one of the nation's premier port cities. Most of the city's laborers were poor and had to live near the dockyards and other places of employment. Downtown and industrial areas developed dense settlements of low-rent housing. Recent immigrants from many European nations clustered together with others of their own nationality, but ethnic and racial segregation was always incomplete. On some streets one ethnic group might predominate, but with a degree of intermixture with diverse neighbors. Enclaves of European nationalities were in continual flux as new immigrants were absorbed and second- and third-generation members dispersed to better housing in newer neighborhoods. Negroes faced constant discrimination that was at least as severe as that confronting any ethnic nationality. Many attempts were made to confine the growing Negro population, using law and intimidation, but these were only partially successful. Totally segregated neighborhoods for Negroes were small in scale through the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Map 2. 1940

The pattern of racial distribution in Baltimore at the end of the Depression and beginning of World War II is portrayed on Map 2. The gray shading on the map indicates the percentage Negro among residents in each census tract, derived from 1940 census data. A glance at the map reveals that parts of the central city had high concentrations of Negro residents while nearly all of the outlying neighborhoods were solidly white.

> Census tracts are small areas with about 2,500-8,000 people (1,000-3,000 housing units). National, state, and local agencies use census tracts for compiling and analyzing the distribution of people and activities. For each census, some tract boundaries are revised to take account of demographic and physical changes. The tract grid for Baltimore City remained remarkably consistent 1940-2000.

The pattern of blacks in the center and whites on the periphery is so widely recognized in contemporary American cities that the term "inner city" has become a synonym for black ghetto. The phrase *Chocolate City, Vanilla Suburbs* has been used as a song title. This racial patterning of cities is neither natural nor inevitable, but arose through a complex interplay of social and economic history and contemporary circumstances. Many studies have documented the discriminatory laws and practices that enhanced racial segregation. In the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the intensity of racial segregation increased while the social, economic, and residential segregation of European ethnic minorities decreased. These findings apply to all large American cities and specifically include Baltimore.

The racial pattern shown by the shading of Map 2 is so familiar that it is helpful to consider a hypothetical world where skin color had no more social meaning than eye color or size of ears. Race would then have only trivial links to where people lived. In 1940, Negroes composed 19% of the population and whites 81%. If race were not imbued with such intense social meaning, every census tract would have had a percentage Negro not very different from 19%. For such a hypothetical Baltimore, Map 2 would show a pattern of uniform shading, indicating near-zero segregation.

Race does affect residence, and the actual Map 2 reveals a strong pattern of racial residential segregation. Most Negro residents were clustered in two central areas. The larger concentration of Negro-occupied housing in 1940 was in the west-central area. A small Negro area had formed to the east, separated from the west cluster by the central business corridor.

Public discourse today envisions racial residential segregation in terms of sprawling black ghettos. Baltimore in 1940 did not have that type of ghetto. Negro population ex-

ceeded 90% in only 7 census tracts. In 38 census tracts, Negroes composed between 10% and 90% of the residents. These tracts were roughly evenly split between those with a Negro majority and those with a white majority. The east-central area of Negro concentration did not contain any mostly-Negro census tracts. In the west-central Negro area each of the census tracts that was more than 90% Negro adjoined other tracts that still had a substantial presence of white residents.

In this report the r	acial distribution is regularly divided into four categories
of percentage Ne	gro (or black):
90% or more	mostly Negro
50% - 89.9%	majority Negro (may in context include mostly Negro)
10% - 49.9%	majority white (may in context include mostly white)
Less than 10%	mostly white

It is likely that most whites living in central areas of Baltimore in 1940 were about as racially prejudiced as whites living elsewhere in the city. Many might have preferred not to have Negro neighbors, but their attachments to old neighbors and familiar neighborhoods, along with their economic circumstances, overrode racial prejudice. Many centralcity neighborhoods once housed immigrants from Europe. Ethnic enclaves had developed with special facilities, such as food shops, restaurants and bars, stores, places of worship, and places of recreation. Segregation of white ethnics, however, was not imposed as totally and rigidly as for Negroes. No large areas were occupied exclusively by any single ethnic group. Furthermore, large proportions of members of the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and later generations assimilated enough to leave ethnic enclaves and join the movement to newer outlying areas. Old ethnic enclaves declined, but often at a slow pace because many older persons, together with a fraction of their descendants, continued to live in inner-city neighborhoods. As the immigrant generation died out, new migrants to the city

took the vacated housing. In Baltimore, during the decades after 1940, many of those moving to the city were Negroes.

The incomplete character of racial residential segregation in Baltimore in 1940, easily visible from inspection of Map 2, can be more formally documented with a few statistical measures calculated from census data. (Census tracts are used here as indicators of neighborhoods.) The first measure is an *exposure index*. In 1940, Baltimore's Negro residents lived, on average, in census tracts that were 69% Negro and 31% white. Under completely segregated ghetto conditions, Negroes would have lived in census tracts that were close to 100% Negro and would have had no nearby white neighbors.

One way to interpret this exposure index is to imagine that a surprise fire drill was conducted for each census tract, and that all residents of a tract gathered in a central location where they encountered all of their tract co-residents. For Negro residents, the average percentage Negro among the people gathered together would have been 69%. (The score on an exposure index indicates an underlying potential for nearby contact that may never be realized in actual behavior.)

Under complete segregation, whites would have only other whites as nearby neighbors. Whites participating in the mythical fire drill would be exposed to nearly 100% white neighbors (or, to keep the focus on percentage Negro, 0% Negro neighbors). The actual average neighborhood percentage Negro for Baltimore's white residents in 1940 was 7%. Most whites were indeed living in neighborhoods that were close to 0% Negro, but enough whites were living in census tracts that were 10% Negro or 32% Negro or 89% Negro that the average score was pulled up from 0% to 7%.

Another measure, the dissimilarity index, is widely used in scholarly studies to compare the degree of racial residential segregation among various cities. The index

takes the score of 100 if segregation is total and 0 if there is no segregation. For Baltimore for 1940 the dissimilarity score was 79. This is a high score, indicative of the very visible pattern of racial residential segregation, but much higher scores (sometimes above 90) have characterized other American cities that were more intensely segregated in 1940 or at more recent census dates.

These analyses of census data confirm that racial residential segregation was incomplete in Baltimore in 1940. Negroes were excluded from vast areas of the city and could find housing only in the central areas, but most of these central neighborhoods had considerable racial diversity. Most whites, but not quite all, lived in racially homogeneous outlying city neighborhoods. Some lived in racially mixed neighborhoods. Average neighborhood racial composition for Negroes was 69% Negro, not 100%. White neighborhoods averaged 7% Negro rather than 0%.

The analyses document that most of the white residents of Baltimore City in 1940 lived in segregated white enclaves, far from Negro neighbors. By contrast, most of the city's Negro residents lived in proximity to white neighbors. Baltimore did not yet have extensive residential areas that were mostly Negro (90-100%). In this sense, Baltimore in 1940 had not yet developed a modern-style Negro ghetto.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, many residents of Baltimore City lived in dilapidated housing that was overcrowded, unhealthy, and unsafe. Health, safety, and zoning regulations were inadequate to overcome the problems, and programs to provide shelter helped only a few of the destitute. The New Deal brought a vastly expanded federal role and a new concept of public housing: city housing authorities, with federal funds and regulations, would construct and operate housing projects and lease the dwelling units to low-income families.

The U.S. Housing Act of 1937 authorized the new program. That same year, the Housing Authority of Baltimore City, chartered by the State of Maryland, began operations as a part of City government. With federal subsidies, special financing arrangements, and tax exemptions, the new projects would not require direct City expenditures. One of the federal regulations specified that good housing should replace bad housing. For every new unit, at least one old unit had to be demolished. In Baltimore, site selection, slum clearance, and housing construction were soon under way. The first project, Poe Homes, opened in 1940, and six more New Deal projects opened 1941-1943. Basic reference information on these projects is provided in Table 1, and full descriptions of the size, location, and occupancy of these seven projects are provided in Section IV-A-1.

Before the full complement of New Deal public housing projects was completed, a parallel program was launched to provide housing for the growing numbers of workers in defense industries. Units in several of the New Deal projects were "diverted to use of war industry employees during the war emergency," but rules reserving all vacancies for lowincome families were reimposed in 1946. The War Housing program also included new

construction, with 3,700 units in "permanent" buildings and 1,800 units in "temporary" quarters. After the war, in some cases long after, the temporary units were demolished and some of the permanent units sold to private investors. Ownership of five of the permanent projects was, sooner or later, transferred to HABC for operation as regular public housing. In this report, these five projects are included as if they had always been part of the HABC family public housing program. Information about the size, location, and occupancy of these projects is provided in Section IV-A-2.

In the early postwar years, planning began to expand the supply of public housing for families by developing new projects. Only two of these projects were completed and opened before 1954, while HABC's policy of mandatory racial designation was still in place. Information on these projects is provided in Section IV-A-3.

The rigidity and irrationality of racial attitudes during the period when HABC imposed mandatory racial designation are illuminated in Section IV-A-4, which describes the change of the racial designation for Fairfield Homes from white to Negro.

The four parts of Section IV-A describe the pre-1954 growth of public housing in Baltimore and the all-encompassing nature with which the official policy of racial segregation was practiced. In Section IV-B, the focus shifts from description to analysis of racial segregation in public housing, followed by assessment of the effects of these policies and practices on general residential segregation in Baltimore.

# IV-A. Racially-Designated Public Housing Projects, 1940-1954

Fourteen public housing projects designed for family occupancy opened during the years 1940-1954 with official racial designations. The projects are grouped into three programs: I) seven New Deal projects; 2) five War Housing projects; and 3) two Urban Renewal projects. As already noted, actions during the war years blurred the lines between

New Deal and War Housing projects. The background of each program is sketched, and information is presented for each project: date of opening, number of housing units, where it was sited, and racial composition of the neighborhood. Maps show the specific location of each project, its spatial relation to other projects, and the racial composition of nearby neighborhoods. Section IV-A concludes with discussion of HABC's switching of the official racial designation of Fairfield Homes and the elaborately managed process of moving white families out and moving Negro families in.

#### IV-A-1. New Deal Projects, 1940-1943

During the Great Depression of the 1930s, housing conditions worsened. New construction was rare, overcrowding increased, maintenance of the aging stock lagged, and the quality of shelter deteriorated. In his Second Inaugural Address, President Franklin Roosevelt spoke of "one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished." Congress authorized public housing as a New Deal initiative to provide decent and affordable shelter. Baltimore opted to participate in the new program and in the late 1930s developed the necessary governmental infrastructure and plans for site selection, clearance, and construction. Seven New Deal projects opened between 1940 and 1943, providing 3,521 new units for rental at low rates to needy families.

With the concurrence of federal and state authorities, Baltimore imposed total racial segregation on its public housing. Each project was assigned a racial identity. Project locations are shown on Map 2, with green circles marking Negro projects and red circles marking white projects. The gray shading on the map groups census tracts into four categories according to percentage Negro in 1940: mostly Negro, majority Negro, majority white, and mostly white. The exact percentage Negro for the tract in which a project is located is shown in the text table.

				% Negro in Census Tract
Project	Units	Race	Opened	1940
MD 2-04 Poe	298	Negro	1940	44
MD 2-02 McCulloh	434	Negro	1941	73
MD 2-01 Latrobe	701	White	1941	81
MD 2-05 Douglass	393	Negro	1941	54
MD 2-03 Perkins	688	White	1942	38
MD 2-06 Gilmor	587	Negro	1942	91
MD 2-10 Somerset	420	Negro	1943	79

# New Deal Projects, 1940-1943

All five New Deal projects assigned to Negroes were placed within the mixed-race residential clusters east and west of the city center. The percentage Negro in the census tracts receiving projects ranged from 44% to 91% (in 1940, before any projects had opened). These projects were 100% Negro in occupancy. Because each unit of public housing was occupied by a family with two or more members, the number of units in a project must be multiplied by 3 or 4 to get an estimate of the number of Negro persons added to the population of the census tract. Each project constituted a large segment of uniracial housing that stood in contrast to the less solidly uniracial character of the surrounding residential areas.

When the sites for the two white projects were selected in the late 1930s, Negro inmigration to the city had slowed. Planners may have assumed that then-current racial boundaries between white and Negro neighborhoods could be maintained. Latrobe and Perkins were placed at the northern and southern boundaries of the east-central area of racially mixed neighborhoods. Latrobe's census tract was 81% Negro in 1940, but the project was placed at the north edge of the tract, adjoining majority-white residential areas. Perkins was placed at the southern boundary of this cluster in a census tract that was 38% Negro in 1940. Tracts neighboring Perkins in every direction except north were mostly white.

#### IV-A-2. War Housing Projects, 1942-1945

When the first New Deal project opened in 1940, World War II had begun in Europe and the United States was becoming the arsenal for democracy. Defense contracts and industrial expansion were attracting new migrants to industrial cities like Baltimore. The unexpected population boom put great strains on already-tight housing markets. A severe shortage of affordable rental housing was identified as a barrier to the war effort and a threat to economic recovery. The federal government launched a War Housing program to provide housing for defense workers. In this section, information is included only on the War Housing projects that were later transferred to HABC for operation as regular public housing. These projects were initially owned by the federal Public Housing Administration but they were managed by HABC and, as with the New Deal projects, complete racial segregation was imposed. Five War Housing projects opened between 1942 and 1945, providing 2,500 new units of subsidized rental housing.

				% Negro in Census Tract
Project	Units	Race	Opened	1940
MD 2-20 Fairfield	300	White	1942	47
MD 2-22 Westport	200	White	1942	13
MD 2-21 Brooklyn	500	White	1942	1
MD 2-09 O'Donnell	900	White	1943	0
MD 2-11 Cherry Hill	600	Nearo	1945	1

#### War Housing Projects, 1942-1945

The four War Housing projects assigned to whites were placed in mostly white areas accessible to expanding defense industries (Map 2). Fairfield, Westport, and Brooklyn were placed on the far south side of Baltimore. O'Donnell, with 900 units the largest of the projects, was isolated from the others in a southeastern industrial tract that was reported by the 1940 census as 99.8% white. O'Donnell was planned as a New Deal project for low-income white families, but was used during the war for defense workers and military

families. Some of the units in New Deal Projects Perkins, Gilmor, and Somerset were also diverted temporarily to housing of war industry employees.

Cherry Hill homes, planned as a war housing project designated for Negroes, was not completed on time. It opened after the war had ended and was operated by HABC as regular family housing. This project was developed on an isolated vacant land site in the sparsely populated Cherry Hill section of south Baltimore. The Cherry Hill project for Negroes was geographically separated by topography, distance, and transportation routes from the white projects already in place in the southern sector of the city.

### IV-A-3. Urban Renewal Projects, 1950-1954

During the postwar decades the city engaged in an extended series of redevelopment activities to improve urban infrastructure. Much housing was destroyed, some specifically for slum clearance and some as a consequence of clearance for new facilities, highways, and amenities. In response to the continuing shortage of low-rent housing, augmented by the displacement of many poor families, the city planned to develop many more public housing projects. Between 1950 and 1970, nearly 5,000 units of public housing were added to the 6,000 units from the New Deal and War Housing programs. Only two of these projects opened before HABC's 1954 decision to drop its policy of mandatory racial designation. Locations of these projects are shown on Map 3, where gray shading identifies residential percentages Negro from the 1950 census.

Map 3. 1950

## Urban Renewal Projects, 1950-1954

				Census Tract
Project	Units	Race	Opened	1940 1950
MD 2-12 Cherry Hill Ext. 1	637	Negro	1952	1 99
MD 2-14 Claremont	292	White	1953	0 0

Cherry Hill Extension 1 was placed just east of the original Cherry Hill (#11). These projects created an isolated Negro residential enclave in south Baltimore. Claremont, designated for whites, was placed far from other public housing, in an exclusively white sector of the city.

These two projects were the last to open during the 1940-1954 era of official racial segregation. Residents of the new Negro project lived near other Negro projects in an exclusively Negro neighborhood,. Residents of the new white project lived in an exclusively white residential area, geographically remote from Negro projects.

#### IV-A-4. Imposed Racial Transition: Fairfield Homes

An administratively imposed change in racial designation of a public housing project highlights the pre-1954 commitment to segregation. War Housing projects were owned by the federal Public Housing Administration and their tenants were selected on the basis of employment in defense production, active duty status, or being a veteran, not on the basis of low income. When HABC took ownership of these properties in the 1950s, tenancy had to be converted to the low-income criteria used for regular public housing. This meant displacing non-qualifying middle-income tenants and replacing them from the public housing waiting list of income-qualified families.

Fairfield Homes (#20) was one of the War Housing projects placed in a residentially isolated industrial tract in the far south of the city. In 1952, half of the units were still occupied veteran-serviceman families. Of Fairfield's tenant who were employed, threefourths worked at Maryland Drydock, Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyards, Curtis Bay Coast

Guard, or Mathieson Chemical Co. Most of these families had incomes higher than the limits specified for tenants in regular public housing. Only 15% of Fairfield tenants were income-qualified for public housing. Confronted with the necessity of a nearly complete turnover of tenants, HABC reassessed Fairfield's future. Fairfield was not expected to be popular among low-income white applicants on the waiting list for public housing. In the small residential neighborhood adjoining Fairfield, most of the housing was classified in the 1950 census as dilapidated or lacking running water (or both), and was occupied by Negroes. Fairfield was separated from white residential neighborhoods, schools, and other neighborhood infrastructure by industries, railroad tracks, and undeveloped land. HABC knew that redevelopment activities during the 1950s would displace a large number of Negro families eligible for public housing. There were not enough public-housing vacancies for Negroes in the Negro projects that were already open or scheduled for early completion.

In August, 1953, HABC gave public notice that Fairfield Homes would be converted from white to Negro occupancy. Any of Fairfield's white families eligible for public housing would be offered units in the other white projects in southern Baltimore -- Brooklyn, Westport, and the planned Westport Extension. Cherry Hill, Cherry Hill Ext 1, and the planned Cherry Hill Ext 2 were closer to Fairfield than was Westport, but HABC policy prohibited any relocation of white families to the designated-Negro Cherry Hill projects.

The majority of the white families at Fairfield and the other War Housing projects taken over by HABC were steadily employed at well-paying jobs and could afford to move to private housing. They joined thousands of other white families who were leaving the central city to find newer and larger housing, often in new developments, at the outskirts of the city and in the suburban counties.

The racial transition of Fairfield was planned with great effort to reassure white tenants about their encounters with Negro tenants and to defuse potential sources of racial conflict. HABC maintained substantial racial separation during the transition, emptying parts of the project of whites before moving Negroes in. The racial transition of Fairfield was under way in 1954 when HABC replaced its mandatory segregation policy with a "freedom of choice" tenant assignment plan. A few white tenants stayed in Fairfield beyond the move-out deadlines given them under the original transition plan. Nevertheless, the full transition from white to Negro occupancy was quickly completed. Fairfield was 97% Negro by the end of 1956 and 100% Negro in 1964.

## IV-B. Effects of Segregated Public Housing on General Residential Segregation

Analyses of citywide racial residential segregation depend on information from the decennial censuses and hence focus on years ending in zero, such as 1940 and 1950. In this section, I examine residential segregation in 1940 and 1950 and the changes that occurred between 1940-1950. Because none of the Urban Renewal projects opened until after 1950, this section focuses on the original 12 racially designated projects that opened in the early 1940s.

The New Deal and War Housing projects added 6,000 new units to Baltimore's housing stock: 3,300 for whites and 2,700 for Negroes. The massive scale of these public housing programs is more clearly revealed when the number of units added by public housing is compared to the total increase in housing supply during the entire 1940s decade. Public housing units constituted 13% of the 1940-1950 increase for whites and 21% for Negroes.

The addition of so much public housing influenced the racial composition of the neighborhoods in which the projects were placed. The effect of projects on housing pat-

terns was amplified by the federal policy pairing public housing with slum clearance. The New Deal program required demolition of old housing in sufficient quantity to match the new units. Thousands of housing units in racially mixed areas were demolished during site preparation for public housing and replaced by equal numbers of units in large uniracial projects.

To examine this linkage and other connections between general residential segregation and segregation in public housing, I examine racial changes during the 1940s in the census tracts that received public housing during the early years of the decade. The six Negro projects are considered first, and then the six white projects. My analysis uses maps, tables, and statistical indexes. Throughout this section, comparison of Map 2 with Map 3 can provide concrete visual representations of the statistical analyses. Map 2 locates the 12 housing projects with respect to the city racial distribution in 1940, immediately before project occupancy. Map 3 locates the projects with respect to the city racial distribution for 1950, five to ten years after the projects opened.

# IV-B-1. Negro Projects

During the 1940s, Baltimore's Negro population grew at a faster rate than its white population. The percentage of the city's population that was Negro increased from 19% to 24%. The number of census tracts more than 10% Negro also increased, so there is more medium and dark gray shading on Map 3 than on Map 2. Inspection of the maps reveals that the placement of Negro public housing projects is associated with several instances of increasing neighborhood percentage Negro. In the west-central area, census tracts around Poe (#04) and Gilmor (#06) were more solidly Negro in 1950 than in 1940. In the east-central area, the neighborhood between Douglass (#05) and Somerset (#10) became more solidly Negro, and Negro residential presence increased in adjoining cen-

sus tracts to the east and north. Expansion of the east-central Negro concentration appears to have been bounded to the north by all-white Latrobe (#01) and to the south by allwhite Perkins (#03).

In the south Baltimore industrial sector, siting of the 600-unit Cherry Hill project (#11) created a Negro residential enclave. The area was sparsely populated in 1940, but nearly all of the population living in the general vicinity was white. By 1950, population in the area had increased sharply. The 1940 census tract was split into three separate 1950 census tracts. In the 1950 tract that contained Cherry Hill Homes, 6,845 of the total population of 6,895 were Negro (99%). The other segments of the large 1940 tract stayed mostly white. Tabular comparison of 1940 and 1950 racial percentages for specific census tracts confirms these findings.

<b>Racial Composition</b>	of Cens	us Tract
	% Negro	
Negro Projects	1940	1950
MD 2-06 Gilmor	91	98
MD 2-02 McCulloh	73	76
MD 2-04 Poe	44	65
MD 2-10 Somerset	79	91
MD 2-05 Douglass	54	62
MD 2-11 Cherry Hill	1	99

Technical note: For the Negro project Cherry Hill and white projects Westport and O'Donnell, population growth led to the 1940 census tract being split into two or three 1950 census tracts. The 1940 data here are for the large tract; 1950 data are for the specific tract that contains the project.

The placement of all-Negro Gilmor in a mostly Negro area helped convert the sur-

rounding neighborhood to nearly exclusive Negro occupancy. Placements of Poe and

Somerset produced dramatic increases in their neighborhood racial composition.

Changes around McCulloh and Douglass were small, in large part because these pro-

jects were located at the edge of census tracts; in each case an adjoining census tract

became mostly Negro in the years following project opening. In the east-central mixed-

race area, the first tract to attain a Negro percentage exceeding 90% was the one containing Somerset and close to Douglass. In southern Baltimore, the opening of Cherry Hill Homes was the major force creating the first sizable Negro residential enclave.

# IV-B-2. White Projects

In the early 1940s, Baltimore opened two New Deal projects for whites, Latrobe (#01) and Perkins (#03). They were placed at the northern and southern edges of the east-central area of mixed-race concentration. Opening of these uniracial projects probably delayed Negro residential expansion in this section. The census tracts where these projects were placed declined in Negro percentage between 1940 and 1950 and neighboring white tracts continued to be majority or mostly white.

Racial Composition of	of Census	Tracts	
	% Negro		
White Projects	1940	1950	
MD 2-01 Latrobe	81	64	
MD 2-03 Perkins	38	32	
MD 2-20 Fairfield	47	44	
MD 2-22 Westport	13	36	
MD 2-21 Brooklyn	0	0	
MD 2-09 O'Donnell	0	18	

Fairfield, Westport, Brooklyn, and O'Donnell were placed in lightly populated south Baltimore industrial zones. The census tracts containing these projects covered large geographic areas because much of the land use was nonresidential. Wartime industrial expansion brought increasing demand for nearby housing. The large-scale War Housing program was matched by rapid expansion of private-sector housing for workers.

Brooklyn was placed in an all-white tract that continued uniracial during the decade. Fairfield, which was restricted to white occupancy until 1953, was placed in a large tract that housed both Negroes and whites. The population of the tract increased from 1,600 to 4,000 during the decade, but the racial composition did not change. All-white Westport

was placed in a tract with a small Negro population that grew rapidly during the 1940s. For O'Donnell, the 1950 Negro percentage is a temporary blip, probably the consequence of temporary War housing for Negroes that was soon to be emptied and demolished. Later census data show that the surrounding area continued preponderantly white for several decades.

# IV-B-3. Changes in City-Wide Residential Segregation during the 1940s

The word *segregation* is often used as if blacks are the only group that is being segregated. However, residential segregation is by definition a reciprocal relationship between both racial groups. If a city has areas into which most blacks are segregated, there must be other areas into which most whites are segregated. On Maps 2 and 3, segregated Negro areas represented by dark shading are paralleled by larger expanses of light shading identifying segregated white areas. In both 1940 and 1950, Baltimore had substantial but incomplete racial residential segregation. The public housing projects that opened in the first half of the decade affected all components of the city's segregation – Negro areas, mixed areas, and white areas. The 12 racially segregated projects added substantially to the city's housing stock. What effects did these projects have on the components of segregation? Did they tend to ameliorate or intensify residential segregation?

The exposure index is a widely used measure of racial segregation. The samerace exposure index for whites shows the average percentage white that white residents encounter in the census tracts where they live. In a situation of total segregation, 100% of the neighbors of any white family would be white. The same-race exposure index for Negroes shows the average percentage Negro that Negro residents encounter in the census tracts where they live. Again, the score would be 100 in a situation of total segregation. However, because census tracts are imperfect delineators of residential neighbor-

hoods, an index calculated from actual census data cannot attain the maximum score of 100.

Here are scores for the same-race exposure index, calculated from Baltimore City census tract data for 1940 and 1950. In 1940, the same-race exposure score for whites was 93 percent. This is remarkably close to the maximum score of 100, and confirms statistically that census tracts in which whites lived were overwhelmingly white. This intense segregation persisted through the 1940s.

Citywide Same-Race Exposure Index				
A STATE OF	1940	1950		
Whites	93	92		
Negroes	69	74		

Negroes, despite the powerful *Jim Crow* restrictions placed on their residential freedom, were much less racially isolated than whites. The census tracts where Negroes lived were, on average, 69% Negro in 1940 and 74% Negro in 1950. These scores are distinctly below those for whites. Subtracting a same-race exposure score from 100 gives a measure of other-race exposure. This technique reveals that Negro exposure to nearby white residents was 31% in 1940 and 26% in 1950. In 1940, many of Baltimore's Ne-groes, but few of its whites, lived in racially mixed neighborhoods. This was still true in 1950, but racial isolation of Negroes was on an upward trend.

Public housing contributed to the upward trend in racial isolation of Negroes. Slum clearance for public housing displaced white and Negro dwellings and replaced them with projects that were 100% Negro or 100% white. Cherry Hill Homes was developed on vacant land, thereby creating new uniracial enclave. A same-race exposure score for 1950, calculated using just the census tracts in which Negro projects were located, is 85. This shows that Negro project residents, on average, were exposed to (lived in) neighborhoods that were 85% Negro. This score is higher than the 74% same-race exposure

score for Negro residents generally. Negroes in public housing projects were more racially isolated than Negroes in other housing.

Public housing accounted for one-fifth of the 1940-1950 citywide increase in Negro housing units. Public housing projects in the 1940s put thousands of Negro families into environments that were much more racially concentrated than was typical for Baltimore's general Negro population. A significant cause of the decade increase in citywide residential isolation of Negroes was replacement of mixed-race slum housing by uniracial housing projects.

Some of the white housing projects were placed in all white areas on vacant land, creating new uniracial white enclaves and thus consolidating racial segregation. Others were placed in racially mixed neighborhoods where they could serve as barriers to movement of Negroes into nearby white residential neighborhoods. In 1950, the average percentage white in census tracts containing white projects was 68%. On average, whites in public housing were less racially isolated than private-market white residents. Because the supply of public housing, relative to total housing stock, was small for whites, project segregation and location had little statistical effect on the high degree of residential isola-tion of whites.

Another widely used measure of racial segregation is the dissimilarity index. It provides a single score that indicates the general level of residential segregation. When used to measure citywide residential segregation, this index specifies how evenly or unevenly whites and Negroes are spread among census tracts. If whites and Negroes were distributed evenly, every tract would have the same percentage Negro as every other tract and the score would be 0. If most tracts were overwhelmingly one race, the score would

be near 100. Dissimilarity scores above 60 are generally regarded as indicating a high degree of segregation.

#### <u>Citywide Dissimilarity Index</u> <u>1940</u> <u>1950</u> 79 80

Baltimore had a high degree of racial residential segregation in 1940. During the following decade, Baltimore experienced an expanding economy, population growth, an increasing Negro percentage, and a large new public housing program. All of these dy-namic forces contained a potential for change in racial patterns and possible reduction of housing segregation. The nearly identical scores for 1940 and 1950 show that the opportunity was unrealized and residential segregation was maintained at a high level.

# IV-B-4. Metropolitan Effects of Public Housing in the Segregation Era

Public housing was a major player in Baltimore's housing market during the 1940s. Six projects for whites, with 3,300 units, were placed in white residential areas. This intensified the exclusion of Negro families from areas of the city where white families predominated and helped confine the growing Negro population to areas of the city that were already majority Negro. Six projects for Negroes, with 2,700 units, were placed in heavily Negro areas, increasing neighborhood percentages Negro and keeping some of the overcrowded Negro population from looking for housing racially mixed or mostly white neighborhoods.

In 1940, most of Baltimore's white families lived in conditions of nearly complete isolation from Negroes. The main exception occurred in the central areas of mixed Negro and white residence. During the 1940s, some of the tracts that had included both races became more solidly Negro, but other tracts at the periphery of the newly forming ghetto changed from all white to mixed. The public housing program for whites restricted the di-

rection of expansion of Negro residential areas in the east-central sector, and tagged several other areas as appropriate for housing whites. The net effect of these and other forces was little change in the white same-race exposure scores or in the dissimilarity scores.

Six of the New Deal and War Housing projects were reserved for Negroes; none was placed in a mostly white residential area. Six of the New Deal and War Housing projects were reserved for whites; none was placed in a mostly Negro residential area. The new governmentally owned and operated housing was sited and operated to reinforce existing racial segregation. No effort was made to counter the segregative tendencies of the general housing market.

As a result of racially discriminatory siting and tenant assignment practices, public housing in the 1940s targeted specific neighborhoods for whites or for Negroes, signified governmental support and encouragement for racial segregation in housing, reduced the supply of racially mixed neighborhoods, and increased the supply of racially homogeneous neighborhoods. In these ways, public housing was a significant accelerator of ghetto formation in central Baltimore. By fostering confinement of Negroes to selected central city locations, public housing was also a significant force for preservation of vast areas of the city as white enclaves. The policies and practices of HABC legitimated and stimulated white flight from mixed-race neighborhoods to housing in more solidly-white neighborhoods.
Public Housing and Racial Segregation in Baltimore

## V. Segregation Despite "Desegregation" 1954-1970

In May 1954, the Supreme Court declared that separate but equal is unconstitu-

tional in the realm of public education. Within weeks, the Baltimore Board of Education

and the University of Maryland adopted desegregation policies. Other public agencies

recognized that the landmark Brown decision might soon be extended beyond public edu-

cation to all realms of governmental racial discrimination. On June 25, 1954, the Housing

Authority Commission adopted a resolution abandoning formal segregation:

The attention of the Commission has been directed to an examination of its racial occupancy policies by reason of the significant events of the past few months, both locally and nationally, establishing a clear trend toward the abandonment of policies sanctioning segregation. The Commission recognizes that this trend affects the Authority's own policies.

Furthermore, an examination of such legal opinion as is available results in the conclusion that the existing policies would be extremely difficult to administer to satisfy legal requirements and still be workable, acceptable, and practical.

Accordingly, the Authority is proceeding to revise its admission policies by eliminating the factor of race in the selection of eligible tenants, consistent with the present admission procedure.

The staff is directed to develop the necessary administrative changes and arrangements toward this end.

(Quoted in "Desegregation Policy," by Oliver Winston, Executive Director of HABC, 6/30/1964.)

For fifteen years, 1940-1954, all public housing projects in Baltimore had been ra-

cially designated. The new policy, as developed in 1954 and 1955, directed that public housing be operated without official racial designations and with tenant assigned switched to a formally non-racial 'freedom of choice'' system. In this section, I analyze what happened during the first sixteen years under the new policy. I examine data on projects, project residents, and city neighborhoods to identify changes that ensued. Did the formal policy of "desegregation," as interpreted and implemented by HABC, transform ra-

cial occupancy patterns and overcome the heritage of racially identified projects? My analysis of these questions is organized into five parts.

The topic in Part A is an examination of trends in racial occupancy of public housing, 1954-1970. In June 1954, when official segregation was in principle laid to rest, HABC was operating 14 racially designated projects. What changes did the "freedom of choice" policy bring to uniracial occupancy of these projects? In Part B the focus shifts to new projects that opened in 1955 or later. The evolving nature of public housing programs is described, followed by separate examination of projects for families, projects for the elderly, and scattered-site housing. Project sites are described and mapped, followed by examination of data on initial racial occupancy and changes that occurred by the end of 1970.

Change in racial occupancy (or lack of change) is a result of the assignment of tenants to projects. In Part C, I examine key aspects of tenant assignment policies and practices. What changes did these practices bring in the racial composition of the projects and of the waiting list?

Parts A, B, and C provide a documentary record of public housing during 1954-1970. In Part D, I review the results of 16 years of operation under the policy adopted in 1954. The evidence leads directly to the conclusion that "desegregation," as implemented by HABC, was a racially structured process.

Public housing is not a self-enclosed system. In Part E, attention broadens to consideration of public housing in its urban context. What were the connections between racial change in public housing and racial change in the general housing market? In what ways did continuing racial segregation in public housing perpetuate and even intensify citywide residential segregation?

### V-A. "Desegregation" and the Racially Designated Projects

During HABC's years of operation with an official racial segregation policy, 14 projects were planned, located, opened, and operated with racial designations. Seven were reserved for Negro tenants and seven for white tenants. In this section, I examine what happened to these projects during the first sixteen years of operation after HABC switched the formal rules for tenant selection and assignment from racially restricted to racially unrestricted "freedom of choice." Was the heritage of racially identified projects eliminated? Did Negro projects and white projects lose their differences and become just projects?

A segregation policy affects many aspects of agency operation, including management, hiring and promotion, assignment of employees, contracting, site selection, operation of waiting lists, and project occupancy. An effective desegregation policy would confront all of these activities as well as the more subtle aspects of equality of treatment. In this report, I focus on patterns of racial occupancy. A distinguishing characteristic of segregated public housing is racial identifiability of individual projects. Uniracial occupancy is the heart of tenant experience of segregation and the accompanying racial labeling is the public and visible face of segregation.

Reports of project racial occupancy, issued periodically by HABC, provide the basis for a time-period analysis of trends in the aftermath of mandatory segregation. Table 2 shows the percentage Negro among the residents of each of the originally racially designated projects for six dates covering the span from 1954 to 1970.

Table 2. Percentage Negro for Family Projects at Selected Dates, 1954-1970.

The first date is June 1, 1954, just days before official abandonment of formal racial designation of projects. Three more dates from the 1950s are shown, to capture any im-

mediate consequences of the changes in HABC policy and practices. The table continues with one date from the mid-1960s and concludes with Dec. 31, 1970.

This analysis of post-1954 trends in racial occupancy begins with the projects that were originally designated for Negroes and then considers the projects originally designated for whites. Data for Fairfield are included in the "white" section of Table 2, to reflect its initial racial designation; its conversion to "Negro" began in 1953 but was not completed before the 1954 policy change.

### V-A-1. Negro Projects

All six Negro projects from the New Deal and War Housing era continued to be 100% Negro after the change from mandatory racial assignment to "freedom of choice" (Table 2). Available statistical reports from the Housing Authority do not record any instance of a white family moving into any of these projects. The only Negro project to open in the final years of the era of official segregation was Cherry Hill Ext. 1. This project, like the original Cherry Hill, opened with only Negro tenants and continued thereafter to be 100% Negro.

HABC's abandonment of mandatory racial designation of projects and adoption of a freedom-of-choice policy for assignment of tenants had virtually no effect on occupancy of the seven pre-1954 projects originally designated for Negroes. In 1970, after 16 years of official "desegregation," all seven projects continued to be uniracial. There was no desegregation of these Negro projects.

### V-A-2. White Projects

During the era of official segregation, HABC operated seven housing projects racially designated for whites: two New Deal projects and four War Housing projects from the early 1940s, and one Urban Renewal project that opened in 1953. During the years

1954-1970, substantial racial change occurred in all seven projects. The timing and pace of change varied, so attention must be given to each project.

Fairfield's carefully managed switch from all white to all Negro was in process during 1954. It had lost most of its white tenants and was gaining Negro tenants. At the end of 1955 it was 90% Negro. The new tenant selection and assignment practices may have slowed move-out of the remaining whites, but racial transition continued. Fairfield became 100% Negro sometime between 1957 and 1964 (Table 2). The "desegregation" practices of HABC did not halt the transition nor did they engender any later reversals. Fairfield continued to be 100% Negro until it was closed in 1987.

The other six designated-white projects were all white in 1954 when racial designation was abandoned and "freedom of choice" tenant assignment implemented. Three of the white projects were soon affected by the new policy.

The Housing Authority of Baltimore City adopted a desegregation policy in the Summer of 1954, which was placed into effect in May 1955. Since that time, Negro families have been admitted to certain formerly all-white projects—Latrobe, Perkins, and more recently, Westport—and all new projects have been opened on a desegregation basis. (Letter, Oliver C. Winston, Executive Director of HABC, to Ernest Works, 8/6/57.)

"Desegregating" Latrobe and Perkins was a central feature of HABC's new practices in 1954-1955. With careful advance planning, building on experience gained with racial change in Fairfield, initial placement of Negroes in these designated-white projects was managed without major racial incidents. This was the beginning of steady racial turnover. Most of the vacancies that occurred were filled with Negro families. Both projects were 0% Negro in 1954, about 5% Negro at the end of 1955, majority Negro in 1964, and 80-90% Negro in 1970. Latrobe and Perkins together had 1,389 dwelling units, but in Dec. 1970 they had only 184 white tenants. More than half of their whites were elderly persons

living alone, probably long-term residents unable to cope with moving elsewhere. When they died, Negro families took their places.

The next project to begin a rapid racial transition was Westport. Like Fairfield, Westport was built in a southern industrial zone as a War Housing project for white defense workers. Westport was isolated from established white neighborhoods and the surrounding neighborhood had a steadily growing Negro population. The project was relatively unattractive to white families on the waiting list for public housing. Racial occupancy data report Westport changing from 0% Negro at the end of 1955 to a Negro majority (59%) by the end of 1957 (Table 2). Transition to 100% Negro was completed by 1970 and Westport continued to be all Negro thereafter.

The other three white-designated projects were protected from immediate racial change. Brooklyn and O'Donnell, projects transferred from War Housing to use as low-rent family housing, and the recently opened Claremont, remained totally white until 1966. The Housing Authority's Director of Housing Management commented in 1959 on the continued segregation of these projects:

Three projects (Brooklyn Brick, Claremont and O'Donnell) have no Negro occupancy. These three projects are located in all-white areas on the fringe of the City limits. (Letter, Harry B. Weiss to Edgar M. Ewing, 11/5/1959)

Location alone is not a sufficient explanation. HABC documents from the 1950s and 1960s, including those justifying the early 1950s racial transition for Fairfield, indicate that the waiting lists for public housing included large numbers of income-eligible Negro families desperate for decent low-rent housing. For more than 10 years following implementation of "freedom of choice," HABC's tenant assignment procedures were managed in such a way that no Negro families were placed in these three projects, although hundreds of Negro families were regularly moving into the other 14 projects. White families

were then a minority of the waiting list, but only whites were assigned to fill vacancies occurring in these three projects.

Not until the late 1960s, when HUD began to challenge discriminatory use of freedom-of-choice policies, did these projects lose their all-white status and receive their first Negro tenants. In 1970, after sixteen years of HABC's operation on a "desegregated basis," Brooklyn, O'Donnell, and Claremont were still 80% to 90% white. In 1970, HABC was operating 22 family public housing projects. Of the 1,601 white families then living in the projects, 1,393 lived in these three majority-white projects. The other 19 family projects housed a total of only 208 white families. Brooklyn, O'Donnell, and Claremont were still white projects in 1970. They were not desegregated.

### V-B. New Public Housing, 1955-1970

During the years 1955-1970, HABC opened eight new projects for families, began a program of scattered-site housing for families, and opened the first of many projects for elderly and disabled persons. What did operation on a "desegregation basis" mean for the new public housing? Part 1 provides a general discussion of the evolution of new public housing programs during the postwar years. Subsequent parts examine location and occupancy for each type of housing: Part 2, family projects; Part 3, elderly projects; and Part 4, scattered-site units.

### V-B-1. Public Housing in the Postwar Years

This section describes the social context following World War II that led to massive urban renewal activities during the 1950s and 1960s, including construction of thousands of additional units of public housing.

During the early 1940s, capital and labor were diverted from civilian goods to national defense. Housing construction, severely depressed during the 1930s, continued to

languish. There was an enormous pent-up demand for housing. A strong postwar economy and an unprecedented baby boom fueled demand for larger, and more modern dwellings. New mortgage financing practices, spurred by FHA and VA policies and loan guarantees, enabled an unprecedented suburban boom. The construction industry provided a steady supply of new apartments and houses, located mostly on undeveloped land in outer areas of the cities and especially in rapidly expanding suburbs.

The national industrial boom of the 1940s had launched a mass movement of young Negro men and women from southern rural towns and cities to new job opportunities in the nation's industrial centers. This Negro migration continued at a rapid pace for three decades, transforming the nation's racial demography.

From 1950 to 1970, the population of metropolitan Baltimore increased by more than 200,000 Negroes and 400,000 whites. Both Negro families and white families needed more housing and yearned for better housing, but whites held the upper hand. *Jim Crow* racial separation was standard practice throughout the real estate industry. The first federal law banning racial discrimination in much of the nation's housing did not pass Congress until 1968, and that law did not contain effective enforcement provisions. Throughout the period of mass suburbanization, the FHA and VA mortgage programs that helped bring home-ownership within reach of the nation's working classes not only tolerated absolute racial segregation but prescribed it for most developments.

In Baltimore City, tens of thousands of white families left homes and apartments in older areas of the city and moved to new garden apartments and tract housing. In just 20 years, 1950-1970, the number of whites living within city limits dropped from 724,000 to 480,000, while the number of Negroes rose from 166,000 to 420,000. Although the city's loss of 244,000 whites was numerically matched by a gain of 254,000 Negroes, neigh-

borhood racial turnover did not come about through a series of simple free-market exchanges. Openly practiced racial discrimination barred Negro families from most of the city's white neighborhoods and nearly all of the new suburban developments. The growing Negro population, excluded from most city and suburban neighborhoods, could not be crowded into existing "Negro housing." Extreme racial conflict and protest accompanied block-by-block expansion of Negro residential areas. The east-side and west-side enclaves of mostly Negro and racially mixed census tracts grew into full-fledged Negro ghettos.

Baltimore's economy and fiscal health were threatened by the loss of thousands of middle-class families to the suburbs, the simultaneous capture of most new businesses by the suburbs, and the city's residue of large quantities of old, crowded, and poorly maintained rental housing. In response to these problems, particularly when federal funding was available, the city launched a variety of development plans, including urban renewal, public improvements, public housing, and highways.

The vagaries of federal budgets and regulations led to ups and downs in the scale of each activity, including public housing. After the wartime period of project construction, 1940-1945, there was a lull. Two new projects opened 1952-1953 and six more 1955-1963. After a mid-1960s lull, project construction resumed at a pace of nearly one a year, with eleven family projects coming into service 1969-1980. Traditional project-style public housing for families was falling out of favor, and after 1980 the only additional family housing was provided through the scattered-site program. Political support for specially designed public housing for elderly and disabled persons continued for a few more years. From 1970 to 1985, Baltimore opened new elderly projects at a one-a-year pace.

The family projects, scattered-site family housing, and elderly project that opened in Baltimore, 1950-1970, added 4,859 housing units. HABC operated 81% more units of public housing in 1970 than in 1950. The siting and occupancy of two of these projects were discussed in Section IV because they opened pre-1954 with official racial designations. This section reports on public housing developments that opened after abandonment of official Jim Crow and adoption of freedom-of-choice tenant assignment. What racial patterns characterized siting and occupancy of new public housing, 1955-1970, during the first 16 years of operation on a "desegregation basis"?

### V-B-2. New Projects for Families

Seven new projects for families were opened during the years 1955-1970. Some of the new projects carried racial designations during pre-1954 planning, but none was fully occupied before official racial designations were removed from HABC statistical bulletins and other reports.

	New F	amily Proj	ects, 195	54-197	0			
			% Neg	ro in F	Project	% Ne	gro in	Tract
Project	Units	Opened	First R	eport	1970	1950	1960	1970
MD 2-15 Lafayette	816	1955	1955	99	100	91	96	98
MD 2-16 Flag House	487	1955	1955	24	95	18	27	66
MD 2-17 Cherry H. Ex. 2	360	1956	1957	100	100	99	100	100
MD 2-19 Lexington	677	1958	1964	100	100	65	88	. 87
MD 2-13 Westport Ext.	232	1960	1964	97	100	36	55	98
MD 2-18 Geo. B. Murphy	758	1963	1964	100	100	88	87	99
MD 2-29 Mt. Winans	140	1969			100	36	55	98
MD 2-34 Oswego Mall	35	1969			100	0	12	94

This section provides a brief review of each project, noting location in relation to other projects, racial composition of the area, and racial occupancy of the project from opening to 1970. Trends after 1970 are analyzed in Section VI.

(#05) and Somerset (#10), two of the original designated-Negro projects (Map 4). Slum

clearance and site preparation for Lafayette displaced nearly 700 families and individuals, mostly Negro. Federal regulations required that displaced families be given priority over regular low-income applicants on the waiting list for public housing. Before 1954, relocation priorities were administered on a racially segregated basis, but thereafter the official policy was that all vacancies were open to all applicants. An applicant at the top of the waiting list was granted freedom of choice to accept or reject any offered vacancy.

# Map 4. 1960

Lafayette was a massive project, with six high-rise buildings and many smaller walk-ups and row houses. When it opened, hundreds of units were suddenly available, and these new units temporarily dominated the list of vacancies. During its first months of operation, a few white families moved in. The numbers reported for Dec. 31, 1955, are 683 units occupied by Negroes and 9 by whites. The white presence in Lafayette was short-lived. A year later, at the end of 1956, the count was four. The next report, for 1964, shows zero white tenants. Sometime between 1956 and 1964 the last white family in Lafayette had moved out. Negroes filled all subsequent vacancies, even though there were whites on the waiting list for public housing and whites were moving into some of the other projects. At all reporting dates since 1957 occupancy of Lafayette has been 100% Negro.

Flag House Homes was planned as a white project at the corner of Pratt and Albemarle Streets. It became the sixth project in the east-central public-housing cluster. A few blocks to the north was Lafayette Courts, which opened virtually all Negro a few months before Flag House. Just two blocks to the west was Perkins (#03), a large project that opened designated-white in 1942. Flag House and Perkins were south of a racial di-

viding line. The census tract in which Flag house was sited was 18% Negro in 1950; the tract containing Perkins was 32% Negro. When Lafayette was being planned for a site just to the north, the census tract containing its site was 91% Negro. Flag House, a project planned for whites, joined with Perkins to form a southern border hemming in the nearby Negro enclave anchored by the all-Negro Lafayette, Douglass, and Somerset projects.

Nearly 400 dwellings were cleared from the Flag House site, about two-thirds occupied by whites and one-third by Negroes. The displaced whites interested in public housing could claim priority for vacancies at Perkins, or, if they waited, at Flag House. The displaced Negroes, until the 1954 policy change, were directed to designated-Negro projects. By the time Flag House opened late in 1955, the top positions on the waiting list were dominated by Negro families displaced by other public housing and urban renewal developments. When it opened, Flag House was no longer officially designated for whites only, but applicant choices made before the policy change led to a strong white majority in the early months. Two months after its opening, Flag House had 45 tenants, 11 Negro and 34 white. During 1956, the project filled with mixed occupancy, about 70% white and 30% Negro. Data are not available for every year, but a continuing racial transition was soon under way. The percentage Negro was 75% in 1964 and 95% in 1970 (Table 2).

The racial transition of Flag House was not merely an unmanaged consequence of the composition of the waiting lists. Its neighbor Perkins on the southern border of the east-central enclave, along with Latrobe Homes on the northern border of the enclave, were selected by HABC in 1954-1955 for carefully staged introduction of Negro tenants. The expectation that white projects would stem expansion of the east-central Negro enclave was abandoned and the three border-protecting white projects were set on the path

to becoming all Negro. With the other enclave projects already all Negro, the projects helped define and consolidate an east-central Negro ghetto.

Cherry Hill Extension 2 opened in 1956 next to its two namesakes in the Cherry Hill area of southern Baltimore, enlarging this enclave of public housing to nearly 1,600 units. Both Cherry Hill (#11) and Cherry Hill Ext. 1 (#12) had been designated-Negro projects and occupancy was still 100% Negro. Cherry Hill Ext. 2 opened 100% Negro and all three projects have been 100% Negro ever since. Many of the initial tenants of the new extension were Negro families displaced by slum clearance and development activities in the central areas of the city, but no white displacees were ever moved into any of the 1,600 units in the Cherry Hill projects.

Westport Extension was placed in southern Baltimore. The older Westport (#22) was designated white from 1942 to 1954, but had become majority Negro before the extension opened in 1960. Westport Extension began with a heavy majority of Negro tenants. By 1970, both Westports had joined the ranks of 100% Negro projects.

Mt. Winans opened in 1969 as a second extension to Westport, bringing the total number of units in this public housing enclave to 572 (Map 5). In 1970, Mt. Winans and the two Westport projects had 100% Negro occupancy. The large census tract in which they were sited was majority white when the first project was planned, but as the projects experienced white-to-Negro racial transition, so did the population of the tract. For the 1970 census, the 1960 census tract was split in two. The new tract, encompassing the three projects and some nearby residential area, was 98% Negro in 1970.

Map 5. 1970

Lexington Terrace was a large project with more units than all three Westport projects combined. It was placed within the emerging west-central Negro ghetto, across the street from Poe (#04), the first designated-Negro project. Lexington opened all Negro and continued to be 100% Negro for all 38 years of its short life. It was demolished in 1996.

George B. Murphy Homes was sited a few blocks north of Poe and Lexington, and a few blocks southwest of McCulloh (#02). Occupancy of these three projects was 100% Negro, and Murphy opened and remained all Negro project. Murphy was another large development, with four 14-story and 20 low-rise buildings. Like the other high-rise projects, it had a short life span. It was demolished in 1999.

Oswego Mall, a tiny project of 35 units, was placed far to the northwest of other housing projects (Map 5). The census tract was all white in 1950; by 1970, it had been fully incorporated into the expanding west-side Negro ghetto. Oswego Mall opened in 1969 with 100% Negro occupancy.

All eight family projects that opened during the first 16 years of HABC's operation on a "desegregation basis" were identifiably "Negro projects" in 1970. Siting of these projects, together with tenant selection and assignment practices, not only caused these projects to become as segregated as the pre-1954 Negro-designated projects, but also contributed to intensification of segregated residential patterns in the neighborhoods surrounding the projects. Seven of the eight projects were built in existing enclaves of Negro public housing or in areas being incorporated into the ghetto. All seven had 100% Negro occupancy in 1970, and their census tracts had become 87-100% Negro. The other project, Flag House, had been planned as a designated-white project and opened in 1955 with majority-white occupancy in a majority-white residential area. Its occupancy was 95% Negro and its census tract had become 66% Negro. White-to-Negro racial transition oc-

curred earlier and more quickly in the project than in the surrounding census tract. Occupation of Flag House thus contributed directly to racial change in the tract.

### V-B-3. Scattered-Site Housing

Political and social controversies increasingly embroiled the massive urban renewal programs of the 1950s and 1960s. Conflicts occurred over site selection, housing demolition, relocation assistance to the displaced, the balance between development goals and housing goals, and the long timelines from planning to completion. Most of these conflicts overlapped with longstanding controversies over segregation, integration, and related civil rights issues. The scattered-site program was launched in the mid-1960s as a flexible approach that could, in principle, be more responsive than traditional project development to meeting housing needs and desegregation objectives. By acquiring and rehabilitating abandoned row houses and other residential structures at scattered sites, the stock of public housing for families could be expanded more quickly than with the lengthy process and high costs of site acquisition, clearance, and new construction.

Available information on scattered-site units is less complete than for traditional projects. Location coordinates for individual units are available in a 1955 data file provided by HABC to the Maryland ACLU. This geographic information file lists 2,854 units that came into service between 1967 and 1995. The units are grouped into projects, and each project has an assigned "beginning date." Because the individual units within each project were initially occupied at a range of dates, the reported beginning date for a unit is only an approximate indicator of when the unit was first occupied.

For a first look at the placement of scattered-site housing, I examine sites for 854 units with pre-1975 beginning dates. On Map 9a, small yellow circles mark locations of

scattered-site units. Map 9a is otherwise identical to Map 5; the gray shading shows 1970 census tract percentage Negro.

Map 9a. Scattered Sites 1967-1974, with 1970 Census Tracts

The early rounds of scattered-site housing were concentrated within mostly-Negro census tracts in the west-central and east-central Negro ghettos. Some of the units were placed in majority-Negro and majority-white tracts at ghetto borders. Large expanses of white neighborhoods received no scattered-site housing.

The racially patterned placement of the first round of scattered sites can be described concisely with a statistical measure. Each scattered-site unit was located in a census tract, and each census tract had a specific percentage Negro in 1970. The arithmetic average of these percentages is 84%. The average racial composition of neighborhoods where scattered-site units were placed was 84% Negro.

Occupancy of the first 304 units of scattered-site housing, reported as of Dec. 31, 1970, was 100% Negro. The program of public housing for families at scattered sites began as a program that provided housing for Negro families in concentrated Negro residential neighborhoods.

The development of the scattered-site housing program after 1974 is covered in Section VI-A-2, but a quick preview confirms that the patterns established during the first round were maintained as the program expanded to 2,854 units.

Families in Scattered-Site Housing			
Year	% Black		
1970	100		
1981	97		
1991	98		
1998	98		

HABC also continued the practice of scattering units only within heavily black neighborhoods. The average percentage black in the census tracts in which the units were placed moved up from 84% (1970) to 91% (1990) and 92% (2000). The scatteredsite program placed thousands of black tenants in the heart of the black ghetto, thus intensifying racial residential segregation. Some of the sites, when chosen and first occupied, were in areas of the city experiencing racial transition from mixed race to mostlyblack occupancy. In these areas, the scattered-site program brought a higher concentration of Negro residents, thereby fostering and guiding ghetto expansion. Scattered-site housing was never used to promote actual desegregation.

### V-B-4. Projects for the Elderly

A new federal housing program launched in the late 1960s helped local housing authorities develop separate projects to house persons who were elderly or disabled. A major reason for separate projects was to have units and structures designed specifically to meet the special needs of older and disabled persons. Because the elderly residents far outnumber the disabled, the new program is usually referred to as elderly housing or elderly projects.

Baltimore's first public housing project specifically designated for the elderly was Lakeview Tower (#33). It opened in 1970 south of Druid Hill Park, distant from all of the existing family projects (Map 5). The areas south and west of the park were mostly Negro when the project was opened in 1970, and the census tract containing the project was 84% Negro. Lakeview Tower's racial occupancy at the end of 1970 was 87% Negro.

### V-C. Waiting Lists, Tenant Assignment, and Declining Numbers of Whites

In 1970, after sixteen years of operation under a "desegregation policy," Baltimore's public housing program had a very high degree of racial segregation. The last column of

Table 2 reports the percentage Negro in 1970 for all 22 family projects operated by HABC. Sixteen projects had 100% Negro occupancy, three were 80-95% Negro, and three were 10-20% Negro. No project had mixed racial occupancy between 21% and 79% Negro. The two new public housing programs, scattered-site housing and elderly housing, had begun with a similar degree of racial segregation. The first 304 units of scattered-site housing had 100% Negro occupancy; the first elderly project was 87% Negro (Table 3).

The original twelve projects in the 1940s provided 6,021 units of public housing, with 45% designated for Negroes and 55% designated for whites. Construction of new projects during the 1950s and 1960s nearly doubled the supply of public housing. Tenant selection and assignment practices produced dramatic change in the racial composition of public housing tenants. During the sixteen years 1955-1970, the number of Negro tenants doubled and the number of white tenants was cut in half.

Public Hou	Public Housing Units, by Race, 1945-1970			
	1945	1955	1970	
Total units	6,021	7,766	10,843	
Occupied by Negroes	2,732	4,485	9,221	
Occupied by Whites	3,289	3,281	1,622	
Percent Negro	45%	58%	85%	

Sixteen years of HABC operation with "freedom of choice" tenant assignment accomplished little actual desegregation of projects but produced a massive shift in the racial clientele served by public housing. What do HABC documents reveal about the causes of persistent segregation and rapid loss of white tenants?

In 1957, a Housing Authority official reviewed "the progress which has been made with the desegregation program" during its first two years. As evidence of progress, he cited the 22% to 32% representation of Negro tenants at Latrobe, Perkins, Flag House,

and Westport and the presence of 4 white families at Lafayette and 8 white families at Fairfield. He offered this elaboration:

It is to be noted that even though the desegregation policy applies uniformly to all housing projects under the jurisdiction of this Authority, there are projects which do not, as of this date, have mixed occupancy. This is due solely to respecting applicant preferences. Advantages and disadvantages of various project locations and conveniences are discussed in detail with applicants at the time the application is filed. This being true, the policy of freedom of choice is operative and applicants are not forced to accept a project solely for the reason of desegregating the tenant body. (Letter, Ellis Ash to Evelyn Merson, 2/4/1957)

This description of HABC's perspective on the first two years of desegregation could be applied, with only minor editing, to the first sixteen years. The "freedom of choice" policy and the detailed discussions with applicants continued to operate with little attention to "desegregating the tenant body." From 1955 to 1970, thousands of vacancies occurred in the projects that had earlier been racially designated. In the originally Negro projects, Negro out-movers were replaced by Negro in-movers. In half of the originally white projects, white out-movers were replaced by Negro in-movers. In the new projects that opened 1955-1970, virtually all of the initial and replacement in-movers were Ne-groes.

Most of the whites who moved into public housing during the years 1955-1970 moved into just three projects, Brooklyn, O'Donnell, and Claremont. As noted by the HABC official quoted earlier, "these three projects are located in all-white areas on the fringe of the City limits." Before 1966, no Negroes moved into any of the vacancies in these projects. One other project, Flag House, received several hundred white in-movers during the years 1955-1960, but then quickly became all Negro. Again, there are special circumstances related to site selection and tenant assignment that explain what happened. The site, when selected, was in a mainly-white area that already had one designated-white

project, and Flag House itself was under development before 1954 as a designated-white project.

A closer look is needed at HABC's tenant assignment process to understand how operation under a formal policy of nondiscrimination could fail so consistently to actually desegregate the projects.

Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, HUD was required to administer federally funded housing programs on a racially nondiscriminatory basis. To implement this mandate, and recognizing that freedom-of-choice methods of tenant assignment were often not effective in eliminating discrimination or fostering desegregation, HUD issued regulations in 1967 requiring limited-choice systems of tenant selection and assignment.

Under Plan A, the applicant at the top of the waiting list

shall be offered an appropriate dwelling in a location in which the greatest number of vacancies exist. If this offer is rejected, he shall be moved to last place on the eligible applicant list. [This and following quotations are from memoranda to and from R. C. Embry, Jr., Secretary, HABC, various dates 10/16/1968 to 1/17/1969.]

Under Plan B, the specific offers would again be based on vacancy rates, but the

applicant would be allowed to reject up to three offers before being moved to last place.

HUD regulations specified that Local Housing Authorities could request a waiver to

allow use of a method other than Plan A or Plan B. HABC did not implement either Plan,

but requested a waiver. In its application for a waiver, HABC asked to:

be allowed to continue our existing nondiscriminatory plan of tenant selection. Applicants are given a choice where they wish to live although they are advised of the reality or unreality of their choices in terms of being housed within a reasonable time....

The "existing nondiscriminatory plan," in place since 1954, had failed to achieve actual desegregation. The waiver application documents provide further insight into the

features of the tenant selection and assignment practices that perpetuated rather than reduced racial segregation.

The memorandum argued that the clientele for public housing needed to be encouraged to make choices. They should "be exposed to alternatives," to "have time to learn, unlearn and relearn," and "to move forward in a positive manner."

To threaten people who reject an already specified dwelling one, two or three times, and tell them they will "be placed at the bottom of the list," is unrealistic. It can also be disastrous.

The "freedom of choice" plan in effect from 1954 to 1968 apparently operated with few constraints on the ability of applicants to wait for a vacancy in a project of their choice. Desegregating the tenant body was not viewed as an appropriate reason for restricting applicant "freedom of choice."

Many aspects of HABC's operations were subject to the formal post-1954 policy of nondiscrimination. Employment practices provide another example of racially biased implementation of "nondiscrimination." Some Negroes were hired or promoted into positions from which they had previously been excluded, but there was not full desegregation of work assignments. Allowing Negroes into positions with supervisory and management duties began gradually, with a focus on the Negro projects. Putting Negro employees in positions where they exercised authority over white employees or tenants came much more slowly. Employment practices thus reinforced the racial identifiability of projects.

Desegregation of the tenant body was dutifully acknowledged to be a goal, but one pursued selectively and at a deliberate pace. The foreseeable result was perpetuation and extension of segregation (see Parts V-A and V-B). Negro tenants were moved serially into selected all-white projects in such a way as to effect rapid racial turnover. All of the new projects, even those originally planned for whites and receiving some white occu-

pancy in their first years, quickly became mainly Negro. For more than a decade, the designated-white projects in white neighborhoods did not receive any Negro tenants. At no time were organized steps taken to foster desegregation by moving whites into any designated-Negro or majority-Negro project. In particular, no white tenants were ever placed in any of the six projects that had been operated before 1954 as racially designated Negro projects. The result of these HABC practices during the years 1954-1970 was that actual desegregation never happened.

"Desegregation" was practiced as a selectively applied one-way process, putting Negroes into formerly white settings that were near the Negro ghetto. As late as 1968 the goal for desegregation was perceived to be moving Negroes into white projects.

Two years ago, a major shift from the one-to-one interview technique was initiated in the Housing Application Office. Applicants for housing were invited to attend a group meeting to discuss their housing opportunities, integration, tour projects and visit dwellings in them....The Supervisor...discussed the health, education, welfare and recreation services in the area, as well as transportation, employment opportunities, day care, shopping, etc....The following table shows the result of these purposefully planned group meetings.

Document No. HUD-02984

The table in the document showed the number of "Negro Family Move-Ins," 1966-1968, for the three projects that had remained all white until 1966 (O'Donnell, Brooklyn, and Claremont). On Aug. 30, 1968, the number of Negro families in residence was shown as 53 in O'Donnell, 19 in Brooklyn, and 18 in Claremont. The long-delayed entry of Negroes into these projects, twelve years after adoption of a desegregation policy, resulted from a specific acknowledgment by HABC that its practices influenced the choices made by Negro applicants.

With no white move-ins to change uniracial occupancy of the all-Negro projects, and with a steady transfer of other projects from all white to all Negro, the number of white

tenants dropped sharply. Fewer and fewer poor whites applied to the waiting list for public housing.

The constantly decreasing number of white families applying for housing was, and continues to be, cause for concern....Despite our conscious efforts to stimulate applications from white families, the following statistics show the constantly decreasing numbers of such families.... Document No. HUD-02981

The number of applications from whites dropped from 2,563 in 1950 to 807 in 1966. The number of applications from Negroes fluctuated, from 3,319 in 1950 (about one-third above the number of whites) to 4,123 in 1966 (five times the number of whites). In the late 1960s, when HABC became concerned about the obvious segregation reflected in its continuing operation of all-Negro and all-white projects, it focused on the remaining all-white projects. HABC adapted its practices in an attempt to steer Negro applicants to the white projects. This fostered still more of exactly the kind of one-way whiteto-Negro transitions that HABC had been encouraging since 1955. The problem to be addressed was not perceived to be the many projects with 100% Negro occupancy or difficulties maintaining racially mixed occupancy, but only the white uniracial occupancy of O'Donnell, Brooklyn, and Claremont. The cause was identified as a reluctance of Negro applicants to move from familiar neighborhoods into unfamiliar ones. Group interviews were designed "to relate nonwhite applicants to projects with which they were not familiar, so that integration could be further advanced." The HABC memoranda do not mention any efforts to foster desegregation by "relating" white applicants or existing white tenants to projects with which they were not familiar.

The major purpose of the requested waiver appears to have been to protect white applicants who rejected placement in a mainly Negro project from losing their chance to live in (subsidized) public housing. Confronting whites with that choice was viewed as un-

realistic and disastrous because, it was assumed, even fewer whites would seek or accept public housing.

HUD and HABC negotiated for months over the application for a waiver and the specific terms. HUD granted formal approval In January 1969. The waiver permitted applicants to specify one of four geographic areas in which they would like to live, and then to have up to three offers of public housing within the selected area. On this list of projects by area, project numbers are shown to facilitate reference to Map 5, and each project's percentage Negro occupancy in 1970 (from Table 2) is given to facilitate assessment of segregative impact of the new assignment policy.

Northwest		Central	East
04 Poe	100%	05 Douglass	100%
02 McCulloh	100%	02 Somerset	100%
06 Gilmor	100%	15 Lafayette	100%
19 Lexington	100%	01 Latrobe	93%
18 Murphy	100%	03 Perkins	80%
		16 Flag Hous	e 95%
East		Souther	ast
09 O'Donnell	20%	11+12+17 Ch	erry Hill 100%
14 Claremont	20%	22+13 Westp	ort 100%
		20 Fairfield	100%
		21 Brooklyn	10%

In two areas, Northwest and Central East, all projects had 80-100% Negro occupancy. In the East area, all projects had 80% white occupancy. Only the Southeast area offered variation in racial occupancy: six projects at 100% Negro and one project at 90% white.

Projects opening after 1968 were to be included in an appropriate area. A map (*HUD-02999*) included with the waiver application showed locations for ten proposed projects; nine were destined for the Northwest area and, as later data show, were destined

for 99-100% Negro occupancy. Planned locations for scattered-site housing were mostly in the Northwest and Central East, areas which were already mostly Negro.

The design of these racially identifiable areas was more likely to retard than to promote desegregation of the projects. White applicants could select the East area and be assured that when they reached the top of the waiting list and were offered an apartment, it would be in a mainly white project located in a mainly white neighborhood far from the expanding Negro ghetto. White applicants who worked in south Baltimore or for other reasons preferred to live there could select the Southeast area and hope that an apartment in Brooklyn would be offered before their three choices had been exhausted.

Negro applicants who selected any area except East could be assured of being offered an apartment in an all-Negro or mostly-Negro project. As reported above, HABC was aware of factors constraining the freedom of Negro applicants to express a preference for a mostly-white project. Unfamiliarity with the neighborhoods was the main reason cited by HABC, but a more obvious cause was the continuing hostility that confronted Negroes moving into "white neighborhoods." The rampant housing discrimination encountered by Baltimore's growing Negro population effectively barred Negroes from renting or buying in vast portions of the metropolitan area where only whites were welcomed. "Negro housing," whether in the private market or in public housing, was largely confined to the emergent Negro ghetto. Expansion of the ghetto was racially structured in a process commonly characterized with antagonistic and warlike terms like *block busting* and *invasion.* HABC actions in the racial transition in Fairfield and in initial placements of Negroes into other mainly white projects demonstrated official sensitivity about white hostilities toward Negroes. Many Negroes were indeed "unfamiliar" with the white projects.

but well-founded fear was a far more fundamental source of Negro trepidation about being integration "pioneers.

The HABC tenant assignment policy had another feature, apart from the grouping of projects into areas, that rendered the three-choice policy much less restrictive than the formal language seemed to impose. An applicant offered a place could refuse it, without using up one of the three choices, if "his circumstances do not allow the move" (*HUD-02986*). Specific hardships that could justify non-counting of a refusal included distance from employment, poor bus connections, and the like. Most of the enumerated hardships intrinsically incorporated the existing racial structure of Baltimore. Employment opportunities and locations had a high degree of racial segregation. "Being close to a relative or friend who can provide" child care could be used by most Baltimore families, white and Negro, to justify not moving far from their current racially influenced residential location. Here are a few more listed hardships that, if invoked, would tend to maintain racial segregation.

Being close to a day care center or a family day care home. Being close to family or friends to whom one can take the children for care. Being close to a relative or friend who can provide [health] care. Being close to the familiar for emotional stability. To be close to...friends or relatives who can care for children while parent is in school.

Hardships were to be considered only "after we have satisfied ourselves that an applicant has not rejected an offered dwelling because of race, color or national origin" (HUD-02987).

HUD's effort to foster desegregation by restricting freedom-of-choice tenant assignment plans was subverted in the case of Baltimore by its approval, on January 17, 1969, of a waiver. HABC was allowed to proceed with a plan that incorporated racial segregation into its implementation. Grouping projects into areas and implementing an extensive list of hardships meant, in practice, that applicants could be protected from having

to accept assignment to a project they did not like. The new plan, like the plan in place 1954-1968, was presented by HABC as nondiscriminatory. In fact, the use of geographic locations, combined with the flexible interpretation of "hardships," functioned as a way to avoid imposing unwelcome choices on white applicants. The new tenant assignment policy was a device to reassure the white community that "desegregation" would be constrained and that white applicants could expect to be offered a vacancy in a "white project." In its attempt to slow the decline in numbers of white applicants and tenants, HABC reinforced its ongoing policy of retaining whites by limiting their exposure to Negroes.

Other policies and practices of HABC, HUD, and Baltimore City also contributed forcefully to transformation of public housing from a totally segregated system serving poor families of both races to a highly segregated system serving mostly black families. The large scale of urban renewal and development projects during the 1950s and 1960s, operating with HUD and City financing and oversight, transformed the residential land-scape of many parts of the central city. Thousands of residents were displaced from their neighborhoods and offered governmental relocation assistance. Relocation personnel were required to advise displacees of their right to apply for public housing. Federal regulations required that displacees from most of the redevelopment programs be granted priority on the waiting list.

Between January 1951 and December 1971, 16,505 households have been displaced by government programs. Of this total, 10,012 (60.7%) were displaced by Urban Renewal and NDP Projects, 2,834 (17.2%) by Public Housing Projects, 1,784 (10.8%) by Public Improvement Programs and 1,832 (11.1%) by Highway Construction. Code Enforcement, a very recent activity, accounts for the remaining 43 (0.2%) households.

Displacement affected many more non-white than white households in Urban Renewal, NDP, Public Housing, and Code Enforcement projects. Department of Housing and Community Development, "Residential Displacement Activity Analysis 1951-1971," May 1971.

Of nearly 10,000 families qualifying for relocation assistance because of displacement by public housing or urban renewal, 86% were Negro (non-white). The DHCD report provides this explanation for the racial composition of the "residential relocation workload."

Social policies behind various government programs have confined Urban Renewal funds to low-income neighborhoods....The majority of low-income residents are non-white. The more affluent white residents are leaving for surrounding counties or the outer city before neighborhood deterioration reaches the point where relocation funds are made available through Urban Renewal or NDP.

Public housing has also been limited to low-income neighborhoods because of the need for better housing where most of the substandard structures exist. There is also resistance to public housing construction by residents of higher income neighborhoods. They often exert pressure to pass zoning ordinances which block public housing expansion to higher income areas.

These explanations are incomplete in that they leave unstated the official racial discrimination that enabled these outcomes. The "more affluent white residents" were leaving (and the more affluent Negro residents were not) because of the racial discrimination embedded in FHA and VA home financing programs, actions by zoning boards and bank regulators, and other official practices. The urban renewal and public housing programs displaced Negroes disproportionately to the Negro share of the low-income population. This occurred because of political pressure from "residents of higher income neighborhoods" who, not coincidentally, were whites lobbying white politicians and officials. Civil rights groups characterized the programs as "Negro removal." Affluent Negroes seeking better neighborhoods encountered hostility from whites, often violent and not always responded to by police. When affluent Negroes did manage to move into "white neighborhoods" near ghetto borders, the neighborhoods often lost code enforcement and other neighborhood-maintaining services.

HABC adopted various policies and practices from 1954 to 1970 in the name of "nondiscrimination," but these were not effectively directed at providing public housing on a racially mixed basis. During these sixteen years, HABC failed to achieve any substantial racial desegregation of its public housing projects. It continued to place new public housing projects in Negro residential areas, thereby signaling that these projects were for Negro occupancy and discouraging white applicants. In response to HABC practices (encouraged and supplemented by practices of federal and city housing and development agencies), the public housing clientele, both tenants and applicants, became overwhelmingly one race. This severely reduced the likelihood of future operation as a multiracial desegregated program.

### V-D. "Desegregation" As a Racially Structured Process

In Sections V-A and V-B, I traced the racial occupancy changes in public housing projects, 1955-1970. During these years of operation with "freedom of choice" rather than officially mandatory racial designation, more and more projects became all-Negro and mostly-Negro, a few projects continued to be mostly-white, and no projects had a sustained period of substantially mixed occupancy by both races. In Section V-C, I examined HABC tenant assignment policies and concluded that they abetted the maintenance of segregation, fostered the one-way project turnovers from white to Negro, and generated a steady racial change in tenants and applicants toward a mainly Negro clientele. In this section, I look back at the 1955-1970 changes in racial occupancy and link them to HABC tenant assignment policies and other practices.

Beginning with Fairfield's conversion from white to Negro, racial change occurring in an individual public housing project was always one-way, from white to Negro. For most projects, occupancy by both whites and Negroes was a temporary condition, existing only

as long as it took for occupancy to be switched from 0% to 100% Negro. In the mid-1950s, HABC viewed Fairfield, with its imposed transition from white to Negro, as a model for peaceful change. White projects were selected for staged turnover if they were close to Negro projects in areas of the city that were gaining Negro residents. Careful planning was undertaken to effect racial transition without subjecting white tenants to more than minimal exposure to Negro tenants.

This model of one-way irreversible racial change was adapted from racial transitions occurring in the general housing market. During the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, Baltimore's Negro population was increasing but extreme racial hostility and myriad forms of discrimination kept most Negroes from obtaining housing in heavily white areas. (White population was also increasing but whites had access to most of the existing stock of housing and all of the new housing stock throughout the metropolitan area.) When a few Negro families "invaded" a white neighborhood near the developing ghetto, typically at the instigation of speculators seeking quick profits by breaking the racial taboos of the mainstream real estate industry, whites, their racial fears deliberately fueled, were quick to flee "changing neighborhoods." This type of racial turnover in housing was familiar to housing professionals, city planners, politicians, and most of the public. Civil rights groups regularly protested and fought against the discriminatory actions that manipulated and perpetuated the process.

To implement "desegregation" in public housing, HABC staged initial entry of Negroes into all-white projects. Unlike private "block-busters," HABC sought to avoid racial violence and white panic. As vacancies occurred, because of normal turnover and because some whites were quick to flee, HABC tenant assignment practices ensured that

all move-ins from the waiting list were by Negro families. This guaranteed a steady transition from white to Negro occupancy.

Within two years of starting phased placement of Negro families into formerly white projects, HABC had established a pattern. Fairfield, Latrobe, Perkins, Westport, and Flag House were quickly being transformed from white projects to Negro projects. During the 15 years, 1956-1970, HABC opened six more family public housing projects. All six of the new projects were located in Negro residential areas and HABC failed to market them to whites. HABC did nothing to prevent all six projects from opening all Negro and continuing for all the rest of their years of service to house only Negroes.

Racial structuring of project racial transitions is also apparent in the delayed introduction of Negroes into Brooklyn, O'Donnell, and Claremont, the only three family projects located in white areas far from the ghetto. Although a majority of the families on the waiting list for public housing were Negro, and Negro tenants were being placed in all of the other projects, no Negroes were placed in these three projects during the first ten years of "freedom of choice" operation. When Negro in-movement finally began in the late 1960s, it proceeded at a slower pace than in any other projects.

HABC never viewed its "desegregation policy" as requiring efforts to introduce whites into all-Negro projects. HABC did nothing to provide models of stable integration. Negroes were moved, selectively and serially, into formerly white projects, but only a tiny number of whites were ever moved into formerly Negro projects. No project that became more than 90% black ever experienced a subsequent period of 10% or more white occupancy.

Official racial designation of projects ended in 1954 but racial identifiability continued. As a result of HABC's site selections, residential displacements, and tenant as-

signment practices, most of the projects had 100% Negro occupancy in 1970 and were racially identifiable as serving Negroes. To a large degree, Baltimore's entire system of public housing, with occupancy 85% Negro, had become identifiable as a system for poor Negroes.

### V-E. Segregated Public Housing and General Residential Segregation, 1940-1970

In this section, I use statistical indexes to assess levels of racial segregation in public housing and in general citywide housing during the years 1940-1970.

In June 1954, before it changed its policy of strict segregation, HABC was operating 14 projects, eight designated for Negroes and six designated for whites. Sixteen years later it was operating 22 family projects, a few hundred scattered-site units for families, and one elderly project. Racial occupancy of each project in 1970 is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 1970.

In the family projects, all projects were uniracial during the segregation era, and 16 years later, in 1970, family projects were still very unevenly distributed along the continuum of project racial percentages.

Number of Family Projects				
% Negro	1954	1970		
100	7	16		
80 - 99	0	3		
60 - 79	0	0		
41 - 59	0	0		
21 - 40	0	0		
1-20	0	3		
0	6	0		

Note: 1954 data not available for Fairfield , which was in transition from White to Negro.

In 1970, 8,777 Negro families were living in the projects. Three-fourths of these Negro families lived in 16 projects that had zero white tenants. Altogether, 97% of Negro tenants lived in identifiably Negro projects (80-100% Negro). White public housing tenants were

heavily concentrated in identifiably white projects (80-99% white). Of 1,601 white residents of family projects, 87% lived in three projects that had been designated-white until 1954 and had zero Negro residents until 1967.

The new scattered-site units for families were completely uniracial in 1970: all 304 occupied units had Negro tenants. The sole project already open in the elderly housing program had 87% Negro occupancy. These two programs were very small in 1970 and are not included in the following statistical analysis of segregation among family projects.

Segregation indexes are a statistical tool for numerically characterizing the degree of racial segregation. These indexes are widely used because they give concise summaries of entire tables of data. They are designed to facilitate examination of trends. For the analysis in this section, I calculate segregation indexes using data on racial occupancy of projects. A similar use of indexes to assess public housing segregation is reported in research sponsored by HUD (*Baseline Assessment of Public Housing Desegregation Cases Cross-site Report*, HUD, April 2000).

The first index used is the dissimilarity index, which measures how evenly whites and Negroes are spread among projects. If there were no segregation, the races would be evenly distributed among projects. Every project would have the same percentage Negro as every other project and the dissimilarity score would be 0. In a highly segregated public housing system, most projects would be overwhelmingly one race and the score would be near 100.

In 1970, most of Baltimore's family public housing projects were uniracial and the rest had one numerically dominant race. This obviously high degree of segregation is re-flected in the dissimilarity index. Calculations using 1970 occupancy data for the 22 family projects give a score of 86.

One interpretation of a dissimilarity score of 86 draws on a hypothetical desegregation order. Suppose that every project were required to have the same percentage mix of Negroes and whites as every other project. To accomplish total desegregation of Baltimore's family public housing projects in 1970, HABC would have needed to reassign 86% of the Negro tenants. Alternatively, HABC could have reassigned 86% of the white tenants.

The dissimilarity score for Baltimore may be compared to scores for public housing in other cities. A HUD study reports dissimilarity scores for the 66 largest public housing authorities (calculated from 1977 data for all projects). Baltimore ranked 14<sup>th</sup> highest among the 66 places. (Goering, Kamely, and Richardson, 1994, Table 31)

During the 1940-1954 segregation era of public housing, dissimilarity scores remained at a steady 100 (except for a small sag during the managed racial transition of Fairfield). In its first sixteen years of post-1954 operation, HABC lowered the dissimilarity score from 100 to 86, a decline of only 14 points. For a comparison from a different context, consider school segregation. In hundreds of school districts, north and south, strong desegregation programs brought dissimilarity scores below 30. In some districts, such as Charlotte-Mecklenburg, scores dropped below 10.

A separate measure is useful to characterize the effect that project segregation has on the daily experience of project residents. What is the racial composition of the other residents in one's project? Same-race and other-race exposure indexes answer this question. I calculated these indexes from data on the 1970 racial distribution of the 22 family projects.

Exposure Indexes for Family Projects, 1970				
	Same-Race	Other-Race		
	Exposure	Exposure		
Negro	95	5		
White	75	25		

For Negro tenants, the average project experience was virtually uniracial: 95% of other project residents were Negro and only 5% were white. The scores for white tenants are not as extreme. Not all other tenants in their projects were whites. Most white public housing tenants lived in one of the three projects where Negro occupancy was 20% or lower. A few whites, however, lived in mainly Negro projects, and this raised the average other-race exposure for whites to 25%. The white same-race exposure score of 75 documents that white project residents, on average, were still able to experience a high degree of racial isolation from Negroes.

After sixteen years of operation on a "desegregation basis," public housing in Baltimore was still highly racially segregated. Most Negro residents lived in identifiably Negro projects and most white residents lived in identifiably white projects. Within their projects and neighborhoods, project residents of each race had little daily exposure to persons of the other race.

The three decades from 1940 to 1970 were a time of dramatic changes in the racial map of the city, as can be seen with a quick flip through Maps 2, 3, 4, and 5. Baltimore's Negro population increased rapidly, but Negroes were excluded from housing in many parts of the city. Areas of concentrated Negro residence greatly expanded. A solidly-Negro ghetto was formed. It expanded through incorporation of bordering neighborhoods, which turned from white to Negro occupancy. Baltimore's white population declined, but the whites who continued to live in the city maintained large geographic sectors of all-white neighborhoods.

The maps portray dramatic expansion of the Negro ghetto and shrinking of the exclusively white enclaves, but visual inspection does not reveal whether the general intensity of segregation was changing. Segregation indexes provide a formal technique for ad-

dressing this issue. The indexes measure the unevenness of the distribution of whites and Negroes among census tracts.

City	wide Diss	imilarity In	ndex
1940	1950	1960	1970
79	80	84	82

Dissimilarity scores for all four years are high. The stability of scores, staying within the narrow range from 79 to 84, demonstrates persistence of a very high degree of segregation in the general housing market.

As the ghetto expanded during these decades, large areas of the city changed from white to Negro occupancy. Each census tract undergoing change spent some period of time with a (temporarily) mixed-race population. In this way, the process of ghetto expansion might have been expected to produce small declines in the dissimilarity scores. The fact that there were small increases in the scores indicates an intensification of housing segregation.

From 1940 to 1970, Negroes became an increasing percentage of the total population of Baltimore City.

Citywide Percentage Negro					
1940	1950	1960	1970		
19	24	35	46		

If residential segregation in 1970 had been minimal, the percentage Negro for individual census tracts would have clustered around the citywide percentage. Most Negroes and whites in this imagined nonsegregated Baltimore would have lived in census tracts with close to even numbers of Negro and white co-residents. Same-race exposure scores for 1970 would be about 46 for Negroes and 54 for whites. The actual Baltimore in 1970 did not resemble this imagined Baltimore. The exposure scores listed here show the average neighborhood (census tract) racial composition for persons of each race:
#### Section V. Segregation Despite "Desegregation" 1954-1970

Citywide Same-Race Exposure Index									
N. 200	1940	1950	1960	1970					
Negroes	69	74	83	86					
Whites	93	92	91	88					

The exposure indexes reveal that the neighborhood experience of segregation changed for Negroes. With ghetto expansion, more and more Negroes were living in census tracts in the heart of the ghetto, where Negro percentages were at or close to 100%. The share of the Negro population living in mixed-race tracts where the ghetto had not yet consolidated, or in tracts at the expanding edges of the ghetto, declined sharply. The daily neighborhood exposure of Negroes to whites dropped correspondingly. Subtracting the same-race exposures from 100 gives a measure of other-race exposure.

City	Citywide Other-Race Exposure Index									
	1940	1950	1960	1970						
Negroes to Whites	31	26	17	14						
Whites to Negroes	7	8	9	12						

Although the map for 1940 shows vast all-white residential enclaves, and the dissimilarity score shows a very high degree of residential segregation, the exposure scores document that residential segregation was incomplete. In 1940, the areas where Negroes were allowed to live had not yet consolidated into Negro-only ghettos. Many Negro residents lived in proximity to whites. On average, Negroes lived in census tracts where 31% of the residents were whites. As the Negro population grew during the next three decades, the ghetto expanded and increasing proportions of Negro residential areas became solidly Negro. By 1970, many Negroes lived miles from any white areas. Average Negro neighborhood exposure to whites dropped steadily after 1940, to only 14% in 1970.

Ghetto expansion, 1940-1970, lengthened the ghetto boundary. This was enough, without any reduction in discrimination or the amount of unevenness in the residential pattern, to bring whites into slightly closer proximity to Negroes. Average white neighbor-

#### Section V. Segregation Despite "Desegregation" 1954-1970

hood exposure to Negroes increased from 7% in 1940 to 12% in 1970. This small degree of Increased exposure occurred mainly along the ghetto border. Inspection of Map 5 confirms the continued existence of many white neighborhoods isolated from Negroes.

If racial residential segregation had been eliminated, white and Negro residents would have shared neighborhoods randomly. The same-race and other-race exposures would have been determined by the citywide racial percentages. In this hypothetical world, white neighborhood exposure to Negroes in 1970 would have been 46% rather than the actual 12%. Negro exposure to whites would have been 54% rather than 14%.

Public housing projects and neighborhoods were highly segregated in Baltimore in 1970. The dissimilarity score, an index of the general unevenness of the racial distribution, was 86 for family projects and 82 for the city's census tracts. Because the racial composition of the projects was so unbalanced (85% Negro) compared to the racial composition of the total city population (46% Negro), the exposure measures for projects and tracts differ. Negro exposure to whites was nearly as low as it could go in projects (5%) and in tracts (14%). For whites, exposure to Negro neighbors was greater in projects (25%) than in the total community (12%), but few of the city's whites lived in the projects.

At each date, racial segregation was more complete in public housing than in the general residential community. The siting and occupancy of public housing intensified Negro concentration and relocated poor whites to totally segregated white projects in white neighborhoods. Policies and practices in the operation of public housing during the years 1940-1970 contributed to the emergence in Baltimore of a solidly Negro and steadily expanding ghetto. These conclusions are developed more fully in Section VI-B, where I assess linkages between public housing segregation and citywide residential segregation during the full span of years, 1940-2002.

Population trends during the three decades after 1970 were quite different from those of the three preceding decades. National economic and demographic transformations brought to an end the mass urbanward migration of blacks. In Baltimore City, the black population remained nearly constant from 1970 to 2000. Rapid suburbanward migration continued, particularly for whites, and the city white population fell from its 1950 peak of 724,000 to 206,000 at the 2000 census. Baltimore, like many other central cities, had entered a period of declining total population.

		Baltimore	e City Po	opulation	(in thou	sands)		
	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	
Black	166	225	326	420	431	436	419	
White	693	724	611	480	345	288	206	
Other Race	1	1	3	6	11	12	26	
Total	859	950	939	906	787	736	651	
% Black	19	24	35	46	55	59	64	

With population loss, the city experienced sharply reduced residential densities. Turnover of housing from white to black occupancy continued. Ghetto expansion produced an increasing number of census tracts more than 90% black. In a new pattern after 1970, there was widespread movement of black families into peripheral areas beyond ghetto borders. The changes are visually dramatic in comparison of the gray shading on Maps 5-8 (1970-2000). The number of census tracts with the two middle shades of gray increased, but there were persisting sectors of mostly-white census tracts. Racial residential segregation, while visually not as stark in 2000 as in 1970, was still the dominant pattern. Changes in citywide residential segregation will be assessed statistically in Section VI-B.

	Map 6. 1980	Map 7. 1990	Map 8. 2000
--	-------------	-------------	-------------

Federal support for public housing programs waxed and waned after 1970, with the emphasis on waning as national political sentiment was mobilized against most forms of "welfare," including public housing projects. Rent payments by public housing tenants had originally been set at a level to cover operating costs. As part of the war on poverty in the late 1960s, public housing rents were limited to 25% of tenant income (amended in 1981 to 30%). Operating subsidies were to be provided by the federal government to local housing authorities to make up for the revenues lost from rent caps. The amounts actually allocated, however, were insufficient and many public housing authorities sank into chronic fiscal crisis. Maintenance and services were reduced. This came along with increasing problems with drugs, crime, and other social dysfunctions. High-rise public housing projects became targets of increasing political and public scorn. In Baltimore, the last project-style public housing for families opened in 1980 and for the elderly in 1985. One old project was closed in the late 1980s, and in the mid-1990s project closings and demolitions became a major (and costly) enterprise. The playing out of these trends in Baltimore City is discussed in Section VI-A.

## VI-A. Changes in Public Housing, 1971-2002

Table 4. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 1981.

Table 5. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 1991.

Table 6. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 2002.

HABC statistical reports for recent years include the traditional two categories of race, *Black* and *White*, and add *Other*. In 2002, there were only 194 tenants classified as *Other*. Because this report examines long-term trends in segregation of blacks and whites, persons of other race are combined with whites or ignored.

#### VI-A-1. New Projects for Families, 1971-1980

Nine family projects were opened from 1971 to 1980, adding 2,305 units and bringing the total inventory of family public housing to 12,760 units. Most of the new units were in three large projects: McCulloh Extension with 516 units, Broadway with 429 units, and Hollander Ridge with 1,000 units. The other six new projects were at the bottom of the size scale, ranging downward from 121 units to only 20. Project locations are identified with large circles on Map 6.

			al see	% Bla	ick in	Tract	% Bl	ack oject	
	Project	Units	Opened	1970	1980	1990	1981	1991	
MD 2-23	McCulloh Ext.	516	1971	99	96	97	100	99	
MD 2-25	Broadway	429	1971	51	84	83	88	88	
MD 2-42	Somerset Ext.	60	1974	94	98	96	100	100	
MD 2-31b	Rosemont	106	1975	98	98	99	99	100	
MD 2-31a	Dukeland	30	1975	98	99	99	100	100	
MD 2-45	Hollander Ridge	1000	1976	6	82	89	76	80	
MD 2-27a	Spencer Gardens	20	1979	93	96	97	100	100	
MD 2-27b	E. Julian Gardens	23	1979	99	99	99	100	100	
MD 2-73	Anderson Village	121	1980	99	96	99	100	100	

New Family Projects, 1971-1980

Seven of the new family projects were sited within the established ghetto, in census tracts that were 93-99% black in 1970. All seven opened with 99-100% black occupancy. McCulloh Ext. and Somerset Ext. adjoin their designated-Negro namesakes (#02 and #10). Anderson Village was sited as a virtual extension to the three Cherry Hill projects (#11, #13, and #17). Spencer Gardens and Emerson Julian Gardens were placed next to other projects within the west-central cluster of all-Negro projects. Rosemont and

Dukeland were placed a couple of miles west of this cluster, but still within the west-side ghetto as it existed when the sites were chosen (cf. Map 5).

Two new projects, Broadway and Hollander Ridge, were constructed with a mix of high-rise and low-rise components. In both projects, most units were for family occupancy, but some buildings were set aside for elderly housing. The family units had mostly black tenants. The elderly units housed both races. Most of the white tenants in each project lived in the elderly units.

The Broadway project was sited at the eastern edge of the east-central ghetto. Its census tract was racially mixed in 1970 (51% black). After Broadway opened, with more than a thousand residents, 88% of whom were black, the tract jumped to 84% black (1980).

Hollander Ridge was Baltimore's largest-ever public housing project. It was sited at the eastern city boundary, far from other projects and isolated from residential neighborhoods by highways, commercial zones, and fences. With nearly 800 units occupied by black families, Hollander by itself accounted for most of the black population in its census tract, which was 6% black in 1970 before Hollander opened and 82% black in 1980.

#### VI-A-2. New Scattered-Site Projects, 1967-1995

The scattered-site program to expand the supply of public housing for families was in its infancy in 1970 and many additional units were added in later years. Because of the data availability issues discussed in Section V-B-3, precise dates of initial occupancy of each unit are not known. An approximate sequencing of the units is based on "project beginning dates." Three time periods are used, centering on 1970, 1980, and 1990. No information is available on locations of units added to the program after 1995. The text table lists the number of units approved for each of the three rounds. The number of scattered-

Family Housing at	Scattered Sites
Dates	Units
1967-1974	854
1975-1984	1609
1985-1995	391
Total, 1967-1995	2854

-site units reported by HABC as occupied was 304 in 1970, 2,020 in 1981, 2,452 in 1991, and 2,511 in 2002 (Tables 3-6).

During the first round of scattered-site family public housing, 1967-1974, units were placed within the black ghetto or in the path of ghetto expansion (Section V-B-3). Locations for the 1975-1984 round of scattered-site housing are plotted on Map 9b, which shows 1980 percentage black for census tracts. Second-round units were heavily concentrated in mostly-black census tracts just west and east of downtown. Comparing Map 9b to Map 9a reveals that the pattern of spatial distribution of the second round resembles the pattern for the first round. Minor differences in the two distributions can be discerned, but none of these alters the main conclusion of similarity.

Map 9b. Scattered Sites 1975-1984, with 1980 Census Tracts

Locations of the third round (1985-1995) of scattered-site units are plotted on Map 9c, where the gray shading shows the black residential distribution in 1990. The number of units in the third round of scattered-site housing (391) was much smaller than in rounds one (854) and two (1,609). The clusters of yellow circles on Map 9c are less dense than on Maps 9a and 9b. The distribution of third-round sites shows roughly equal concentrations in the west-central ghetto, the east-central ghetto, and the emerging northwest extension of the ghetto. The sites in the northwest are clustered in a line extending along the mass transit route linking this part of the city to the west-central ghetto and downtown. This northwestern cluster of scattered-site units was evident, on a small

scale, in the first round, and it grew during the second and third rounds. By 1990, several of the northwestern census tracts receiving scattered-site housing had become more solidly black than they were in 1970. Ghetto consolidation along this corridor may have been spurred by, and in any case was reinforced by, the placement of scattered-site housing.

## Map 9c. Scattered Sites 1985-1995, with 1990 Census Tracts

Through three decades of operation of the scattered-site program, units were rarely placed in the outlying white residential sectors. Neither were scattered units placed in the rapidly expanding outlying black neighborhoods, aside from parts of the northwest corridor.

Division of scattered-site housing into three rounds, using approximate dates of first occupancy, was a convenient means to explore whether locational patterns changed through time. Comparison of the successive maps demonstrated that locational patterns remained largely unchanged from the late 1960s to the early 1990s. In each round, units were scattered into three distinct clusters. One cluster was placed in the east-central Negro ghetto. Another cluster was placed in the close-in portions of the west-central Negro ghetto. The third cluster was placed in a northwestern strip of mostly-black census tracts being incorporated into the expanding west-side ghetto.

Because the spatial patterns of scattered-site housing show so little connection to dates of occupancy, the division into rounds is dropped for the final two maps. All 2,854 scattered-site units, 1967-1995, are plotted on Map 9d (with 1990 census tracts) and Map 9e (with 2000 census tracts).

Map 9d. Scattered Sites, All Units 1967-1995, with 1990 Census Tracts

Map 9e. Scattered Sites, All Units 1967-1995, with 2000 Census Tracts

Nearly all tenants of scattered-site housing have been black -- 100% in 1970 and 98% in 2002. The scattered-site program thereby intensified the reality and perception of public housing as a program for blacks. By placing the scattered sites within the expanding ghetto, and failing to place sites in majority white sectors of the city, HABC reinforced general racial residential segregation.

#### VI-A-3. New Projects for the Elderly, 1973-1985

The first project for the elderly and disabled opened in 1970. Fifteen more were opened during the next 15 years. When the last of these opened in 1985, HABC had 2,951 units in projects for the elderly and several hundred additional units designed for elderly use but located in projects where the majority of the tenants were families.

## New Elderly Projects, 1971-1980

				% Bla	ick in T	Tract			
E	roject	Units	Opened	1970		and the second se	1981	1991	
MD 2-39	Claremont Ext.	152	1973	20	54	71	16	54	
MD 2-41	West Twenty	357	1973	7	33	36	86	85	
MD 2-47	Govans Manor	199	1974	10	14	19	40	73	
MD 2-54	Bel-Park Tower	274	1974	44	93	96	94	99	
MD 2-44	Wyman House	168	1975	9	33	36	50	68	
MD 2-43	Monument East	187	1976	94	98	98	97	99	
MD 2-53	Ellerslie	125	1976	17	72	77	56	68	
MD 2-56	Brentwood	150	1976	64	67	69	91	96	
MD 2-46	Chase House	189	1978	8	26	30	44	70	
MD 2-51	B. Mason Apts.	223	1979	30	77	84	97	100	
MD 2-52	Lakeview T. Ext.	144	1979	84	89	93	94	99	
	MD 2-39 MD 2-41 MD 2-47 MD 2-54 MD 2-44 MD 2-43 MD 2-53 MD 2-56 MD 2-56 MD 2-46 MD 2-51	MD 2-41 West Twenty MD 2-47 Govans Manor MD 2-54 Bel-Park Tower MD 2-44 Wyman House MD 2-43 Monument East MD 2-53 Ellerslie MD 2-56 Brentwood MD 2-46 Chase House MD 2-51 B. Mason Apts.	MD 2-39 Claremont Ext. 152   MD 2-41 West Twenty 357   MD 2-41 West Twenty 357   MD 2-47 Govans Manor 199   MD 2-54 Bel-Park Tower 274   MD 2-44 Wyman House 168   MD 2-43 Monument East 187   MD 2-53 Ellerslie 125   MD 2-56 Brentwood 150   MD 2-46 Chase House 189   MD 2-51 B. Mason Apts. 223	MD 2-39Claremont Ext.1521973MD 2-41West Twenty3571973MD 2-41West Twenty3571973MD 2-47Govans Manor1991974MD 2-54Bel-Park Tower2741974MD 2-44Wyman House1681975MD 2-43Monument East1871976MD 2-53Ellerslie1251976MD 2-56Brentwood1501976MD 2-46Chase House1891978MD 2-51B. Mason Apts.2231979	ProjectUnitsOpened1970MD 2-39Claremont Ext.152197320MD 2-41West Twenty35719737MD 2-47Govans Manor199197410MD 2-54Bel-Park Tower274197444MD 2-44Wyman House16819759MD 2-43Monument East187197694MD 2-53Ellerslie125197617MD 2-56Brentwood150197664MD 2-46Chase House18919788MD 2-51B. Mason Apts.223197930	ProjectUnitsOpened19701980MD 2-39Claremont Ext.15219732054MD 2-41West Twenty3571973733MD 2-47Govans Manor19919741014MD 2-54Bel-Park Tower27419744493MD 2-44Wyman House1681975933MD 2-43Monument East18719769498MD 2-53Ellerslie12519761772MD 2-56Brentwood15019766467MD 2-46Chase House1891978826MD 2-51B. Mason Apts.22319793077	MD 2-39 Claremont Ext. 152 1973 20 54 71   MD 2-41 West Twenty 357 1973 7 33 36   MD 2-41 West Twenty 357 1973 7 33 36   MD 2-47 Govans Manor 199 1974 10 14 19   MD 2-54 Bel-Park Tower 274 1974 44 93 96   MD 2-44 Wyman House 168 1975 9 33 36   MD 2-43 Monument East 187 1976 94 98 98   MD 2-53 Ellerslie 125 1976 17 72 77   MD 2-56 Brentwood 150 1976 64 67 69   MD 2-46 Chase House 189 1978 8 26 30   MD 2-51 B. Mason Apts. 223 1979 30 77 84	ProjectUnitsOpened1970198019901981MD 2-39Claremont Ext.152197320547116MD 2-41West Twenty35719737333686MD 2-47Govans Manor199197410141940MD 2-54Bel-Park Tower274197444939694MD 2-44Wyman House16819759333650MD 2-43Monument East187197694989897MD 2-53Ellerslie125197617727756MD 2-56Brentwood150197664676991MD 2-46Chase House18919788263044MD 2-51B. Mason Apts.223197930778497	ProjectUnitsOpened19701980199019811991MD 2-39Claremont Ext.15219732054711654MD 2-41West Twenty3571973733368685MD 2-47Govans Manor19919741014194073MD 2-54Bel-Park Tower27419744493969499MD 2-44Wyman House1681975933365068MD 2-43Monument East18719769498989799MD 2-53Ellerslie12519761772775668MD 2-56Brentwood15019766467699196MD 2-46Chase House1891978826304470MD 2-51B. Mason Apts.223197930778497100

The 11 elderly projects that opened 1971-1980 are first plotted on Map 6. Project locations are marked with squares; shades of green and red indicate percentage black among occupied units as of June 1981.

% Black

Five of the new elderly projects were placed in majority-white census tracts in the central sector spreading from downtown up to the northern city boundary (Chase House, West Twenty, Wyman House, Ellerslie, and Govans Manor). Two new projects (Brentwood and Lakeview Tower Extension) were placed in majority-black census tracts bordering the central corridor. One project, Monument East, was placed next to all-black Somerset (#10) in a mostly black census tract among the east-central cluster of family projects.

Two of the elderly projects that opened in the 1970s (Bel-Park Tower and Bernard E. Mason Apts.) were placed far to the west or northwest, within the path of ghetto expansion. Their census tracts were majority white in 1970 but majority black by 1980.

Claremont Extension was placed next to Claremont (#14), an east-side family project originally designated for whites that received its first black tenants in the late 1960s and was still 80% white in 1970. The surrounding census tract was 80% white in 1970. Claremont Ext. opened in 1973 with mainly white occupancy, and was 16% black in 1981.

Four elderly projects opened in the early 1980s. Project locations are shown on Map 7. Three of the four were placed in mostly black census tracts within the west-side black ghetto. Hollins House was sited near Poe (#02) in a west-central cluster of all-black family projects. Rosemont Tower and Allendale were placed in the south-central part of the west-side ghetto. All three projects have had mostly black occupancy since opening.

New Elderly Projects, 1981-1985 % Black % Black in Tract in Project Project Units Opened 1980 1990 1991 MD 2-71 Primrose Place 125 1982 5 34 1 MD 2-74 Hollins House 130 1983 90 92 95 MD 2-70 Rosemont Tower 203 1984 98 99 100 MD 2-75 Allendale 164 1985 99 98 99

Primrose Place was placed in a white neighborhood just south of the west-side ghetto. It was far from other projects, family or elderly. Its census tract was 99-100% white

when the site was selected. Primrose Place was the only elderly project with majoritywhite occupancy in 1991. In 2002 it was unique among all projects, family and elderly, as the only one with majority-white occupancy.

Elderly projects were sited in different locations than family projects. Half of the 31 family projects, but only two of the 16 elderly projects, were placed in the close-in portions of the east-central and west-central black ghettos. Nine family projects, but no elderly projects, were placed in the southern sector of the city. Four elderly projects, but no family projects, were placed in majority-white census tracts in the central corridor extending north of downtown. One elderly project was sited in a mostly-white census tract in the southern sector of the city.

Throughout the history of developing public housing, projects for blacks were usually placed close to the city center and projects for whites were placed farther out. Elderly projects, which had a greater presence of whites among their tenants, were placed farther from the city center than were family projects. A *centralization* measure, average distance from the City Center, quantifies this conclusion. Distances, measured in miles, are weighted by number of tenants so that a large project contributes more to the average distance than does a small project.

	1950	1970	1991
Family Projects	1000		
All Tenants	2.2	1.9	2.1
Black Tenants	1.6	1.6	1.9
White Tenants	2.7	3.7	4.0
Elderly Projects			
All Tenants		2.0	2.8
Black Tenants		2.0	2.8
White Tenants		2.0	2.8

For family projects, distance from the city center averaged about 2 miles for projects constructed during each time period. Placement of projects farther out, in the mainly-white areas of the city, was rare during the segregation era and continued to be unusual thereafter. There were racial differences, however. In 1950, when projects had a designated race, black tenants were a mile closer to the city center, on average, than were white tenants. During the next 40 years, as more projects were opened, the average distance for black tenants increased by only 0.3 mile, while the average distance for white tenants increased by 1.3 miles. The race differential was magnified. In 1991, white tenants of family projects were two miles farther from the city center than were black tenants.

Only one elderly project was open in 1970. It was 2.0 miles from the city center. There were 16 elderly projects in 1991, but elderly projects with more white residents were located no differently than those with fewer whites. The centralization measures document an important way that siting and occupancy practices for elderly projects differed from siting and occupancy practices for family projects.

The placement of elderly projects demonstrates that it was possible to acquire and develop public housing at sites in white neighborhoods at considerable distances from the city center. This analysis supports a conclusion that the placement of nearly all family housing projects within the black ghetto and close to the city center was the result of intentional siting choices. HABC developed many projects in outer areas of the city with low concentrations of black residents, but assigned nearly all such projects to use as elderly housing rather than as family housing.

## VI-A-4. System Shrinkage: Project Closings and Demolitions, 1987-2001

Baltimore's traditional public housing system, with family projects, scattered-site units, and elderly projects, peaked in size sometime around 1990. No traditional family

projects were built after 1980, no traditional elderly projects were built after 1985, and few scattered units were opened in the 1990s. Some public housing units have been opened since the mid-1990s as replacement housing for projects taken out of service and demolished. None of this housing is included in the HABC and HUD data files used to compile the information on racial occupancy of public housing in 2002, reported in Table 6. The data file for scattered site housing includes six units from Project MD2-84, designated as Fairfield replacement housing. Aside from these six units, the maps, tables, and analyses in this report exclude replacement housing. The report focuses on the nature and extent of racial segregation of public housing before the 1995 litigation and partial settlement. The changes that occurred to the traditional projects after 1995 are discussed here to make the analyses current and document whether there have been recent changes in segregation patterns and trends.

Contraction of the system began when Fairfield was closed in 1987 and accelerated with systematic demolitions from 1995 to 2001. Demolitions were carried out by federal and local government agencies. All of the projects selected for demolition were family

	Demolis	hed Proje	ects, 199	5-2001			
		Year	Pre-de	molition	% B	lack	
	Year	Demol-	Occu	bancy	in Tr	act	
Project	Opened	ished	Year 9	%Black	1990	2000	
MD 2-20 Fairfield	1942	1997	1986	100	56	5	
MD 2-15 Lafayette	1955	1995	1991	100	98	90	
MD 2-16 Flag House	1955	2001	1998	100	65	25	
MD 2-19 Lexington	1958	1996	1991	100	99	98	
MD 2-18 Murphy	1963	1999	1998	100	99	99	
MD 2-25 Broadway	1971	2000	1998	96	83	85	
MD 2-45 Hollander	1976	2000	1998	84	89	94	
MD 2-27b E. Julian	1979	1999	1991	100	99	99	

projects. Most of the demolished units were in high-rise buildings, but surrounding lowrise structures in the same or adjoining projects were also taken down. Only one of the original 12 projects from the 1940s was demolished, while three projects that opened in

the 1970s were less than 30 years old when torn down. The demolished projects are marked with a red X on Maps 8 and 9e, and are identified in Table 6 with an asterisk.

Four of the demolished projects were located among large clusters of ghetto projects. Lexington, Murphy, and Julian, were neighbors within the west-central ghetto. The two census tracts in which these projects were located lost 4,600 people -- more than half of their black population -- from 1990 to 2000. The remaining population in these ghetto tracts, however, was nearly all black. Lafayette was part of the east-central ghetto cluster. The number of blacks in its tract declined by 1,400 during the decade, but the ghetto tract continued to be mostly black.

Two of the demolished projects (Flag House and Broadway) were at the southern fringe of the east-central ghetto. Their closings removed black population from the census tracts. The effect was dramatic for Flag House, with the census tract losing four-fifths of its black residents and dropping from 65% black to 25%. Broadway was demolished after data collection for the 2000 census, so the full effects of its closing may not be apparent. Still, emptying out of the project before the census date (April 1, 2000) fueled a 1990-2000 drop of 800 blacks from the population of this majority-black tract. The small white population also dropped during the decade, and the tract percentage black was little changed.

Fairfield's census tract experienced repeated dramatic changes through the decades of its existence, largely related to the project's opening in the early 1940s with 300 units designated for whites, its conversion in the 1950s to all Negro, and its closing in the 1980s. Fairfield's isolated southeastern site adjoined a small run-down residential neighborhood. The tract was large geographically, but had only 1,600 residents in 1940, evenly split by race. During the war years the tract gained about 1,000 white residents who lived in the project and about 1,000 Negro residents attracted to the area's defense-

industry jobs and cheap housing. When Fairfield was converted to Negro occupancy in the 1950s, the displaced whites left the tract. The tract population dropped by 1,800 and its black percentage jumped from 44% (1950) to 82% (1960). As a result of Fairfield's closing in the 1980s and the subsequent demolition of nearby deteriorated private housing, the tract population dropped to 600 in 1990 and 100 in 2000. The percentage black, which stayed about 80% through the 1960s and 1970s, dropped to 56% in 1990 and 5% in 2000. This is a clear example of the direct effect that siting and occupancy actions by public housing authorities have on the racial composition of surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Hollander Ridge, which opened in 1976 with 1,000 units, was placed in an isolated location, separated by physical barriers from most of the residential portions of its census tract. The tract population was 2,700 in 1970 before Hollander opened, 4,600 in 1990, and back to 2,700 in 2000 with Hollander closed. (The implosion of the project on July 9, 2000, came after the April 1 date of the 2000 census, but the project was mostly empty before the census.) The tract percentage black jumped from 6% (1970) to 89% (1990). Before the project closed, about one-fifth of its tenants were white, and they accounted for most of the white population of the census tract. Closing of the project and displacement of all tenants caused the tract white population to drop to 100 persons. The tract percentage black in 2000 was 95%.

The demolitions, targeted at large high-rise projects, had an enormous impact on the supply of public housing in Baltimore City. The last of the demolitions, to Flag House Courts, took place with great public fanfare on Feb. 10, 2001. When the dust cleared from the rubble, eight projects with 4,490 housing units were gone.

Baltimore's public housing program had grown continually for five decades since its start in 1940. During the 1950s and 1960s, the supply of public housing jumped by 80%, mostly in projects for families. During the 1970s and 1980s, construction of nine family projects and 15 elderly projects, along with rapid growth in the scattered-site program, brought more than five thousand new units into service, increasing the public housing stock by 48%. From 1991 to 2002, demolitions and other project closings brought a decrease of 24%. The effects of this massive deconstruction on racial segregation in public housing segregation and in citywide residential segregation will be assessed in the next section.

T	otal Units of	Public Housing	
1.	1950	6,021	
	1970	10,843	
	1991	16,011	
	2002	12,151	
Note: Numb	pers for 1970, 1	991, and 2002 are occupie	d units.

#### VI-B. Segregated Public Housing and General Residential Segregation, 1940-2002

In this section, I analyze and assess racial segregation, in public housing and citywide, during the years after 1970. The extensive changes that occurred, 1971-2002, in family projects, family housing at scattered sites, and elderly projects, were described in Section VI-A. With this background in place, I turn to a summary assessment and statistical analysis of post-1970 racial trends in segregation. This is done in three parts, beginning with segregation of public housing, moving to citywide general residential segregation, and concluding with an analysis that links projects to general residential neighborhoods. These analyses of segregation during the period 1970-2002 parallel the analyses reported in Section V-E for the period 1940-1970. To provide perspective on the recent changes and allow them to be linked to the full history of public housing in Baltimore, se-

lected data for earlier years, reported in previous sections, are included in the text tables in this section.

#### VI-B-1. Segregation among Public Housing Projects, 1940-2002

From 1970 to 1991, the number of public housing projects in Baltimore doubled and the number of tenants increased by half. From 1991 to 2002, one-sixth of the projects were demolished and the tenant population dropped by one-fourth. What effects did these massive changes have on patterns of racial occupancy and segregation within public housing? To answer this question, I analyze public housing data for 1991, to represent the system at its peak, and for 2002, the most recent date for which data are available. Analyses for the recent period are then combined with analyses for 1940-1970 to permit a summary view of all six decades of public housing in Baltimore.

The distribution of projects by percentage black changed dramatically through the decades. In 1945, half of the projects were 100% black. In 1970 there were 10 more projects than in 1950, and 10 more projects that were 100% black. In 1991, there were even more 100% black projects. In 2002, after the demolitions, there were still three times as many 100% black projects as there had been in 1950.

Distribution of Fam	nily Proj	ects by	Perce	entage Black	K
% Black		1970			
100	6	16	20	18	
80 - 99	0	3	6	4	
60 - 79	0	0	1	0	
41 - 59	0	0	0	0	
21 - 40	0	0	2	0	
1 - 20	0	3	0	0	
0	6	0	0	0	
Number of Projects	12	22	29	22	

At the bottom of the distribution in 1970, with percentages black between 1 and 20, were Brooklyn, O'Donnell, and Claremont, the three old family projects originally designated white that had only recently received their first black tenants. In 2002, these three

projects were 81-86% black, but these percentages were remarkably low in light of the fact that every other family project was 99-100% black. In particular, all of the family projects that opened after 1970 and were still in service in 2002 were 100% black.

The distribution of elderly projects by percentage black contrasts with the distribution of family projects. In 2002, only two of 16 elderly projects were 100% black, and four were less than 80% black.

The disappearance of projects from the bottom categories of percentage black is related to the steady increase in the percentage of total public housing tenants who were black. The shift in racial composition of public housing is the culmination of a trend that was jump-started by project racial turnovers instigated during the 1950s and 1960s. The post-1970 expansion and 1990's contraction of the system did nothing to reverse the shift that had occurred from 1950 to 1970 toward a mostly-black clientele.

	Percentage Black in Public Housing							
	1950	1970	1991	2002				
Family projects	45	85	89	97				
Scattered-site units		100	98	98				
Elderly projects		87	85	86				
Total	45	85	90	94				

The word *segregation* is used with many meanings. In this discussion, the context is a formal one, where segregation simply refers to unevenness in a distribution. The dissimilarity index measures that unevenness.

Dissimi	larity Inde	ex for Fan	nily Public	c Housing	Projects
11.1	1950	1970	1991	2002	
	100	86	78	79	

The decline in dissimilarity from 1970 to 1991 occurred because the 1991 clustering of project percentages black around 89% was somewhat closer than the 1970 clustering of project percentages black around 85%. The primary reason for this was the sharp upward shift in percentage black in Brooklyn, O'Donnell, and Claremont. From 1991

to 2002, no new projects and only a few scattered-site units were added to the public housing inventory. The loss of thousands of units to demolition could have had segregative or desegregative effects, but there was a rough balance. Six of the demolished projects had been 100% black before closing. The other two, Broadway and Hollander, were below average in percentage black in 1991 (88% and 80% black, respectively). In 2002, 17 family projects were 99-100% black and three family projects were 81-86% black. Evenness would have required all projects to be 97% black, The actual distribution deviated far enough from this standard to yield a high dissimilarity score, 79.

The uneven distribution of blacks and whites among projects is a central feature of public housing in Baltimore through the entire six decades. Another key aspect of the segregation story, beginning with post-1954 policy changes, is the dramatic scarcity of white tenants. Occupancy of public housing became increasingly black. Exposure indexes are useful for demonstrating how this compositional transition affected the nature of segregation within the projects.

If black and white tenants had been evenly distributed among family projects in 1991, each project would have been 89% black and 11% white. In those circumstances, all black tenants and all white tenants would have lived in projects where 89% of their coresidents were black and 11% were white. In the language of exposure indexes, samerace exposure for blacks would have been 89% and same-race exposure for whites would have been 11%.

Actual same-race exposure scores have been affected by the high degree of segregation -- the uneven distribution of races among projects. At all dates, black tenants, on average, had a virtually uniracial project experience. For 1970 and the later dates, samerace exposure for black tenants would have been very high even if black and white tenants

Same-Race Exposu	ure Inde	xes for Fa	amily Proj	ects
	1950	1970	1991	2002
Blacks	100	95	94	97
Whites	100	75	52	16
Tenant Percentage Black	45	85	89	97
Tenant Percentage White	55	15	11	3

had been randomly assigned to projects. Once the percentage black rose to 85%, 89%, and 97%, it became impossible for black residents to have many white neighbors within the projects.

For white tenants, however, it mattered greatly that assignment of races to projects was actually far from random. In 1991, for example, if whites and blacks had been evenly distributed among projects, white exposure to whites would have been 11%. Because the distribution of whites and blacks among projects was actually extremely uneven (as shown by a dissimilarity score of 78), white residents, on average, lived in projects where half of the other residents were also white.

In 2002, there were so few whites living in family projects that their exposure score had fallen sharply. In that year, most co-residents of white tenants were black families. Nevertheless, 226 of the 234 white tenants in family projects lived in the three historically white projects, Brooklyn, O'Donnell, and Claremont. (These projects, with black percentages of 81, 86, and 85, respectively, were still "whiter" than the other projects, all of which were 99-100% black.)

Because of the very high percentage black that has characterized public housing tenants in Baltimore since the late 1950s, whether tenant assignment was segregated or non-segregated made little difference to the everyday racial encounters that blacks had within the projects. Even if the few whites had been distributed evenly with the black tenants, so that the dissimilarity score dropped to zero, the vast majority of neighborly encounters within each project would be blacks seeing other blacks.

## VI-B-2. General Residential Segregation, 1940-2000

The tenants of public housing live in racial settings that are quite different from the general residential environment of the city. Segregation indexes calculated from citywide census tract data are a useful tool for characterizing general residential segregation. Citywide dissimilarity indexes for the period 1940-1970 were examined in Section V-E. Here are scores tracking trends for the entire span, 1940-2000.

## <u>Citywide Dissimilarity Index</u> <u>1940</u> <u>1950</u> <u>1960</u> <u>1970</u> <u>1980</u> <u>1990</u> <u>2000</u> 79 80 84 82 79 76 71

The dissimilarity scores document a small increase in citywide residential segregation from 1940 to 1960, followed by four decades of steady slow decline. Inspection of Maps 4-7 illustrates the changes from 1960 to 2000. The increasing number of census tracts with 10-90% representation of each race caused the small declines in the index. The continued existence of large numbers of tracts that were 90-100% black or 90-100% white accounts for the fact that all of the scores continue to be in the high range for American cities. If the scores were to decline by another 11 points during the next 30 years as they did during the last 30 years, Baltimore would still have a high degree of racial residential segregation.

The percentage black among the total population of Baltimore City increased steadily through six decades, 1940-2000, but the demographic trends for blacks and whites changed sharply in the middle of the period. After 1970, the city's black population stayed approximately constant while the white population declined rapidly. As black families, seeking improved housing, moved into areas of the city bordering the ghetto, and

then in a sectoral pattern toward outlying areas of the city and close-in suburbs, the pre-1970 pattern of rapid neighborhood racial turnover was no longer as prevalent.

During the 1940-1970 decades of rapid growth in black population, the first blacks moving into a white area would commonly spur a self-fulfilling prophecy of white flight and ahetto incorporation. Three of the forces that facilitated racial turnover have changed. First, civil rights laws have helped a growing black middle class in their search for better housing. Many white enclaves have been opened to their first black residents. Second, the new demographics of the city meant that there was no longer an ever-increasing number of blacks fueling an overheated demand for housing. Once black demand for housing was directed to many neighborhoods, not just a handful of ghetto-border areas opened by speculative block-busting, there simply weren't enough black families desperate enough for housing that they flowed into every newly opened neighborhood, however crowded and expensive. Third, the early postwar period of inflated housing demand among whites came to an end. The slump in residential construction during the Depression and WW II had produced a pent-up demand, and the postwar boom in family formation and babies kept demand far ahead of housing supply. During these decades, whites clung fiercely to "their neighborhoods" and fought intrusion of Negroes. Through the 1950s and 1960s, rapid suburban development provided many attractive housing choices for white families. Moreover, the baby boom ended. After 1970, there were fewer and fewer whites willing to live in the city. Ghetto growth, racial politics, anti-city rhetoric and policies, and white prejudices all fueled white abandonment of Baltimore City.

The civil rights and demographic changes might have given rise to large declines in citywide residential segregation if there had ever been any movement of white families into the heavily black sectors of the city. The absence of two-way racial change is a good

basis for forecasting that segregation is unlikely to decline rapidly or fall to a low level. In Baltimore City, blacks have moved into more and more "white tracts," thus reducing the numbers of tracts at one end of the racial distribution. "Black tracts," however, stay black, and more tracts are added to their number, thus sustaining segregation at a high level.

As with segregation among public housing projects, so with citywide housing segregation among census tracts: multiple indexes and measures are valuable for uncovering more of the social complexity. Same-race exposure scores, calculated for the general residential population, demonstrate the implications of Baltimore's pattern of segregation on the neighborhood experiences of blacks and whites.

	Citywide Same-Race Exposure Index											
	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000					
Blacks	69	74	83	86	86	86	85					
Whites	93	92	91	88	83	79	70					

Through the entire six decades, both blacks and whites lived, on average, in neighborhoods where most of the other people were of the same race. From 1940 to 1970 black same-race exposure increased as the ghetto was formed and consolidated (Section V-E). Since 1970, this aspect of black residential experience has been constant. Stability in same-race exposure resulted from two contrasting trends: a slow decline in the unevenness of the racial distribution and a steady increase in the citywide percentage black. Unevenness declined because blacks were able to move into housing in many more parts of the city. Although some census tracts experienced rapid racial transition and became part of the expanding ghetto, many other census tracts remained mixed. If citywide percentage black had stayed the same, declining unevenness would have caused a drop in same-race exposure. Percentage black increased, however, which meant, on average, more black neighbors for the average black resident of Baltimore. By chance, the opposing forces – decreased unevenness and increased percentage black --

counteracted each other to yield remarkable stability in the same-race exposure score for blacks.

For whites, the process worked differently. The increasing number of census tracts in which both races lived meant that more whites were being exposed to black neighbors. This dynamic tended to cause declines in white same-race exposure. This force was not counterbalanced by increases in the size of white enclaves; instead, percentage white, and the number of mostly-white census tracts, declined. The citywide same-race exposure score for whites fell only five points 1940-1970. With the post-1970 demographic and civil rights changes, white same-race exposure dropped 18 points 1970-2000.

For whites in 2000, same-race exposure was 70%; other-race exposure, therefore, was 30%. The average situation for whites living in Baltimore City in 2000 was that 30% of their census-tract neighbors were blacks. This is a remarkable change since 1940, when average white exposure to black neighbors was only 7%. (This analysis is based only on the situation in Baltimore City; if suburban census tracts were included, the results would be dramatically different. Hundreds of thousands of suburban white families live without numerically significant neighborhood exposure to black families.)

## VI-B-3. Segregated Public Housing and General Residential Segregation: Linkages

The analyses of segregation in public housing and in citywide residential patterns produced a common set of trends. Formal statistical segregation – unevenness of the racial distribution as measured by the dissimilarity scores – declined slowly in both arenas, but remained at high levels to the present day. Scores measuring exposure to same-race project co-residents varied by race, as did scores measuring exposure to same-race neighbors in the census tract. At all dates 1940-2000, blacks lived in residential environ-ments (projects and tracts) that on average were almost entirely black. For whites, the lo-

cal residential environment changed dramatically. In the early years of public housing, white project residents lived among 100% white co-residents; by 1991, the average project environment for whites was half white and half black. In 2002, the few remaining white residents of family projects had a large majority of blacks among their co-residents. Whites living in general residential neighborhoods continued to have a large, but shrinking, majority of whites as neighbors. The citywide same-race exposure score declined from 93 in 1940 to 70 in 2000. Whites experienced increasing exposure to black neighbors -- from an average 7% black in 1940 to 30% black in 2000.

These statistical analyses treated projects and census tracts as separate worlds. Another form of exposure index illuminates racial patterns in the distribution of public housing projects among city residential neighborhoods. For this purpose, I define the racial environment for each public housing tenant as the entire population of the census tract in which the project is located. From the maps it is obvious that most family projects and most scattered-site units were sited in majority-black or mostly-black census tracts, and elderly projects were sited more diversely with many outside of the black ghetto. Indexes of "project resident exposure to blacks in census tracts" provide a summary measure of how family and elderly projects differed, and how black and white residents of each type of project encountered quite different residential neighborhoods.

Project Resident	Exposure to B	lacks in Cen	sus Tracts, 1991
	All	Black	White
	Residents	Residents	Residents
Family Projects	85	90	43
Scattered Sites	91	91	
Elderly Projects	68	73	39

I use census data for 1990 and project data for 1991, when most of the closings and demolitions of projects were still in the future. The first data column shows that residents of family projects lived in census tracts that, on average, were 85% black. Families

living in scattered-site units were even more concentrated in ghetto tracts, with an average of 91% black. The exposure score for residents of elderly projects is lower; they lived in census tracts with an average of 68% black.

Each of these scores -- 85, 91, and 68 -- is toward the high end of the percentage scale, and the differences may be viewed as small or large, depending on the perspective from which they are viewed. The most obvious perspective is the citywide percentage black, which was 59% in 1990 and 64% in 2000. For 1991, a reasonable round-number estimate is 60%. This provides a baseline perspective: for all Baltimore residents in 1991, average exposure to blacks in census tracts was 60%. From this perspective, the exposure-to-blacks score for elderly projects, 68%, is only a few percentage points higher than would have occurred if elderly projects had been sited randomly. The maps, with their gray shading of tract percentages black, provide a related perspective. Inspection of Map 7, with attention to the elderly projects and the gray shading, does not support the notion of random siting. Large swathes of tracts of the lightest shade and of the darkest shade are bereft of elderly projects. But elderly projects are not heavily concentrated within the innercity ghetto tracts. Several are in the north-central sector of racially diverse tracts, one is in a mostly white tract, and others are near ghetto borders. The exposure score summarizes these visual observations in a single number, 68%, that can now be interpreted as nonrandom, but tilting above 60% because of a concentration of elderly projects in majority or mostly black tracts, along with systematic underrepresentation in mostly white tracts.

For family projects, the exposure score of 85% can also be interpreted from the twin perspectives of the citywide 60% black and the distribution portrayed on Map 7. The distribution of family projects is far from random. They are heavily concentrated in mostly black tracts, especially in the core west-central and east-central ghettos and in two southern

black enclaves that were created by clustering of Negro projects. Mostly white and majority white tracts are bereft of family projects. The family project exposure score of 85% is much closer to the theoretical maximum of 100% than it is to the elderly project score of 68% or the theoretical random value of 60%.

Scattered-site housing is family housing and its distribution is closer to that of family projects than of elderly projects (Map 9e). There is nothing random in the map of scattered sites. They are extraordinarily concentrated within mostly black census tracts. The exposure score of 91% approaches the 100% maximum value.

All 16 elderly projects were opened during the span 1970-1985. Nine family projects were opened during the same span, and about 86% of the scattered-site units were sited 1967-1984. For elderly public housing, HABC was able to find sites scattered around the city, not randomly but with a wide dispersal, a mix of census tract racial percentages, and no pronounced concentration within the black ghetto. For family public housing, whether in projects or scattered sites, HABC selected ghetto locations. These locational patterns are directly linked to the efforts of HABC to stave off total segregation of elderly housing, which in 1991 retained a small proportion of white residents (15%) and still had several mixed-race projects. Locational patterns are also a significant part of the explanation of HABC's failure to stave off total segregation of clientele and projects in family project housing and clientele and sites in family scattered-site housing. Sites for family projects and scattered units were deliberately kept out of white areas and were concentrated in heavily black areas. The known consequence was that tenancy would be almost entirely black, and the further direct result was consolidation and intensification of the city's black ghetto.

Scores for project resident exposure to blacks in census tracts, 1991, were also calculated separately for black public housing residents and white public housing residents. These scores are in the second and third columns of the text table.

For black residents of family projects, the score of 90% provides strong documentation that most lived in heavily-black ghetto neighborhoods. Black families living in scattered-site housing were similarly concentrated within the ghetto (91%). Black residents of elderly projects, on average, lived in neighborhoods that were 73% black, a remarkably lower figure than for blacks in family public housing. In 1991, 85% of all residents in elderly projects were black, and blacks living in elderly projects had very few white coresidents. Because of the locations of elderly projects, however, there was substantially more racial diversity in the neighborhoods surrounding the projects than within the projects.

Adoption of a metropolitan perspective would provide a far more intensely segregative evaluation of the city's public housing. The Baltimore metropolitan area constitutes a single housing market, labor market, and economy. The city population, according to the 2000 census, constituted only one-fourth of the total metropolitan population (Table 7). The percentage black for city residents was 64%, while the metropolitan percentage black was 28%. If the city public housing program, together with the smaller public housing programs operated in a few of the suburban jurisdictions, had dispersed public housing randomly throughout metropolitan Baltimore, neighborhood exposure scores for public housing residents would have averaged about 28%, far below the actual scores. From a metropolitan perspective, family public housing, in location and occupancy, almost totally racially segregated.

Returning to a city perspective, the exposure score of 43% for white residents of family projects demonstrates that as late as 1991, long after the city population became majority black, project whites lived in census tracts that were majority white. A similar situation characterized elderly projects, where white residents had a neighborhood exposure to only 39% black. HABC's few white tenants were provided a majority-white residential environment, while their black tenants were confined to black projects in ghetto neighborhoods. From 1991 to 2002, several projects were demolished but this did nothing to change the racially segregated character of the public housing in Baltimore City.

			Year		Race			
		Year	Demol-	No. of	Desig-		Year	No. of
		Opened	ished	Units	nation		Opened	Units
Projects I	for Families					Scattered Site Housing		
Opened 1	940-1954					Opened 1965-1995		
MD2-04	Poe	1940		298	Negro	Total, All Sites	1965-1995	2854
MD2-02	McCulloh	1941		434	Negro			
MD2-01	Latrobe	1941		701	White	Projects for the Elderly		
MD2-05	Douglass	1941		393	Negro	Opened 1970		
MD2-03	Perkins	1942		688	White	MD2-33 Lakeview Tower	1970	161
MD2-20	Fairfield	1942	1997	300	* White	Opened 1971-1980		
MD2-22	Westport	1942		200	White	MD2-41 West Twenty	1973	357
MD2-21	Brooklyn	1942		500	White	MD2-39 Claremont Ext.	1973	152
MD2-06	Gilmor	1942		587	Negro	MD2-54 Bel-Park Tower	1974	274
MD2-09	O'Donnell Heights	1943		900	White	MD2-47 Govans Manor	1974	199
MD2-10	Somerset	1943		* 420	Negro	MD2-44 Wyman House	1975	168
MD2-11	Cherry Hill	1945		600	Negro	MD2-53 Ellerslie Apts.	1976	125
MD2-12	Cherry Hill Ext. 1	1952		637	Negro	MD2-43 Monument East Apts.	1976	187
MD2-14	Claremont	1953		292	White	MD2-56 Brentwood	1976	150
Opened 1	955-1970					MD2-46 Chase House	1978	189
MD2-15	Lafayette Courts	1955	1995	816		MD2-51 Mason Apts.	1979	223
MD2-16	Flag House Courts	1955	2001	487		MD2-52 Lakeview Tower Ext.	1979	144
MD2-17	Cherry Hill Ext. 2	1956		360		Opened 1981-1985		
MD2-19	Lexington Terrace	1958	1996	677		MD2-71 Primrose Place	1982	125
MD2-13	Westport Ext.	1960		232		MD2-74 Hollins House	1983	130
MD2-18	Murphy	1963	1999	758		MD2-70 Rosemont Tower	1984	203
MD2-29	Mount Winans	1969		140		MD2-75 Allendale	1985	164
MD2-34	Oswego Mall	1969		35				
Opened 1	971-1980							
MD2-23	McCulloh Ext.	1971		516				
MD2-25	Broadway	1971	2000	429				
MD2-42	Somerset Ext.	1974		60	1.1			
MD2-31b	Rosemont	1975		106				
MD2-31a	Dukeland	1975		30		Family Total		12760
MD2-45	Hollander Ridge	1976	2000	1000		Scattered Site Total		2854
MD2-27a	Spencer Gardens	1979		20		Elderly Total		2951
MD2-27b	Julian Gardens	1979	1999	23				
MD2-73	Anderson Village	1980		121		PUBLIC HOUSING TOTA	L	18565

## Table 1. Reference Table: All Public Housing Projects, 1940-2002

\* Somerset's capacity was reduced to 257 units in the 1980s. Fairfield's designation was changed in 1953 from White to Negro.

Notes: Many project names have been shortened and abbreviated. The a and b codes for Projects 27 and 31 are not official. Demolished projects may have been emptied earlier; the longest gap is for Fairfield - emptied in 1987, demolished in 1997. No information is available for public housing units added after 1995.

Sources: HABC, Semi-Annual Statistical Bulletin, June 1991. Year demolished is from Baltimore Sun files. Race designation is from HABC, D evelopment Program, Project No. MD 2-19, rev. 3/2/53, and other HABC documents. Data on Scattered-site units are from a data file provided by HABC to the Md. ACLU, 1995.

Table 2. Percentage Negro for Family Projects at Selected Dates, 1954-1970

		Year	1954	1955	1956	1957	1964	1970
		Opened	<u>6/1</u>	12/31	12/31	12/31	<u>6/30</u>	12/31
Projects (	Originally Design	ated for N	egroes					
Opened 1	940-1945							
MD2- 04	Poe	1940	100	100	100	100	100	100
MD2- 02	McCulloh	1941	100	100	100	100	100	100
MD2- 05	Douglass	1941	100	100	100	100	100	100
MD2- 06	Gilmor	1942	100	100	100	100	100	100
MD2- 10	Somerset	1943	100	100	100	100	100	100
MD2- 11	Cherry Hill	1945	100	100	100	100	100	100
Opened 1	950-1954							
MD2- 12	Cherry Hill Ext 1	1952	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Originally Design	ated for W	hites					
Opened 19	and the second sec							
MD2- 01	Latrobe	1941	0	7	29	45	78	93
MD2- 03	Perkins	1942	0	4	21	33	57	80
MD2- 20	Fairfield	1942		90	97	98	100	100
MD2- 22	Westport	1942	0	0	29	59	96	100
MD2- 21	Brooklyn	1942	0	0	0	0	0	10
MD2- 09	O'Donnell	1943	0	0	0	0	0	20
Opened 19		1		1.1				
MD2- 14	Claremont	1953	0	0	0	0	0	20
Projects (	Opened 1955-196	9 without (	Official Ra	acial Desi	ignation			
MD2- 15	Lafayette	1955		99	99		100	100
MD2- 16	Flag House	1955		24	30	30	75	95
MD2- 17	Cherry Hill Ext 2	1956				100	100	100
MD2- 19	Lexington	1958					100	100
MD2- 13	Westport Ext	1960					97	100
MD2- 18	Murphy	1963					100	100
MD2- 29	Mt. Winans	1969						100
MD2- 34	Oswego Mall	1969						100
FAMILYP	ROJECTS TOTAL		<u>49</u>	58	<u>62</u>	66	<u>78</u>	85

\* Fairfield was being converted from White to Negro occupancy in 1954; occupancy on 11/23/54 was reported as 61 White and 17 Negro families. No data were reported for Lafayette for 1957.

Sources: HABC letters, reports, and Statistical Bulletins .

# Table 3. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 1970

	Total	Negro	White	% Negro
Projects for Families				
Opened 1940-1945				
MD2- 04 Poe	296	296	0	100
MD2-02 McCulloh	434	434	0	100
MD2- 01 Latrobe	698	650	48	93
MD2- 05 Douglass	388	388	0	100
MD2-03 Perkins	679	543	136	80
MD2- 20 Fairfield	300	300	0	100
MD2- 22 Westport	199	199	0	100
MD2- 21 Brooklyn	498	49	449	10
MD2- 06 Gilmor	586	586	0	100
MD2- 09 O'Donnell	886	174	712	20
MD2- 10 Somerset	420	420	0	100
MD2- 11 Cherry Hill	598	598	0	100
Opened 1952-1954		•		
MD2- 12 Cherry Hill Ext 1	635	635	0	100
MD2- 14 Claremont	291	59	232	20
Opened 1955-1970				
MD2- 15 Lafayette	811	811	0	100
MD2- 16 Flag House	476	452	24	95
MD2- 17 Cherry Hill Ext 2	358	358	0	100
MD2- 19 Lexington	668	668	0	100
MD2- 13 Westport Ext	232	232	0	100
MD2-18 Murphy	751	751	0	100
MD2- 29 Mt. Winans	139	139	0	100
MD2- 34 Oswego Mall	35	35	0	100
Scattered Site Housing				
Opened 1967-1970				
Total, All Sites	304	304	0	100
Projects for the Elderly				
Opened 1970				
MD2- 33 Lakeview Tower	161	140	21	87
Family Total	10378	8777	1601	85
Scattered Site Total	304	304	0	100
Elderly Total	161	140	21	87
PUBLIC HOUSING TOTAL	10843	9221	1622	<u>85</u>

Source: HABC, Quarterly Statistical Bulletin, Fourth Quarter 1970.

T-3 1970 2/27/2003

Table 4. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 1	981	
---	-----	--

					%						%
	Total	Black	White	Other	Black		Total	Black	White	Other	Black
Projects for Families						Scattered Site Housing					
Opened 1940-1954						Opened 1967-1981					
MD2- 04 Poe	297	297	0	0	100	Total, All Sites	2020	1961	56	3	97
MD2- 02 McCulloh	432	429	2	1	99						
MD2- 01 Latrobe	696	690	5	1	99	Projects for the Elderly					
MD2- 05 Douglass	388	388	0	0	100	Opened 1970					
MD2- 03 Perkins	687	656	31	0	95	MD2- 33 Lakeview Tower	160	154	6	0	96
MD2- 20 Fairfield	299	299	0	0	100	Opened 1971-1980					
MD2- 22 Westport	198	198	0	0	100	MD2- 41 West Twenty	357	308	47	2	86
MD2- 21 Brooklyn	495	83	409	3	17	MD2- 39 Claremont Ext	152	25	126	1	16
MD2- 06 Gilmor	585	584	1	0	100	MD2- 54 Bel-Park Tower	274	258	16	0	94
MD2- 09 O'Donnell	673	168	487	18	25	MD2- 47 Govans Manor	199	79	119	1	40
MD2- 10 Somerset*	•	•	•		100	MD2- 44 Wyman House	168	84	82	2	50
MD2- 11 Cherry Hill	598	597	0	1	100	MD2- 53 Ellerslie Apts.	125	70	53	2	56
MD2- 12 Cherry H. Ex 1	634	633	0	1	100	MD2- 43 Monument East	187	182	5	0	97
MD2- 14 Claremont	291	101	186	4	35	MD2- 56 Brentwood	150	136	14	0	91
Opened 1955-1970						MD2- 46 Chase House	189	84	104	1	44
MD2- 15 Lafayette	814	814	0	0	100	MD2- 51 Mason Apts.	223	216	7	0	97
MD2- 16 Flag House	484	479	5	0	99	MD2- 52 Lakeview T. Ext	144	136	8	0	94
MD2- 17 Cherry H. Ex 2	359	359	0	0	100						
MD2- 19 Lexington	667	666	1	0	100						
MD2- 13 Westport Ext	231	231	0	0	100						
MD2- 18 Murphy	735	732	2	1	100						
MD2- 29 Mt. Winans	140	140	0	0	100						
MD2- 34 Oswego Mall	34	34	0	0	100						
Opened 1971-1980											
MD2- 23 McCulloh Ext	515	514	0	1	100						
MD2- 25 Broadway	429	376	52	1	88						
MD2- 42 Somerset Ext	60	60	0	0	100						
MD2- 31 b Rosemont	106	105	1	0	99						
MD2- 31 a Dukeland	30	30	0	0	100	Family Projects Total	12016	10568	1402	46	89
MD2- 45 Hollander	993	759	220	14	76	Scattered Site Total	2020	1961	56	3	97
MD2- 27 a Spencer	20	20	0	0	100	Elderly Total	2328	1732	587	9	74
MD2- 27 b Julian	23	23	0	0	100						
MD2- 73 Anderson	103	103	0	0	100	PUBLIC HOUSING TOTAL	16364	14261	2045	58	87

\* No data were reported for Somerset for 1981, but it was fully occupied at 100% Black in earlier and later reports.

Source: HABC, Semi-Annual Statistical Bulletin, December 1981.

# Table 5. Race of Occupants of Public Housing, 1991

							%		%
			Total	Black	White	Other	Black	Total Black Wh	ite Other Black
Proje	cts	for Families						Scattered Site Housing	
Open	ed 1	940-1954						Opened 1967-1991	
MD2-	04	Poe	293	292	1	0	100	Total, All Sites 2452 2409	42 1 98
MD2-	02	McCulloh	313	313	0	0	100		
MD2-	01	Latrobe	697	695	1	1	100	Projects for the Elderly	
MD2-	05	Douglass	219	216	3	0	99	Opened 1970	
MD2-	03	Perkins	354	333	20	1	94	MD2-33 Lakeview Tower 159 158	0 1 99
MD2-	20	Fairfield *	6	6	0	0		Opened 1971-1980	
MD2-	22	Westport *	1	1	Ó	0		MD2- 41 West Twenty 334 283	27 24 85
MD2-	21	Brooklyn	317	93	223	1	29	MD2- 39 Claremont Ext 151 82	68 1 54
MD2-	06	Gilmor	429	428	1	0	100	MD2- 54 Bel-Park Tower 274 272	2 0 99
MD2-	09	O'Donnell	889	301	567	21	34	MD2- 47 Govans Manor 196 144	47 5 73
MD2-	10	Somerset	255	252	3	0	99	MD2- 44 Wyman House 167 113	53 1 68
MD2-	11	Cherry Hill	430	429	1	0	100	MD2- 53 Ellerslie Apts. 125 85	37 3 68
MD2-	12	Cherry H. Ex 1	588	586	2	0	100	MD2- 43 Monument East 186 184	1 1 99
MD2-	14	Claremont	290	202	85	3	70	MD2- 56 Brentwood 150 144	5 1 96
Opene	ed 1	955-1970						MD2- 46 Chase House 189 132	52 5 70
MD2-	15	Lafayette	771	771	0	0	100	MD2- 51 Mason Apts. 223 223	0 0 100
MD2-	16	Flag House	458	457	1	0	100	MD2- 52 Lakeview T. Ext 142 140	2 0 99
MD2-	17	Cherry H. Ex 2	336	336	0	0	100	Opened 1981-1985	
MD2-	19	Lexington	630	630	0	0	100	MD2- 71 Primrose Place 124 42 8	82 0 34
MD2-	13	Westport Ext	219	219	0	0	100	MD2- 74 Hollins House 130 124	6 0 95
MD2-	18	Murphy	731	728	3	0	100	MD2- 70 Rosemont Tower 201 200	1 0 100
MD2-	29	Mt. Winans	140	140	0	0	100	MD2- 75 Allendale 164 162	2 0 99
MD2-	34	Oswego Mall	35	35	0	0	100		
Opene	d 1	971-1980							
MD2-	23	McCulloh Ext	507	502	5	0	99		
MD2-	25	Broadway	424	375	48	1	88		
MD2-	42	Somerset Ext	58	58	0	0	100		
MD2-	31	b Rosemont	106	106	0	0	100		
MD2-	31	a Dukeland	30	30	0	0	100	Family Projects Total 10644 9462 110	8 74 89
MD2-	45	Hollander	959	769	144	46	80	Scattered Site Total 2452 2409 4	12 1 98
MD2-	27	a Spencer	20	20	0	0	100	Elderly Total 2915 2488 38	15 42 85
MD2-	27	b Julian	22	22	0	0	100		
MD2-	73	Anderson	117	117	0	0	100	PUBLIC HOUSING TOTAL 16011 14359 153	85 117 90

\* Fairfield was reportedly closed in 1987. No data were reported for Westport for 1991, but it was fully occupied at 100% Black in earlier and later reports. Percentage Black is not shown for Fairfield and Westport because of small numbers.

Source: HABC, Semi-Annual Statistical Bulletin, June 1991.

Table 6. Race of Occupants of Public Hou	using,	2002
--	--------	------

							%						%	
			Total	Black	White	Other	Black		Total	Black	White	Other	1000	
Project	s fe	or Families						Scattered Site Housing						
Opened	1 19	40-1954						Opened 1967-2002						
MD2- 0	04	Poe	295	295	0	0	100	Total, All Sites	2511	2466	40	5	98	
MD2- 0	02	McCulloh	422	421	1	0	100							
MD2- 0	01	Latrobe	664	663	1	0	100	Projects for the Elderly						
MD2- 0	05	Douglass	381	379	2	0	99	Opened 1970						
MD2- 0	03	Perkins	673	671	2	0	100	MD2- 33 Lakeview Tower	144	142	2	0	99	
MD2- 2	20	Fairfield *		•		•	•	Opened 1971-1980						
MD2- 2	22	Westport *	426	426	0	0	100	MD2- 41 West Twenty	325	180	20	125	55	
MD2- 2	21	Brooklyn	478	389	87	2	81	MD2- 39 Claremont Ext	127	109	18	0	86	
MD2- 0	06	Gilmor	533	533	0	0	100	MD2- 54 Bel-Park Tower	266	263	3	0	99	
MD2- 0	90	O'Donnell	726	621	103	2	86	MD2- 47 Govans Manor	191	160	10	21	84	
MD2- 1	10	Somerset	254	254	0	0	100	MD2-44 Wyman House	166	129	36	1	78	
MD2- 1	11	Cherry Hill	547	547	0	0	100	MD2- 53 Ellerslie Apts.	116	106	9	1	91	
MD2- 1	12	Cherry H. Ex 1	464	464	0	0	100	MD2- 43 Monument East	172	166	5	1	97	
MD2- 1	14	Claremont	217	185	31	1	85	MD2- 56 Brentwood	141	125	7	9	89	
	0	pened 1955-1970						MD2- 46 Chase House	182	133	24	25	73	
MD2- 1	15	Lafayette *	•	•	0.*			MD2- 51 Mason Apts.	221	220	1	0	100	
MD2- 1	16	Flag House *	•			•	•	MD2- 52 Lakeview T. Ext	127	125	1	1	98	
MD2- 1	17	Cherry H. Ex 2	86	86	0	0	100	Opened 1981-1985						
MD2- 1	19	Lexington *		•		•		MD2- 71 Primrose Place	122	56	66	0	46	
MD2- 1	13	Westport Ext*		•		•	100	MD2- 74 Hollins House	127	120	7	0	94	
MD2- 1	18	Murphy *	•	•	•	•	•	MD2- 70 Rosemont Tower	196	193	3	0	98	
MD2- 2	29	Mt. Winans*	•	•	•		100	MD2- 75 Allendale	163	163	0	0	100	
MD2- 3	34	Oswego Mall	35	35	0	0	100							
Opened	19	71-1980												
MD2- 2	23	McCulloh Ext	447	445	2	0	100							
MD2- 2	25	Broadway *	•	•		•	•							
MD2- 4	12	Somerset Ext	59	59	0	0	100							
MD2- 3	31	b Rosemont	98	98	0	0	100							
MD2- 3	31 /	a Dukeland	29	29	0	0	100	Family Total	6854	6620	229	5	97	
MD2- 4	15	Hollander *	•	•	•	•		Scattered Site Total	2511	2466	40	5	98	
MD2- 2	27 1	a Spencer	20	20	0	0	100	Elderly Total	2786	2390	212	184	86	
MD2- 2	27 1	b Julian *	•	•		•	•							
MD2- 7	13	Anderson *	0			•	•	PUBLIC HOUSING TOTAL	12151	11476	481	194	94	

\* Occupancy data for #22 Westport include data for its neighbors, #13 Westport Ext and #29 Mt. Winans. Projects #15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 27b, and 45 were demolished 1995-2001. No occupancy was reported for Project #73. No data for 2002 were reported for Projects #4, 56, and 71; data here are for 1998.

Note: For Scattered Site units, total is for 2002 but race data are estimates using the 1998 racial distribution.

Sources: HABC Annual Plan 2002, Support for Deconcentration (data file), and HUD, Multifamily Support System. Public Housing, as of January 1998 (data file).

T-6 2002 4/24/2003

# Map 1. Reference: Locations of Family and Elderly Public Housing Projects

# **G** Family Projects

- Latrobe McCulloh 23 Perkins 4 Poe Douglass 5 6 Gilmor O'Donnell Hts. 9 10 Somerset Cherry Hill Cherry Hill Ext. 1 Westport Ext. Claremont 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 Lafayette Cts. Flag House Cts. Cherry Hill Ext. 2 Murphy Lexington Terr. Fairfield 18 19
- 20 21 22 23 25 27a 27b Brooklyn
- Westport
- McCulloh Ext.
- Broadway Spencer Gdns. Julian Gdns.
- Mt. Winans 29
- 31a Dukeland
- 31b Rosemont
- 34 Oswego Mall
- 42 45
- Somerset Ext. Hollander Ridge Anderson Village
- 73

Census Tracts, 2000

**Elderly Projects** Lakeview Tower Claremont Ext. 33 39 West Twenty Monument East Wyman House Chase House 41 43 44 46 47 Govans Manor Mason Apts. Lakeview T. Ext. Ellerslie Apts. Bel-Park Tower 51 52 53 54 56 70 71 74 75 Brentwood Rosemont Tower Primrose Place Hollins House Allendale



Sources: HUD, "Research Maps Volume 2: Selected Research Data Sets for 1998" HABC, "Development Maps", 2000 US Census Burcau, "TIGER/Line", 2000
# Map 2. 1940

## **Family Projects**

- 1 Latrobe 2 McCulloh 3 Perkins

- Poe 4
- Douglass Gilmor 5
- 6
- O'Donnell Hts. 9
- 10 Somerset 11 Cherry Hill 20 Fairfield 21 Brooklyn 22 Westport



Applied Population Laborator University of Wisconsin-Madiso

Sources: HUD, "Research Maps Volume 2: Selected Research Data Sets for 1998" HABC, "Development Maps", 2000 USDA Forest Service, "Baltimore Eccosystem Study, 1940 Census Tract File" HABC, "Development Program, Project No. MD 2-19", Rev, 3/2/53

**Project Type** 

Negro

• White

# Map 3. 1950

## **Family Projects**

- Latrobe McCulloh Perkins 1
- 23456910
- Poe
- Douglass Gilmor
- O'Donnell Hts.

- 10 Somerset 11 Cherry Hill 12 Cherry Hill Ext. 1 14 Claremont 11 Cherry Hi 12 Cherry Hi 14 Claremon 20 Fairfield 21 Brooklyn 22 Westport

**Project Type** 

Negro

.

White

D . 80 00 (22 -Census Tract % Negro, 1950 90 or more 50 - 89.9 10 - 49.921 Less than 10

Sources: HUD, "Research Maps Volume 2: Selected Research Data Sets for 1998" HABC, "Development Maps", 2000 USDA Forest Service, "Baltimore Ecosystem Study, 1950 Census Tract File" HABC "Development Protram Project No. MD 2-10" Rev. 3/2/53

3 Miles

4/29/03 Applied Population Laboratory University of Wisconsin-Median

## Map 4. 1960

## **Family Projects**

- Latrobe McCulloh 123
- Perkins
- 4 Poe
- Douglass Gilmor 56
- 9
- O'Donnell Hts.
- 10 Somerset
- 11 Cherry Hill
- Cherry Hill Ext. 1 12
- 13 Westport Ext. 14 Claremont
- 15 Lafayette Cts.
- 16 Flag House Cts.
  17 Cherry Hill Ext. 2
  18 Murphy
  19 Lexington Terr.
  20 Fairfield

- 21 Brooklyn
- 22 Westport



- Family, Opened 1940 1954 Family, Opened 1955 - 1964 0







3 Miles

4/29/03

Applied Population Lab

# Map 5. 1970

## **Family Projects**

- Latrobe McCulloh
- 23 Perkins
- Poe
- 45 Douglass
- 6 Gilmor
- 9 O'Donnell Hts.
- 10 Somerset
- 11 Cherry Hill
- Cherry Hill Ext. 1
- 12 Cherry Hill Ex 13 Westport Ext.
- 14 Claremont
- Lafayette Cts.
   Flag House Cts.
- Cherry Hill Ext. 2 17
- 18
- Murphy Lexington Terr. 19
- Fairfield 20
- 21 Brooklyn 22 Westport
- 29 Mt. Winans
- 34 Oswego Mall

## **Elderly Projects**

33 Lakeview Tower



- Family, Opened 1940 1964 0 Family, Opened 1965 - 1970 0
- Elderly, Opened 1970
- Less than 10





3 Miles

4/29/03

Applied Population La University of Wisconsin-







## Map 9a. Scattered Sites 1967-1974, with 1970 Census Tracts

## **Family Projects**

Latrobe McCulloh 1 234 Perkins Poe 56 Douglass Gilmor 9 O'Donnell Hts. 10 Somerset Cherry Hill 11 12 Cherry Hill Ext. 1 13 Westport Ext. 14 Claremont Lafayette Cts. 15 Flag House Cts. Cherry Hill Ext. 2 16 17 Murphy Lexington Terr. 18 19 20 21 22 29 34 Fairfield Brooklyn Westport Mt. Winans Oswego Mall

Elderly Projects 33 Lakeview Tower

Family, Opened 1940 - 1964

O Family, Opened 1965 - 1970

Elderly, Opened 1970

**Project Type** 

0

Sources: HUD, "Research Maps Volume 2: Selected Research Data Sets for 1998" HABC, "Development Maps", 2000 USDA Forest Service, "Baltimore Ecceystem Study, 1970 Census Tract File" HABC, "Scattered-site datafile", (Provided to MD ACLU) 1995 HABC, "Quarterly Statistical Bulletin, Fourth Quarter 1970"

Scattered Site, Opened 1967-1974

Ō Project % Negro, 1970 Census Tract % Negro, 1970 90 or more 90 or more 50 - 89.9 50 - 89.9 10 - 49.910 - 49.9Less than 10 Less than 10 3 Miles 4/29/03

Applied Population Laboratory University of Wisconsin-Madisor

## Map 9b. Scattered Sites 1975-1984, with 1980 Census Tracts

N

Fan	nily Projects Latrobe	Elderly Proj 33 Lakeview		HA A	4.7		
23	McCulloh	39 Claremon	t Ext.		47		
45	McCulloh Perkins Poe Douglass Gilmor O'Donnell Hts. Somerset Cherry Hill Cherry Hill Ext. 1 Westport Ext. Claremont Lafayette Cts. Flag House Cts. Cherry Hill Ext. 2 Murphy Lexington Terr. Fairfield Brooklyn Westport McCulloh Ext. Broadway Spencer Gdns. Julian Gdns. Mt. Winans Dukeland Rosemont	43 Monumer	nt East				$1 \times 1$
69	Gilmor O'Donnell Hts.	44 Wyman H 46 Chase Ho 47 Govans M	fanor	No sector	11st		XX
10 11	Somerset Cherry Hill	51 Mason Ap 52 Lakeview	ots. T. Ext		THN	X	
12 13	Cherry Hill Ext. 1 Westport Ext.	53 Ellerslie A 54 Bel-Park 56 Brentwoo	tpts. Tower		112		$\langle \langle \rangle [/]$
14 15	Claremont Lafayette Cts.	56 Brentwoo	d A		44		4
16 17	Flag House Cts. Cherry Hill Ext. 2			<u>,                                      </u>		And And	
18 19	Murphy Lexington Terr.			X. Caracteria			
20 21	Fairfield Brooklyn						
22 23	Westport McCulloh Ext.		and the second sec				
25 27a	Broadway Spencer Gdns.					0 03 9 -	
27b 29	Julian Gdns. Mt. Winans				8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Card Cont	00
31a 31b	Dukeland Rosemont			MA		The way and	
34 42 45 73	Oswego Mall Somerset Ext.		4			The second	6
45 73	Hollander Ridge Anderson Village			11	20000/	arrive (	
	· musicon · mugo				29	$\mathbb{V}$	and Di
						· ( //2	
						Mything and	
Pro	Family, Opened 194	40-1970 <b>Pr</b>	oject % Black, 1981 Not Yet Open	Census Tract % Black	k, 1980	20	K
0	Family, Opened 197	71-1980	90 or more	50 - 89.9		21	
	Elderly, Opened 19 Elderly, Opened 19		50 - 89.9	10 - 49.9		Y	$\checkmark$
0	Scattered Site, Open	ned 1975-1984	10 - 49.9	Less than 10		22	
		-	Less than 10			$\nabla$	" in
"Research	h Maps Volume 2: Selected Res opment Maps", 2000 "CensusCD 1980", 1999 red-site datafile", (Provided to M Annual Statistical Bulletin", Dec	earch Data Sets for 1998"		0 1 2	3 Miles	re la compañía de la comp	5
, "Scattere	ed-site datafile", (Provided to M	D ACLU) 1995	NOTE: No completion man	reported for census tract 2606.03 in	1090 it is shaded as I are then	100/ Diask	Applied Po University of

4/29/03

## Map 9c. Scattered Sites 1985-1995, with 1990 Census Tracts

## **Family Projects**

Latrobe McCulloh Perkins 23 4 Poe 5 Douglass 69 Gilmor O'Donnell Hts. 10 Somerset Cherry Hill Cherry Hill Ext. 1 Westport Ext. Claremont 11 12 13 14 15 16 Lafayette Cts. Flag House Cts. Cherry Hill Ext. 2 17 18 19 Murphy Lexington Terr. Fairfield 20 21 22 23 25 27a 27b 29 31a 31b Brooklyn Westport McCulloh Ext. Broadway Spencer Gdns. Julian Gdns. Mt. Winans Dukeland Rosemont 34 42 45 73 Oswego Mall Somerset Ext. Hollander Ridge Anderson Village

**Elderly Projects** Lakeview Tower Claremont Ext. 33 39 West Twenty 41 44 44 44 52 53 55 56 71 74 57 74 57 Monument East Wyman House Chase House Govans Manor Mason Apts. Lakeview T. Ext. Ellerslie Apts. Bel-Park Tower Brentwood Rosemont Tower Primrose Place Hollins House Allendale

# 101 09 Project % Black, 1991 Census Tract % Black, 1990 90 or more

## **Project Type**

- Family, Opened 1940-1980 0 Elderly, Opened 1970-1980
- Elderly, Opened 1981-1985
- Project Closed, 1987 ×
- Scattered Site, 1985-1995 0
- 50 89.9 10-49.9 Less than 10

90 or more 50 - 89.9 10-49.9 Less than 10

Sources: "HLD,""Research Maps Volume 2: Selected Research Data Sets for 1998"" HABC, "Development Maps", 2000" US Census Bureau, "IGER/Line", 1990 US Census Bureau, "Summary File 1", 1990 HABC, "Scattered-site datafile", (Provided to MD ACLU) 1995 HABC, "Semi-Annual Statistical Bulletin", June 1991 Baltimore Sun Archives

3 Miles

4/29/03 Applied Population Laboratory University of Wisconsin-Madison

## Map 9d. Scattered Sites, All Units 1967-1995, with 1990 Census Tracts

## **Family Projects**

$\begin{array}{c}1\\2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\9\\10\\11\\2\\13\\14\\5\\16\\17\\18\\9\\20\\22\\22\\57\\7\\9\\31\\3\\4\\25\\73\end{array}$	ab ab	Latrobe McCulloh Perkins Poe Douglass Gilmor O'Donnell Hts. Somerset Cherry Hill Cherry Hill Ext. Westport Ext. Claremont Lafayette Cts. Flag House Cts. Cherry Hill Ext. Murphy Lexington Terr. Fairfield Brooklyn Westport McCulloh Ext. Broadway Spencer Gdns. Julian Gdns. Mt. Winans Dukeland Rosemont Oswego Mall Somerset Ext. Hollander Ridge

1

2

**Elderly Projects** Lakeview Tower Claremont Ext. West Twenty Monument East Wyman House Chase House Govans Manor Mason Apts. Lakeview T. Ext. Ellerslie Apts. Bel-Park Tower Brentwood 33 39 41 43 44 46 47 51 52 53 53 56 70 Brentwood Rosemont Tower Primrose Place Hollins House 71 74 75 Allendale



## **Project Type**

- Family, Opened 1940-1980 0 Elderly, Opened 1970-1980
- Elderly, Opened 1981-1985
- Project Closed, 1987 \*
- Scattered Site, 1967-1995 0

90 or more 50 - 89.9

""Research Maps Volume 2: Selected Research Data Sets for 1998"" ""Development Maps", 2000" isus Bureau, "Summary File 1", 1990 sus Bureau, "Summary File 1", 1990 "Scattered-site datafile", (Provided to MD ACLU) 1995 "Seni-Angual Statistical Bulletin", June 1991

3 Miles

Applied Popula University of Wisc

## Map 9e. Scattered Sites, All Units 1967-1995, with 2000 Census Tracts

## **Family Projects**

123456910112314516178920122357ab 331425733142573	Latrobe McCulloh Perkins Poe Douglass Gilmor O'Donnell Hts. Somerset Cherry Hill Cherry Hill Ext. Westport Ext. Claremont Lafayette Cts. Flag House Cts. Cherry Hill Ext. Murphy Lexington Terr. Fairfield Brooklyn Westport McCulloh Ext. Broadway Spencer Gdns. Julian Gdns. Mt. Winans Dukeland Rosemont Oswego Mall Somerset Ext. Hollander Ridge Anderson Villag

**Project Type** 

0

35

0

Family, Opened 1940-1980 Elderly, Opened 1970-1985

Project Demolished, 1995-2001 Scattered Site, 1967-1995

<b>Elderly Projects</b>				
3391 434 467 523 5460 7145	Lakeview Tower Claremont Ext. West Twenty Monument East Wyman House Chase House Govans Manor Mason Apts. Lakeview T. Ext. Ellerslie Apts. Bel-Park Tower Brentwood Rosemont Tower Primrose Place Hollins House Allendale			

E

2



## Sources

Sources 1-24 are listed alphabetically by title. Sources 25-213 are listed alphabetically by author. For sources identified as folders, the individual items in the folder are included in the regular listing or identified in *Notes*. Many items have a stamped-on document number or page; these are shown at the end of the main listing or in *Notes*. Call Number, Notes, or Abstract may follow the main listing. Call Number is an accession number used by Prof. Taeuber. Notes and Abstract provide additional information on contents.

- Answers and objections of defendants Housing Authority of Baltimore City, Daniel P. Henson, III, and the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore to Plaintiffs' interrogatories. [Baltimore, MD]: United States District Court for the District of Maryland; 1998 Feb 28. Call Number: 96 Notes: In Case folder (Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al..)
- [BALT '95 complaint & case docs.]. 1995. Call Number: 96 Notes: folder of various documents regarding the case Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al.
- Baltimore ecosystem study, 1940 census tract file. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service; [received 2002].
- Baltimore ecosystem study, 1950 census tract file. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service; [received 2002].
- Baltimore ecosystem study, 1960 census tract file. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service; [received 2002].
- Baltimore ecosystem study, 1970 census tract file. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service; [received 2002].
- [Baltimore Sun archives]. 1994-2002. Call Number: 97 Notes: Folder of clippings on demolished projects and related public housing articles.
- Biosketch : Dr. Lenneal J. Henderson, Jr. 1995 May 8. Call Number: 96 Notes: In Case folder (Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al..)
- Complaint. [Baltimore, MD]: United States District Court for the District of Maryland; 1995 Jan 31. Call Number: 96 Notes: In Case folder (Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al..)
- [Desegregation]. 1954-1970.
   Call Number: 93 Notes: folder of various documents regarding desegregation of public housing.
- 11. [Fairfield Homes]. 1953.

Call Number: 92

Notes: folder of various documents regarding Fairfield Homes and its racial transition; Document numbers: 253, 543, 555, 556, 574, 592, 676, 677, 678, 680, 1385

12. Family public housing developments by census tract.

Abstract: "3 p. table with project name, address, 1990 census tract, tract when site selected"

- Federal defendant's answers and objections to plaintiffs' second set of interrogatories. [Baltimore, MD]: United States District Court for the District of Maryland; 2002 Feb 6. Call Number: 96 Notes: In Case folder (Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al.)
- 14. Federal defendant's response to plaintiffs' first set of interrogatories to defendants United States Department of Housing and Urban Development and Henry G. Cisneros related to plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction. [Baltimore, MD]: United States District Court for the District of Maryland; 1998 Feb 27. Call Number: 96 Notes: In Case folder (Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al.)
- HABC administrative plan for Thompson v. HUD partial consent decree Section 8 programs. 2002 May 21. Call Number: 96 Notes: In Case folder (Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al.); 1 letter attached
- Location of public housing developments in Baltimore City. 1995 Jul 27. Abstract: "includes race data for development occupants and census tracts"
- Maryland assisted housing. Abstract: "15 p. printout - race and income data (but lots of missing data)"
- Metropolitan area counties shy away from open housing, Montgomery's strong law seen unlikely. Evening Sun. Baltimore, MD; 1967 Aug 9.
- Outline of the opinions that Lenneal J. Henderson is expected to offer at the preliminary injunction hearing in Thompson v. HUD. Baltimore, MD: Whiteford, Taylor & Preston, L.L.P.; 1995 Aug 23. Call Number: 96 Notes: In Case folder (Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al.); 1 letter attached
- Research maps volume 2: selected research data sets for 1998. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; 1998?
- 21. Thompson, et al., plaintiffs, vs. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, et al., defendants. Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al. United States District Court for the District of Maryland; 1995 Jan 31.
   Call Number: 96 Notes: In Case folder (Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al.)
   Abstract: "Class Action Complaint (56 pp) + Attachments A and B"
- 22. [Transcription error, no item].
- 23. Thompson, et al., plaintiffs, vs. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, et al., defendants. Thompson, et al. v. HUD, et al. United States District Court for the District of Maryland; 1998 Feb 28. Abstract: "Housing Authority of Baltimore City and mayor response to plaintiffs' first set of interrogatories"
- 24. [War housing, including temporaries].

Call Number: 91

Notes: folder of maps and other documents regarding war housing projects in Baltimore in the late 1940's and early 1950's

25. American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Maryland. Background regarding the ACLU's lawsuit to remedy decades of racial segregation and discrimination against Baltimore City's public housing residents. Baltimore, MD: American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Maryland; 1995 Jan 31. Call Number: 95

Notes: In folder that also contains the ACLU of Maryland's "Fact sheet regarding public housing replacement settlement"

- Ash, EllisLetter To: Winston, Oliver C. [Baltimore, MD]; 1954 Jun 24. 7 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: "588"; In "Desegregartion" folder Abstract: "Administrative implications resulting from change in racial occupancy policies"
- ---Letter To: Merson, Evelyn. 1957 Feb 4. 2 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: In "Desegregartion" folder Abstract: Reply to Merson's letter of 1/25/57
- Ash, Ellis. The Baltimore study : an account of the experience of the Housing Authority of Baltimore City in developing and applying a desegregation policy to its low-rent public housing program. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1955 Dec 9. Call Number: 93 Notes: "565"; In "Desegregation" folder
- Ash, Ellis and Ewing, Edgar M. Planning meeting on Westport desegregation. 1956 May 22. Call Number: 93 Notes: "563"; In "Desegregation" folder
- Baltimore, City of. Ordinance No. 293 (Council No. 549). 1977 Mar 16. Call Number: 39 Notes: "1237"
- ---. Ordinance No. 459 (Council No. 646). 1969 May 21. Call Number: 38 Notes: "1228"
- Baltimore, City of. Relocation plan : Project Uplift phase II. [Baltimore, MD]: City of Baltimore; 1986 Feb 5; HA13686-13693. Call Number: 83
- Baltimore Public Housing Program Hub. Briefing paper : scattered site public housing. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1999 May; HUD-26192-26198. Call Number: 90
- Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency, Community Renewal Program. Displacement and Relocation, past and future : Baltimore, Maryland. Baltimore, MD: Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency; 1965 Mar; Staff Monograph 5.4, Stage One. Call Number: 5 Notes: "640"
- Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency, Research Division. Data sheets : urban renewal and public housing projects, Baltimore, Maryland. Baltimore, MD: Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency; 1961 May. Call Number: 3 Notes: "622"; two letters attached

- 36. Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency, Research Division. The new locations and housing characteristics of housing characteristics of families displaced from Area 3-C. Baltimore, MD: Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency; 1961 Mar. Call Number: 7 Notes: "637"
- Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency, Research Division. Ten years of relocation experience in Baltimore, Maryland. Baltimore, MD: Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency.; 1961 Jun. Call Number: 4 Notes: "623"
- Branch, Van Story (Assistant Director for Housing Management). Letter To: Ewing, Edgar M. [Baltimore, MD]; 1967 Sep 18. Call Number: 93 Notes: In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Desegregation Trends" -- includes 4 graphs
- ---Letter To: Embry, R. C. Jr. [Baltimore, MD]; 1968 Oct 16. 11 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: "HUD-02980-02999"; In "Desegregartion" folder Abstract: "Requirements for administration of low-rent housing under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - selection of applicants and assignment of dwelling units"
- Briggs, Xavier de Souza; Darden, Joe T., and Aidala, Angela. In the wake of desegregation : early impacts of scattered-site public housing on neighborhoods in Yonkers, New York. Journal of the American Planning Association. 1999 Winter, 65(1):27-49. Call Number: 28
- Brodie, M. J. Application for public housing project. [Baltimore, MD]: [Department of Housing and Community Development]; 1977 Jul 12; HUD-03517-03528. Call Number: 42 Notes: Consists of letter to Everett H. Rothschild, Director, Department of Housing and Community Development, with copies of City of Baltimore Bill No. 549 / Ordinance No. 293, plus other documents related to the bill.
- Brodie, M. J., Secretary. Extract from the minutes of a regular meeting of the Commission of the Housing Authority of Baltimore City held on the 20th day of March, 1979. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1979 Mar 20; HA19250-19258. Call Number: 65 Notes: 1 letter attached
- Callan, Paul C.; Steeble, Robert, and Dean, Paula. Subsidized rental housing : Baltimore City, 1940-1985. [Baltimore, MD]: Neighborhood Progress Administration / D.H.C.D., Research & Analysis Section, Directorate for Neighborhood Activities; 1986 Feb 14; HA15878-15904. Call Number: 33
- Chrystie, Richard H. (Housing Manager). Letter To: Weiss, Harry B. [Baltimore, MD]; 1961 Mar 22. 1 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Latrobe Occupancy Ratios"
- 45. Covell, Robert H. A management control assessment of the HUD tenant selection and assignment policy. Office of HUD Program Compliance; 1984 Dec (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity assessment report). "Plaintiff's exhibit 945" Call Number: 8

- 46. Cronk, Jackson F. (Director, HPMC, 3.3F). Letter To: Cunningham, Maxine B. 1976 Sep 10. 1 p. Call Number: 49 Notes: "HUDBAL 003481" Abstract: "Equal Opportunity Review, Rehabilitation Demonstration Project - Development Program - MD 2-76 Baltimore City, Maryland"
- 47. --- (Director, Housing Development Division, 3.3F). Letter To: Cunningham, Maxine B. 1977 Sep 26. 1 p. Call Number: 47 Notes: "1213" Abstract: "Review A 1 Low Rent Public Housing Applications: Baltimore city"
- Crosse, George I. B. (Manager, Baltimore Office, HUD). Letter To: Hearn, Robert W. Executive Director Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Baltimore, MD; 1988 Mar 31. 3 p. Call Number: 85 Notes: "HUD-02123-02125" Abstract: "Housing Authority of Baltimore City's Performance, Low-Rent Public Housing Development, Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Program"
- Cunningham, Maxine B. Review application for public housing development, MD06-1-2, Baltimore City, Maryland. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1977 Sep 16; HUDBAL 001201-001206. Call Number: 45
- 50. Department of Housing and Community Development. Acquisition-rehabilitation procedures. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1978 Aug 1; HUDBAL 001240-001383.
   Call Number: 58
   Notes: Have 2nd (and better) copy of HUDBAL 001240-001243, with pages on 2nd copy numbered HUD-03511-03514
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Application for public housing project. [Baltimore, MD]: [Department of Housing and Community Development]; 1977 Jun 3; HUD-03529-03542. Call Number: 41
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Application for public housing project. [Baltimore, MD]: [Department of Housing and Community Development]; 1977 Aug 26; HUD-01932-001937. Call Number: 43
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Applications for public housing (Project No. MD-06-1-1), (Project No. MD-06-1-2). [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1977 Sep 19; HUD-03582-03611. Call Number: 46
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Baltimore City MD 2-76 demonstration program. [Baltimore, MD]: [Department of Housing and Community Development]; 1979; HUDBAL 001636-001868. Call Number: 68
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Baltimore rehabilitation project, 297 dwelling units (MD 2-G). Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1976 Oct 4; HUD-01878-01896. Call Number: 50

- 56. Department of Housing and Community Development. City of Baltimore comprehensive housing affordability strategy, 1994-1998. Baltimore, MD: Baltimore City Department of Housing and Community Development; 1993 Dec 30; HA10477-HS10600. Call Number: 1 Notes: Letter attached
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Development program, MD 2-63. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1977 Dec 30; HUD-03557-03581. Call Number: 52
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Development program phase II, Project No. MD 2-62. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1978 Sep 21. Call Number: 60 Notes: "1236-1242"
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Development program, Project No. MD 2-63. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1978 May 24. Call Number: 54 Notes: "1247-1271"
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Development programs for public housing projects MD 2-64, MD 2-67 & MD 2-68. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1979 May 11; HUDBAL 000828-000844. Call Number: 66
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Preliminary site report, MD 06-4-1, 505 units. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1978 May 3; HUDBAL. 003970-004005. Call Number: 53
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Project No. MD 2-63. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1978 May 8; HUD-03672-03705. Call Number: 64
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Project No. MD 2-66. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1979 Jun 14. Call Number: 67 Notes: "1301-1353" Abstract: Preliminary site report.
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Project No. MD 2-69. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1980 Mar 3. Call Number: 71 Notes: "1360-1398"
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Project No. MD 2-72. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1980 Oct 21; HUDBAL 000123-000163. Call Number: 73
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Proposed rehabilitation project, 235 dwelling units (MD 2-76). Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1976 Aug 9; HUD-01897-01930. Call Number: 48

- Department of Housing and Community Development. Revised development program : Project No. MD 2-72. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1981 Aug 3; HUDBAL 000108-000120. Call Number: 75 Notes: 1 letter attached
- Department of Housing and Community Development. Vacant House Program (MD 2-76) properties under contract. Baltimore, MD: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1978 Jul 3; HUDBAL 000184-000188. Call Number: 55
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, December 1980. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1980 Dec.
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, December 1982. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1982 Dec.
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, December 1984. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1984 Dec.
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, December 1985. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1985 Dec.
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, December 1986. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1986 Dec.
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, December 1981. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1981 Dec.
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin; June 1981. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1981 Jun.
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, June 1982. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1982 Jun.
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, June 1983. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1983 Jun.
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, June 1984. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1984 Jun.
- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, June 1985. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1985 Jun.

- Department of Housing and Community Development and Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Semiannual statistical bulletin, June 1987. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1987 Jun.
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Housing Authority of Baltimore City, Application for a low-rent public housing program. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1969 Jul; HA09257-09273. Call Number: 40
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Planning Division Research & Analysis Section. Changes in housing by race and tenure, Baltimore, Md., 1960-1970. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1971 Oct; No. 7. Call Number: 17 Notes: 2 copies
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Planning Division Research & Analysis Section. Quarterly statistical bulletin, fourth quarter 1970. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1970; HA23795-23840. Call Number: 101
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Planning Division Research & Analysis Section. Residential displacement activity analysis 1951-1971. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1971 May. Call Number: 32 Notes: "638"
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Planning Division Research & Analysis Section. Semi-annual statistical bulletin, June, 1988. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1988 Jun. Call Number: 114
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Planning Division Research & Analysis Section. Semi-annual statistical bulletin, December 1988. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1988 Dec. Call Number: 115
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Planning Division Research & Analysis Section. Semi-annual statistical bulletin, June, 1989. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1989 Jun. Call Number: 116
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Planning Division Research & Analysis Section. Semi-annual statistical bulletin, December 1989. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1989 Dec. Call Number: 117
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Planning Division Research & Analysis Section. Semi-annual statistical bulletin, June 1991. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1991 Jun. Call Number: 118
- Department of Housing and Community Development, Planning Division Research & Analysis Section. Semi-annual statistical bulletin, December 1991. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1991 Dec. Call Number: 119

- Department of Housing and Community Development, Planning Division Research & Analysis Section. Semi-annual statistical bulletin, June 1992. [Baltimore, MD]: Department of Housing and Community Development; 1992 Jun. Call Number: 120
- Embry, R. C. Jr. Resolution approving a plan of selection of applicants and assignment of dwelling units for low-rent housing projects. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City, Department of Housing and Community Development; 1968 Dec 17; Resolution No. PH-22-68. Call Number: 9 Notes: 4 letters attached
- Ewing, Edgar M. (Assistant to the Director of Management). Letter To: Ash, Ellis. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 Apr 5. 2 p. Call Number: 93

Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Further Steps on Implementing Desegregation"; regarding meeting held on 3/25/55

- 94. --- (Assistant to the Director of Management). Letter To: Ash, Ellis. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 Apr 5. 2 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Further Steps on Implementing Desegregation"; regarding meeting held on 3/31/55
- 95. --- (Assistant to the Director of Management). Letter To: Ash, Ellis. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 May 4. 2 p. Call Number: 93
   Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Desegregation Meeting" of 5/2/55
- 96. Fisher, Jacob (Housing Manager). Letter To: "Resident" of Latrobe Homes. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 May 23.

l p.
Call Number: 93
Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: Regarding desegregation policy.

 97. --- (Housing Manager, Latrobe Homes). Letter To: Ash, Ellis. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 Jul 6. 1 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Letter re desegregation from tenants... dated July 2, 1955... signed by Mr. and mrs. William Hopwood..."

98. --- (Housing Manager, Latrobe Homes). Letter To: Ash, Ellis. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 Jul 6. 1 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Letter from Mr. and mrs. William Hopwood"

99. --- (Housing Manager, Latrobe Homes). Letter To: Ash, Ellis. [Baltimore, MD]; 1956 Oct 3. 1 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Move-ins, Move-outs, Sept. 1956 and Folders on hand"

100. Fitzpatrick, B. T. (Deputy Administrator and General Counsel, OA). Letter To: Horne, Frank S. Racial Relations Service OA. 1951 May 7. 3 p. Call Number: 6 Notes: "Plaintiff's exhibit 167" Abstract: "Occupancy preference provisions of United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended."

- 101. GeoLytics, Inc. CensusCD 1980. 1999. Notes: Data file, from 1980 U.S. census.
- 102. Goering, John M.; Kamely, Ali, and Richardson, Todd. The location and racial composition of public housing in the United States : an analysis of the racial occupancy and location of public housing developments. [Washington, D.C.]: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research; 1994 Mar.
- 103. Goering, John M.; Kraft, Joan; Feins, Judith; McInnis, Debra; Holin, Mary Joel, and Elhassan, Huda. Moving to Opportunity for fair housing demonstration program : current status and initial findings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research; 1999 Sep. Call Number: 25
- Goodman, Allen C. Residential segregation in Baltimore's neighborhoods. [Baltimore, MD]: [Johns Hopkins University Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research]; 1984 Feb(Census Note 11). Call Number: 19
- 105. Goodman, Allen C. and Lewin, Noga. Residential segregation by race and other attributes : a tale of three cities. [Baltimore, MD]: [Johns Hopkins University Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research]; 1984 Sep(Census Note; No. 13). Call Number: 21
- 106. Goodman, Allen C. and Lewin, Noga. Residential segregation in the Baltimore metropolitan area : a crossjurisdiction analysis. [Baltimore, MD]: [Johns Hopkins University Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research]; 1984 May(Census Note; No. 12). Call Number: 20
- 107. Hartman, Sara (Director of Research ). Letter To: King, Margaret M. [Baltimore, MD]; 1964 Apr 17. 4 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: In "Desegregartion" folder Abstract: "tables... regarding trends in the age and race distribution of the occupants of public housing in Baltimore"
- 108. Hartman, Sara. Baltimore's housing situation in 1960. [Baltimore, MD]: Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency, Research Division, Planning Department; 1962 Jul. "627" Call Number: 13
- Hendrickson, H. R. (Management Operations Supervisor). Letter To: Weiss, Harry B. [Baltimore, MD]; 1956 Sep 6. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Applicants for Latrobe, Perkins and Westport"
- 110. Hobbs, Thomas R. (Area manager, Department of Housing and Urban Development). Letter To: Brodie, M. J. Executive Director Housing Authority of Baltimore City. 1978 Sep 19. 1 p. Call Number: 59 Notes: "1277" Abstract: Regarding Development Program of May 24, 1978
- 111. --- (Area Manager). Letter To: Brodie, M. J. Commissioner department of Housing and Community Development. 1978 Dec 5. 3 p. Call Number: 63 Notes: "1282-1284" Abstract: "Project No. MD2-63, Low Rent Public Housing - AWR"

- 112. --- (Area Manager, 3.1S). Letter To: Cunningham, Maxine B. 1979 Aug 22. 1 p. Call Number: 69 Notes: "HUDBAL 000781-000783" Abstract: "Review - Development Program - MD 2-64, MD 2-67, MD 2068 (formerly MD 2-64) Baltimore, Maryland"
- 113. --- (Area Manager, 3.1S). Letter To: Milberry, Rheba G. FHEO Division 3. 1E. 1980 May 21. 1 p. Call Number: 72 Notes: "HUDBAL 003074-003075" Abstract: "FHEO Review - Low Rent Public Housing Development Program - MD 2-69 Baltimore, Maryland"
- --- (Area Manager, 3.1S). Letter To: Milberry, Rheba G. FHEO Division 3. 1E. 1980 Dec 15. 1 p. Call Number: 74 Notes: "HUDBAL 000164-000165" Abstract: "Preliminary Site Report Review, Low Rent Public Housing, Baltimore City MD 2-72... Approval with conditions"
- 115. --- (Area Manager). Letter To: Brodie, M. J. Executive Director Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Baltimore, MD; 1981 Sep 30. 2 p. Call Number: 76 Notes: "HUDBAL 000105-000107" Abstract: "MD 2-72, Low Rent Public Housing, Development Program Approval"
- 116. --- (Manager, Baltimore Area Office, HUD). Letter To: Pines, Marion Commissioner Neighborhood Progress Administration. Baltimore, MD; 1984 Jul 24. 5 p. Call Number: 81 Notes: "HA 13883-13887" Abstract: "PHA Notification Number MD06P002077, Baltimore City Low Rent Public Housing, Fiscal Year 1984"
- 117. ---Letter To: Pines, Marion Executive Director Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Baltimore, MD; 1986 Mar 19. 3 p. Call Number: 84 Notes: "HA13837-13898; Also attached is a copy of a letter from Hobbs to Pines dated June 3, 1985, re: "Proposal for the subject proposal" Abstract: "Low Rent Public Housing, Project No. MD06P002077, Final Site Approval, Limited Proposal Approval"
- 118. Hopwood, William and Hopwood, Deborah AnnLetter To: Latrobe Homes Office, Housing Authority of Baltimore City. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 Jul 2. 4 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: Opinions on desegregation policy
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Acquisition with rehabilitation, Project MD06-P002-077. Baltimore, MD: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1984 Aug 24; HA13869-13882. Call Number: 82
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Actual development cost certificate : Housing Authority of Baltimore City. [Baltimore, MD] : [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1992 Dec; HA14030-14032. Call Number: 89
   Notes: 2 letters attached
   Abstract: Re: Project No. MD06P002077

- 121. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Agency's definition [Web Page]. 1999 Nov 11; Accessed 2002 Apr 29. Available at: http://www.habc.org/agencys\_definition.htm. Call Number: 30
- 122. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Annual plan 2002, support for deconcentration. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 2002? Notes: Printout from data file
- 123. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Application for demolition of scattered site units submitted to: the United States Department of Housing & Urban Development. Baltimore, MD: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1998 Sep 1; HUD-07108-07200. Call Number: 34
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Certificate of completion---consolidated. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1982 Mar 31; HUD-01303-01307. Call Number: 77 Notes: 1 letter attached Abstract: Re: Project MD 2-62
- 125. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Desegregation of Perkins and Latrobe. 1955 May 4.
- 126. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. [Development cost for Project MD002069, Vacant House Program -School Sites]. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1991; HA14017-14028. Call Number: 88 Notes: Includes various documents and letters regarding development cost for Project MD002069
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Development maps : engineer and capital improvements. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 2000; HA25147-25250. Call Number: 98
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Development program : Parts I-VIII, Project No. MD 2-19, Program Reservation no. MD 2-A, Fremont Avenue, Baltimore 2, Maryland. Baltimore, MD: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1952 May 29; HA12673-12742.
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Development program, Project No. MD 2-19. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1953 Mar 2.
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Development program : Project No. MD 2-23 for 516 dwelling units, Program Reservation no. MD 2-A, Baltimore, Maryland. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1964 Dec 1. Call Number: 11
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Developments maps. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 2000.
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Effects of the post-war program on Negro housing. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1945 Sep 25. Call Number: 94
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Fairfield file : folder one, Baltimore City vacant houses disposition list. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1983; HUDBAL 003916-003968. Call Number: 80

- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Funding/Organization [Web Page]. 1999 Mar 20; Accessed 2002 Apr 29. Available at: http://www.habc.org/fundingorganization.htm. Call Number: 30
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 12/31/80. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1981]. Call Number: 102
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 12/31/81. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1982]. Call Number: 104
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 12/31/82. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1983]. Call Number: 106
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 12/31/84. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1985]. Call Number: 109
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 12/31/85. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1986]. Call Number: 111
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 12/31/86. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1987]. Call Number: 112
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 6/30/81. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1981]. Call Number: 103
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 6/30/82. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1982]. Call Number: 105
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 6/30/83. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1983].
   Call Number: 107
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 6/30/84. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1984]. Call Number: 108
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 6/30/85. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1985]. Call Number: 110
- [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Highlights : public housing statistical data as of 6/30/87. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; [1987]. Call Number: 113
- 147. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. History : yesterday, today, & tomorrow [Web Page]. 1999 Nov 8; Accessed 2002 Apr 29. Available at: http://www.habc.org/habchist.htm. Call Number: 30

- 148. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. List no. P-78-462 for annual contributions contracts. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1978 Sep 27. Call Number: 61 Notes: 2 letters attached; "1243-1246"
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Message from the executive director [Web Page]. Accessed 2002 Apr 29. Available at: http://www.habc.org/director\_message.htm. Call Number: 30
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Mobility : overall vision and objectives [Web Page]. Accessed 2000 Feb 25. Available at: http://www.habc.org/mobility.htm. Call Number: 30
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Notice of date of full availability : Project No. MD06P002077. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1990 Feb 14; HA13787-13788. Call Number: 87 Notes: 1 letter attached
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Occupancy audit : Housing Authority of Baltimore City, March 30 -April 22, 1981. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1981; HUDBAL 001131-001148. Call Number: 10
- 153. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Occupancy statistics. 1955 Dec 31.
- 154. [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]. Occupancy status at Latrobe & Perkins (as of 3:10 P.M., 6-10-55); Units reported vacant end of month; Housing Application Office weekly referral report : 6-10. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1955 Jun 10. Call Number: 93 Notes: "577"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: tables
- 155. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. PHA plans : 5 year plan for fiscal years 2002-2006, annual plan for fiscal year 2002. [Washington, D.C.]: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Public and Indian Housing; 2002 May 21; HUD 50075. Call Number: 31
- 156. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Preliminary site report by public housing agency : Housing Authority of Baltimore City. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1977 Nov 16; HUD-03633-03670. Call Number: 51
- 157. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Project No. MD 2-67 : Certificate of completion consolidated. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1983 Mar 31; HA09091-09099. Call Number: 78 Notes: 1 letter attached
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Project No. MD06P002069 : final list of properties and units. Baltimore, MD: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1988 Sep 19; HUD-02126-02131. Call Number: 86
- 159. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Public housing racial occupancy statistics. 1957 Feb 1.
- 160. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Public housing racial occupancy statistics. 1958 Jan 13.

- 161. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Public housing racial occupancy statistics. 1959 Nov 5.
- 162. Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Report on racial occupancy policies of the Housing Authority of Baltimore City. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1954 Jun 24. Call Number: 93 Notes: "571"; "By staff committee appointed by Oliver C. Winston, Executive Director"; 1 letter attached; In "Desegregartion" folder
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Scattered-site datafile. 1995. Notes: Data file on CD "Provided to MD ACLU"
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City. Tabulation by cost center. [Baltimore, MD]: [Housing Authority of Baltimore City]; 1955.
   Call Number: 93
   Notes: 13/31/55, 6/30/56 and 12/31/56; In "Desegregartion" folder
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City and Department of Housing and Community Development. Public housing racial occupancy statistics. 1967 Sep 18.
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City, Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing AgencyLetter To: ? 1963 May
   Abstract: "BURHA's response to Afro-American's charges of discrimination
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City, Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency. Public housing racial occupancy statistics. 1964 Apr 17.
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City, Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency. Quarterly statistical bulletin, first quarter 1967. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1967. Call Number: 100
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City, Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency. Quarterly statistical bulletin, fourth quarter 1967. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1967. Call Number: 99
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City, Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency. Quarterly statistical bulletin : second quarter, 1961. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1961 Aug 31.
   Call Number: 93
   Notes: In "Desegregation" folder
- Housing Authority of Baltimore City, DHCD Housing Management. Leased housing overview. 1968 Mar 27.
- Kelly, James (Economist, 3.1M). Letter To: Hobbs, Thomas R. Area Manager 3. 1S. Baltimore, MD; 1983 Apr 18. 3 p. Call Number: 79 Notes: "HUDBAL 000024-000027" Abstract: "Preliminary Site Report, Baltimore City, Section 8 Substantial Rehabilitation, Schools 182, 140, 112, 104, 74, and 34, Project #MD2-69 and MD2-72"
- 173. Kladky and Associates. Racial characteristics of public and private housing in Baltimore City and Baltimore County. Baltimore, MD: Greater Baltimore Community Housing Resource Board; 1989 Apr 28. Call Number: 23

- Lewis, Gloria and Smith, Thomas W. Low- and lower-middle income housing production in the Baltimore region. Baltimore, MD: Regional Planning Council; 1971 Jan; HUD Project # Md. P-84. Call Number: 18
- 175. Lucas, Harold, Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing. Approval of the Housing Authority of Baltimore City's (HABC) request for demolition of 297 units in 17 developments, MD06P002024, MD06P002035, MD06P002040, MD06P002058, MD06P002059, MD06P002062, MD06P002063. MD06P002064, MD06P002065, MD06P002066, MD06P002067, MD06P002068, MD06P002069, MD06P002072, MD06P002076, MD06P002077, and MD06P002089. HUD-06939-06967. Call Number: 35 Notes: Memorandum for William D. Tamburrino, Director, Office of Public Housing, 3BPH, through Ainars Rodins, P.E., Director, SAC, PIA
- Massey, Douglas S. and Denton, Nancy A. American apartheid : segregation and the making of the underclass. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; 1993.
- The dimensions of residential segregation. Social Forces. 1988 Dec; 67(2):281-315. Call Number: 26
- McDougall, Harold A. Black Baltimore : a new theory of community. Philadelphia: Temple University Press; 1993.
- Merson, Evelyn (Editor, TRENDS in Housing). Letter To: Ash, Ellis. 1957 Jan 25. 1 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: In "Desegregartion" folder Abstract: Regarding Ash's "Baltimore Story" of 12/55
- Morton Hoffman & Co. Affordability and other housing problems of low income households in Baltimore County, 1980, 1984 and 1985 : summary of report. Baltimore, MD: Human Resources Development Agency; 1985 May. Call Number: 22
- Olson, Sherry H. Baltimore : the building of an American city. Rev. and expanded Bicentennial ed. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press; 1997.
- Orser, W. Edward. Blockbusting in Baltimore : the Edmondson Village story. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky; 1994.
- 183. Popkin, Susan J.; Galster, George; Temkin, Kenneth; Herbig, Carla; Levy, Diane K.; Richer, Elise, and Urban Institute. Baseline assessment of public housing desegregation cases : cross-site report. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research; 2000 Apr. 2 v.
- 184. Rabin, Yale. The effects of development control on housing opportunities for black households in Baltimore County, Maryland : a report to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1970 Aug. Call Number: 15
- 185. Rosen, Dennis and Totten, Thomas. Assisted housing in the Baltimore region. Baltimore, MD: Regional Planning Council; 1978 Jan 1; HUD Project # Md. P-106. Call Number: 14

 Rothschild, Everett H. (Area Director, Department of Housing and Urban Development). Letter To: Brodie, M. Jay, Executive Director Housing Authority of Baltimore City. [Baltimore, MD]; 1977 Sep 16. 2

> p. Call Number: 44 Notes: "HUD-03515-03516" Abstract: "Low Rent Public Housing Application, Project no. MD06-1-1, 105 units, Acquistion with Rehabilitation"

- 187. --- (Area Manager, 311S). Letter To: Cunningham, Maxine B. 1978 Jul 24. 2 p. Call Number: 56 Notes: "1275-1276" Abstract: "Review development program, MD2-63, Baltimore City, Maryland"
- 188. --- (Area Manager, 3.1S). Letter To: Cunningham, Maxine B. 1978 Jul 25. 1 p. Call Number: 57 Notes: "1235" Abstract: "Preliminary site review LRPH applications MD2-62 and MD06-4-1"

Homes"

- Rusk, David. Baltimore unbound : creating a greater Baltimore Region for the twenty-first century : a strategy report. Baltimore, MD: Abell Foundation, distributed by John Hopkins University Press; 1996.
- 190. Siegel, Esther Frank (Supervisor, Housing Application Office). Letter To: Ewing, Edgar M. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 Apr 22. 2 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Impressions of Mr. Fisher's memorandum to Mr. Ash on de-segregation at Latrobe

191. Simons, Lawrence B. (Assistant Secretary). Letter To: Hobbs, Thomas R. Area Manager Baltimore Area Office 3. 1S. 1978 Nov 22. 4 p. Call Number: 62 Notes: "1278-1281" Abstract: "Low Rent Public Housing, Vacant House Rehabilitation Program, Baltimore City, Maryland, Waiver of Certain Processing Procedures"

 --- (Assistant Secretary). Letter To: Hobbs, Thomas R. Area Manager Baltimore Area Office 3. 15. 1979 Aug 30. 6 p. Call Number; 70

> Notes: "1354-1359"; Includes copy of letter from Simons to Hobbs dated Nov. 22, 1978, re: "Notice H-78-28 PHA Acquisition of Single Family, Duplex and Similar Housing" Abstract: "Request for Waivers - Public Housing Program Acquisition With Rehabilitation Projects, Projects MD-2-64, MD-2-65, MD-2-66, MD-2-67 and MD-2-68, Baltimore, Maryland"

193. Steiner, R. L. (Director, Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency). Letter To: Matthews, Ralph. [Baltimore, MD]; 1963 May 3. 9 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Includes copies of BURHA's employment policy and project tenant selection policy; In "Desegregartion" folder Abstract: Regarding the Baltimore Afro-American's "memorandum regarding the personnel and tenant selection policies of the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency."

 Taeuber, Karl E. and Taeuber, Alma F. Negroes in cities : residential segregation and neighborhood change. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.

- 195. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Demographic, economic, social and political characteristics of Baltimore City and Baltimore County. 1970 Aug(Staff report). Call Number: 16
- 196. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Abbreviated template : features race and income data. Call Number: 122 Notes: data table
- 197. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) databook : Maryland. [Washington, D.C.]: United States Department of Housing and Urban Development; [1993]. Call Number: 2 Notes: Based on 1990 census.
- 198. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. In the crossfire : the impact of gun violence on public housing communities. [Washington, D.C.] : U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; [2000]. Call Number: 29
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Multifamily tenant characteristics support system, as of Jan. 1998. [Washington, D.C.]: [U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development]; 1998 Jan.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The state of the cities 2000. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; 2000 Jun; Fourth annual. Call Number: 24
- 201. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Multifamily Tenant Characteristics Support System. Resident characteristics report. [Washington, D.C.]: [U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development]; 1998 Feb 20. Call Number: 121 Notes: "As of: January 1998" for state of Maryland; "0119-0150"
- 202. Weiss, Harry B. (Chief, Tenancy & Relocation Section). Letter To: Ewing, Edgar M. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 Apr 20. 1 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Marginal notes on Perkins desegregation memo of 4-19-55"
- 203. --- (Chief, Tenancy & Relocation Section). Letter To: Ewing, Edgar M. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 Apr 20. 1 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "Marginal notes on Latrobe desegregation memo of 4-19-55"
- 204. --- (Chief, Tenancy & Relocation Section). Letter To: Ewing, Edgar M. [Baltimore, MD]; 1957 Feb 1. 1 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: Table, "Desegregated occupancy as of 1/31/57"
- 205. --- (Acting Director of Management). Letter To: Ash, Ellis. [Baltimore, MD]; 1957 Apr 3. 1 p. Call Number: 93
   Notes: In "Desegregation" folder
   Abstract: "Desegregation Progress" table

206. --- (Director of Management). Letter To: Ash, Ellis. [Baltimore, MD]; 1958 Jan 13. 1 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: In "Desegregartion" folder Abstract: "...tabulation indicating the trend in the desegregation of three formerly all white

projects ... " 207. --- (Director of Housing Management). Letter To: Ewing, Edgar M. [Baltimore, MD]; 1959 Nov 5. 2 p. Call Number: 93

Notes: In "Desegregartion" folder Abstract: "Status of Desegregation"

White, Michael J. Segregation and diversity measures in population distribution. Population Index. 1986 208. Summer: 52(2):198-221. Call Number: 27

209. Winston, Oliver C. (Executive Director). Letter To: Biggard, Edward [Baltimore, MD]: 1955 May 20. 2 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: "This will confirm your conference with Mr. Franklyn C. Hochreiter (?) on May 18 ... " (copy hard to read)

210. --- (Executive Director). Letter To: Schettino, Mario Reverend St. Leo's Rectory. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 May 26. 2 p. Call Number: 93

> Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: Regarding tenant selection policy

211. --- (Executive Director). Letter To: Noll, Joseph Reverend St. James Rectory. [Baltimore, MD]; 1955 May 26.2 p. Call Number: 93

> Notes: Part of packet of letters labeled with number "572"; In "Desegregation" folder Abstract: Regarding tenant selection policy

- 212. --- (Executive Director). Letter To: Works, Ernest. 1957 Aug 6. 2 p. Call Number: 93 Notes: In "Desegregartion" folder Abstract: Reply to Works' letter of 7/22/57, regarding HABC's desegregation policy adopted "in the Summer of 1954" and "placed into effect in May 1955."
- 213. Winston, Oliver C. Desegregation policy : an address to all employees of the Housing Authority of Baltimore City. [Baltimore, MD]: Housing Authority of Baltimore City; 1954 Jun 30. Call Number: 93 Notes: "530"; In "Desegregartion" folder

April 2003

## KARL TAEUBER

## Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Sociology, University of Wisconsin

Curriculum Vitae

Address: 1911 Vilas Avenue, Madison, WI 53711-2233 email: ktaeuber@wisc.edu Phone: 608-251-0974

## **Employment History**

University of Wisconsin-Madison, Dept. of Sociology [1180 Observatory Ave., Madison, WI 53706-1393] Professor since 1967 (Emeritus since 1995).

Assoc. Prof. 1965-67. Asst. Prof. 1964-65.

Visiting Professor, Univ. of Warwick (Coventry, England), 1991-92. Visiting Fellow, London School of Economics (London, England), Jan.-May, 1989. Visiting Social Scientist, Rand Corporation (Santa Monica, CA), 1969-70.

- Univ. of California-Berkeley, International Population & Urban Research and Dept. of Sociology Research Associate and Instructor, 1963-64.
- Univ. of Chicago, Population Research & Training Center Research Associate, 1961-63.

National Cancer Institute, Biometry Branch (Bethesda, MD) Senior Asst. Scientist, 1959-61.

## Education

Ph.D., Harvard Univ. (Sociology), 1959.
 Dissertation: Residential Segregation by Color in United States Cities, 1940 and 1950.
 Major professors: Samuel Stouffer and Sanford Dornbusch.
 Graduate study, Univ. of Chicago, 1958-59.
 National Science Foundation fellowships, 1957-59.

- MA, Harvard Univ. (Sociology), 1957 National Science Foundation fellowship, 1956-57. Graduate study, Univ. of Chicago, Summer 1955.
- BA, Yale Univ. (Sociology), 1955. Honors: Magna Cum Laude. Ford Foundation Early Admission Scholarships, 1951-53.

Teaching [Principal Courses Taught]

Graduate seminars and colloquia: Race and Ethnic Studies, Demography.

Graduate course: Race and Ethnic Studies.

Undergraduate Courses: Statistics for Sociologists, World Population, Race and Ethnic Relations.

## Service in Professional Associations and Organizations

Nat'l. Acad. of Sciences – Nat'l. Research Council: Chair of "Workshop on Race and Ethnicity Classification--An Assessment of the Federal Standard for Race and Ethnicity Classification," 1994.

NAS-NRC: Panel on Census Requirements in the Year 2000 and Beyond, 1992-94.

Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research: Chair of Advisory Committee on the 1990 Census, 1990-97.

Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research: elected member of Council 1985-89; Chair 1988 and 1989; ex-officio member of Council 1990 and 1991.

Social Science Research Council: Director, representing Amer. Stat. Assoc. 1970-75; Presidential Search Com. 1978; Com. on Soc. Sci. Personnel, Chair 1972-75; Com. on Problems and Policy, 1971.

Nat'l. Inst. of Child Health and Human Development: Population Research and Training Com., 1971-75, Chair 1974-75.

U.W. Press: Editor, Series in Social Demography 1985-95.

Population Assoc. of America: Board of Directors, 1966-69; Chair, Com. on Population Stat., 1967-72.

American Sociological Assoc.: Publications Com.1978-80.

American Assoc. for the Advancement of Science: Fellow 1986-95; Social Sciences Nominating Com. 1983-86, Chair 1985-86.

White House Seminar on National Growth Policy, 1970: Panelist.

U.S. Nat'l. Com. on Vital and Health Statistics: Sub-Com. on Migration and Health Stat. 1966-68.

Proposal reviews and site visits for Nat'l. Science Foundation, Nat'l. Institutes of Health, etc.

## **Editorial Service**

Demography: Editorial Com. 1978-81.

Annual Review of Sociology: Editorial Com. 1973-78.

American Journal of Sociology: Co-editor 1962-63; Advisory Editor 1965-69.

American Sociological Review: Advisory Editor 1968-71.

Manuscript reviews for many journals and publishers.

## **Expert Witness**

#### Housing segregation cases

Baltimore	Fitchburg, W	
Beloit, WI	Greensboro	
Broward County, FL	Madison, WI	
Chicago	Memphis	
Cincinnati	Milwaukee	

#### School segregation cases

Akron Atlanta Boston Chattanooga Cincinnati Cleveland Columbus Dallas Dayton Detroit Grand Rapids Indianapolis Kalamazoo Knoxville Los Angeles Madison WI Memphis Milwaukee (city) Milwaukee (metro) Pasadena Prince George's County Richmond St. Louis San Diego San Francisco Topeka Tucson Youngstown Wilmington

#### **Consulting and Advising**

American Institutes for Research, Magnet Schools Study, Technical Working Group, 1990-91.

Rand Corp., Desegregation Research Advisory Committee, 1974.

U.S. Senate Select Comm. on Equal Employment Opportunity, 1970.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1969-70.

U.S. National Research Council, 1969-70.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967-68.

#### **University Service**

Dept. of Sociology: Chair, 1970-73; Director of Graduate Studies, 1965-68; member and chair of many committees, 1964-95.

Center for Demography and Ecology: Steering Committee since 1964; Director, 1980-85.

Institute for Research on Poverty: Fellow, 1966-95; Asst. Director for Research, 1978-80.

Academic Planning Council (University): Member, 1977-80.

Social Studies Division: Executive Committee 1975-79, Chair, 1978-79.

Graduate School Administrative Committee: Member, 1980-83

Graduate School Social Sciences Fellowship Committee: Chair, 1975-78.

Faculty Senate: Senator, 1975-77, 1981-83.

Community Service [professionally related]

Madison Metropolitan School District: Integration Advisory Committee, 1983-84; Integration Monitoring Committee, 1984-88, Chair 1984-86.

Madison Area Community Housing Resources Board, 1985-91.

City of Madison, Dept. of Planning and Development, Housing Survey Advisory Committee 1985.

## PUBLICATIONS

"Empirical Analysis of Segregation Indexes." Pp. 60-64 in Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, 1959. Washington: American Statistical Association, 1959.

"The Fertility of the Chinese in Northeast China" (with Irene B. Taeuber). Pp. 348-354 in International Population Conference, Vienna, 1959. Vienna, Union Internationale pour l'Etude Scientifique de la Population: 1959.

"Duration-of-Residence Analysis of Internal Migration in the United States." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 39:116-131 (Jan. 1961).

"Residence Histories and Exposure Residences for the United States Population" (with William Haenszel and Monroe G. Sirken). Journal of the American Statistical Association 56:824-834 (Dec. 1961).

Local Community Fact Book, Chicago Metropolitan Area, 1960 (with Evelyn M. Kitagawa). Chicago: Chicago Community Inventory, University of Chicago, 1963.

"The Negro as an Immigrant Group." American Journal of Sociology 69:374-382 (Jan. 1964).

"Lung Cancer Mortality as Related to Residence and Smoking Histories: II. White Females" (with William Haenszel). Journal of the National Cancer Institute 32:803-838 (Apr. 1964).

"Negro Residential Segregation: Trends and Measurement." Social Problems 12:42-50 (Summer 1964).

"White Migration and Socioeconomic Differences between Cities and Suburbs" (with Alma F. Taeuber). American Sociological Review 29:718-729 (Oct. 1964).

"The Changing Character of Negro Migration" (with Alma F. Taeuber). American Journal of Sociology 70:429-441 (Jan. 1965).

"Residential Segregation." Scientific American 213:12-19 (Aug. 1965).

Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change, with Alma F. Taeuber. Chicago: Aldine, 1965. Paper edition: Atheneum.

"Perspectives on the Urbanization of the Negro Population in the United States." In United Nations, World Population Conference, 1965.

"Cohort Population Redistribution and the Urban Hierarchy." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 43:450-462 (Oct. 1965).

"Metropolitan Migration and Intervening Opportunities" (with Omer R. Galle). American Sociological Review 31:5-13 (Feb. 1966).

"Cohort Migration." Demography 3: 416-422 (1966).

"The Negro Population in the United States" (with Alma F. Taeuber). Pp. 96-160 in The American Negro Reference Book, edited by John P. Davis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1966.

"Occupational Assimilation and the Competitive Process: A Re- Analysis" (with Alma F. Taeuber and Glen G. Cain). American Journal of Sociology 72:273-285 (Nov. 1966).

"The Demographic Context of Metropolitan Education." Pp. 132-153 in Problems in Urban Educational Planning, edited by Ernest Q. Campbell. St. Ann, MO: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, 1967. "White-Negro Occupational Differentials." Pp. 254-257 in Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, 1967. Washington: American Statistical Association, 1967.

"The Residential Redistribution of Farm-Born Cohorts." Rural Sociology 32:20-36 (March 1967).

"Recent Immigration and Studies of Ethnic Assimilation" (with Alma F. Taeuber). Demography 4: 798-808 1967).

Migration in the United States: An Analysis of Residence Histories (with William Haenszel and Leonard Chiazze, Jr.). Public Health Monograph No. 77. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

"Population Trends and Residential Segregation since 1960" (with Reynolds Farley). Science 159:953-956 (March 1, 1968).

"The Problem of Residential Segregation." In Urban Riots: Violence and Social Change, Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science XXIX (July 1968).

"The Effect of Income Redistribution on Racial Residential Segregation." Urban Affairs Quarterly 4:5-14 (Sept. 1968).

"Negro Population and Housing: Demographic Aspects of a Social Accounting Scheme." Pp. 145-193 in Race and the Social Sciences, edited by Irwin Katz and Patricia Gurin. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

"The Use of Residence Histories in Studying Migration and Population Redistribution" (with Judah Matras). Pp. 2805-2819 in International Population Conference, London, 1969, Vol. IV. London: Union Internationale pour l'Etude Scientifique de la Population, 1969.

"Metaphorical Interpretations of Religious Beliefs" (with Sanford M. Dornbusch, Malcolm McAfee, and H. Laurence Ross). Pp. 100-110 in American Mosaic: Social Patterns of Religion in the United States, edited by Phillip E. Hammond and Benton Johnson. New York: Random House, 1970.

"Social Research and the 1970 Census" (with George Armerding). Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1970.

"Patterns of Negro-White Residential Segregation." Pp. 69-84 in Demographic Aspects of the Black Community, Special Issue of Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 48 (April 1970).

"Toward a Social Report: A Review Article." Journal of Human Resources 5:354-360 (Summer 1970).

"Federal Statistics for What?" (with Halliman H. Winsborough). Pp. 154-157 in Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, 1972. Washington: American Statistical Association, 1972.

"Milliken v. Bradley and Residential Segregation: Reactions." Pp. 95-97 in Milliken v. Bradley: The Implications for Metropolitan Desegregation. Washington: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974.

"Social and Demographic Trends: Focus on Race." Pp. 31-49 in The Future of the Metropolis: People, Jobs, Income, edited by Eli Ginzberg. Salt Lake: Olympus, 1975.

"Demographic Perspectives on Housing and School Segregation." Wayne Law Review 21:833-850 (March 1975).

"Indexes of Racial Residential Segregation for 109 Cities in the United States, 1940 to 1970" (with Annemette Sorensen and Leslie Hollingsworth, Jr.). Sociological Focus 8:125-142 (April 1975).

"Models of Change in Residential Segregation, 1940-1970" (with Halliman H. Winsborough and Annemette Sorensen). Working Paper 75-27. Madison: Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, 1975.

"Racial Segregation: The Persisting Dilemma." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 422:87-96 (Nov. 1975).

"Family and Work: The Social Life Cycle of Women" (with James A. Sweet). Pp. 31-60 in Women in the American Economy, edited by Juanita Kreps. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall for the American Assembly, 1976.

"The Black Population in the United States" (with Alma F. Taeuber). Pp. 159-206 in The Black American Reference Book, edited by Mabel M. Smythe. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

"Desegregation: Chicago Background." Pp. 15-21 in Desegregation and Chicago Public Schools: Issues and Options. Chicago: American Issues Forum, 1976.

"A Practitioner's Perspective on the Index of Dissimilarity" (with Alma F. Taeuber). American Sociological Review 41:884-889 (Oct. 1976).

"Demographic Trends Affecting the Future Labor Force." Pp. 101-191 in Demographic Trends and Full Employment. Special Report No.12. Washington: National Commission for Manpower Policy, 1976.

"Demographic Perspectives on Metropolitan School Desegregation." Pp. 7-15 in School Desegregation in Metropolitan Areas: Choices and Prospects. Washington: National Institute of Education, 1977.

"Old Data for New Research" (ed. with William M. Mason and Halliman H. Winsborough). Working Paper 77-3. Madison: Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, 1977.

"Forward." Pp. ii-iv in Minority Students: A Research Appraisal, by Meyer Weinberg. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Social Demography: Research and Prospects (ed. with Larry L. Bumpass and James A. Sweet). New York: Academic Press, 1978.

"Residential and School Segregation: Some Tests of Their Association" (with Franklin D. Wilson). Pp. 51-78 in Demography of Racial and Ethnic Groups, edited by Frank Beacn and W. Parker Frisbie. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

"The Demographic Impact of School Desegregation Policy" (with Franklin D. Wilson). Pp. 135-152 in Population Policy Analysis: Issues in American Politics, edited by Michael Kraft and Mark Schneider. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1978.

"Housing, Schools, And Incremental Segregative Effects." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 441:157-167 (Jan. 1979).

"Housing and School Segregation in Indianapolis." Integrated Education 17:14-18 (Jan.-April 1979).

"Residential Segregation in the Atlanta Metropolitan Area." In Urban Atlanta: Redefining the Role of the City, edited by Andrew N. Hamer. Research Monograph 84. Atlanta: College of Business Administration, Georgia State University, 1979.

"Sociological Practice in the Courts." Wisconsin Sociologist 16 (Fall 1979): 112-122.

"Social Science Evidence and Adversary Proceedings." Notes and Comments. Madison: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin, 1979.

"Preface." Pp. 3-5 in Good Neighborhood: The Challenge of Open Housing, by Morris Milgram. New York: Norton, 1979.

"The Urban Impacts of the Program for Better Jobs and Income" (with Sheldon Danziger, Robert Haveman, and Eugene Smolensky). Pp. 219-242 in The Urban Impacts of Federal Policies, edited by Norman J. Glickman. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

"A Demographic Perspective on School Desegregation in the USA" (with Franklin D. Wilson, David R. James, and Alma F. Taeuber). Pp. 83-105 in Ethnic Segregation in Cities, edited by Ceri Peach, Vaughan Robinson, and Susan Smith. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

"The 1980 Census Undercount Controversy." On Wisconsin 3:4-5 (Winter 1981).

"Racial Segregation among Public and Private Schools" (with David R. James). Sociology of Education 55 (Apr.-July, 1982): 133-143.

"Racial Segregation among Public and Private Schools: A Response" (with David R. James). Sociology of Education 56 (Oct. 1983): 204-207.

"School Desegregation and Racial Housing Patterns." New Directions for Testing and Measurement 14 (June 1982): 53-65.

"Racial Residential Segregation, 28 Cities, 1970-1980." Appendix in Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights, A Decent Home...A Report on the Continuing Failure of the Federal Government to Provide Equal Housing Opportunity. Washington: Center for National Policy Review, Catholic University, 1983.

"Census of Population, 1940: Public Use Microdata Sample Tape Technical Documentation" (project codirector and contributing author). Washington: Bureau of the Census, 1983.

"Census of Population, 1950: Public Use Microdata Sample Tape Technical Documentation" (project codirector and contributing author). Washington: Bureau of the Census, 1984.

"Measures of Segregation" (with David R. James). Pp. 1-32 in Sociological Methodology 1985, edited by Nancy Brandon Tuma. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Population Pyramids. Introductory Demographic Techniques - Module 1 (with Doris Slesinger, Robert Israel, and Peter Ubomba-Jaswa). Computer disk for IBM-compatible personal computers. Madison, WI: Madison Academic Computer Center, University of Wisconsin, 1987.

"The Contemporary Context of Housing Discrimination." Yale Law and Policy Review VI: 339-347 (No. 2, 1988).

"Measures of Racial Exposure: Some Problems" (with Alma F. Taeuber). Working Paper 88-1. Madison: Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, 1988.

"On Conflict Resolution: Right Makes Right." Pp. 113-118 in Crossroads of Social Science, edited by Heinz Eulau. New York: Agathon Press, 1989.

"Residence and Race: 1619 to 2019." Pp. 121-153 in Race: Twentieth Century Dilemmas-Twenty-First Century Prognoses, edited by Winston A. Van Horne and Thomas V. Tonnesen. Milwaukee: Institute on Race and Ethnicity, University of Wisconsin System, 1989.

"Desegregation of Public School Districts: Persistence and Change." Phi Delta Kappan 72:19-24 (Sept. 1990).

"Resegregation of Public School Districts, 1968-1986" (with Pamela J. Smock and Alma F. Taeuber). Working Paper 90-16. Madison: Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, 1990.

"Insurance Redlining, Agency Location, and the Process of Urban Disinvestment" (with Gregory D. Squires and William Velez). Urban Affairs Quarterly 26:567-588 (June 1991).

"Census." Pp. 188-193 in Encyclopedia of Sociology, edited by E. Borgatta and M. Borgatta. New York: Macmillan, 1992.

"Census" and "Population." In World Book Encyclopedia, 1992.

Measures of Fertility. Introductory Demographic Techniques-- Module 2 (with Doris Slesinger, Richard Rathge, and Robert Israel). Computer disk for IBM-compatible personal computers. Madison, WI: Applied Population Laboratory, University of Wisconsin, 1992.

"Spatial Isolation of a Black Underclass: An American Case Study" (with Elaine Fielding). New Community 19:113-127 (Oct. 1992).

"Census." World Book Encyclopedia Online Edition, 2000.

"2000 Census: Methods, Results, Issues." World Book Special Census Edition, 2001.

## STATEMENT OF COMPENSATION KARL TAEUBER

To date, Dr. Taueber has billed plaintiffs' counsel approximately \$55,000 for work performed in the preparation of reports for the American Civil Liberties Foundation of Maryland. His report-preparation rate is \$65 per hour. In addition, he has retained a person to create the maps appended to his report for which the billing has been approximately \$25,000. These figures do not include expenses.