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IS CHICAGO'S PLAN FOR TRANSFORMATION PROMOTING INTEGRATION OR REINFORCING SEGREGATION?

JOE O'BRIEN

I. INTRODUCTION

On a frigid morning in February of 1998, Verna Berryman and her seventeen-year-old son Vernon were forced out of the Cabrini-Green housing project that had been their home for six years. Over the next several months, Berryman and her son would engage in an agonizing journey traversing through a myriad of troubled neighborhoods in search of a quality home in the private market. Like Berryman, thousands of uprooted tenants are forced to make a similar expedition because of what Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) officials call the "Plan for Transformation." Under this scheme, the CHA is using federal grants to integrate the city by destroying massive amounts of aged public housing to construct mixed income developments in place of the decrepit dwellings. As a result, many CHA tenants are forced to use federally funded housing vouchers and relocate in the private market.

---

* J.D., May, 2008, The John Marshall Law School. The author appreciates the hard work of the current Editorial Board of The John Marshall Law Review. He also thanks his personal editor John Heintz, for assisting him in the writing of this Comment. The author dedicates this Comment to his family and extends much thanks to Adam Penkhus.

2. Id.
3. Id.
4. Id.
5. See Edward Bair & John M. Fitzgerald, Hedonic Estimation and Policy Significance of the Impact of HOPE VI on Neighborhood Property Values, 22 REV. OF POLY RES. 771, 774 (2005) (reiterating that the main criticism of the HOPE VI program is that it causes mass displacement of CHA tenants).
The CHA's plan is highly controversial. There have been allegations that minority tenants are encouraged by CHA's own agents to relocate into racially ghettoized neighborhoods. Complaints also state that the discriminatory effects of the relocations (that minority tenants end up relocating to racially segregated neighborhoods) violate the Fair Housing Act (FHA), which requires housing agencies to "affirmatively further" fair housing through the promotion of more racially and economically integrated housing for tenants.

Is the CHA's plan in fact failing to further the concepts of fair housing mandated by the FHA? To better answer this question, part II.A discusses the influence and effects of racism on public housing. Part II.B analyzes the federal government's attempt to remedy a longstanding history of racist housing policies through the introduction of the HOPE VI program.

Part II.C examines the way in which the CHA is using HOPE VI grants to integrate the city. It also discusses aspects of this plan that have led to litigation. Because the issue of whether or not the plaintiff's claims violate the FHA is still being litigated and remains unresolved, part III analyzes whether the implementation of the CHA's plan does, indeed, violate the FHA. Because the manifest weight of the evidence points to a clear violation of the act, Part IV offers proposals to remedy the violations.

II. BACKGROUND

A. The Influence and Effects of Racism on Federally Financed Public Housing and How the Courts Have Intervened

Federally financed public housing was created under the Public Works Administration Act in 1933. Until the codification

---


8. 42 U.S.C. §§ 3608(e)(5), 3601; see also Wallace, 298 F. Supp. 2d at 718-19 (holding plaintiff's stated claims for violations of the FHA and HUD regulations established a duty to affirmatively further fair housing).

of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it was well-accepted policy to racially segregate public housing. With federal funding and approval, local housing agencies constructed public housing in underdeveloped, racially segregated neighborhoods and selected minority tenants for these developments. Often, the selected sites had high crime and poverty rates. Many of the developments were also isolated from the rest of the city. Even after the enactment of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, "the federal housing agency took no voluntary, effective action to desegregate public housing."

Successful claims filed against the U.S. Department of Housing and Development (HUD) and local housing agencies started a movement that would eventually change the face of public housing. In 1971, the Seventh Circuit held that HUD's "knowing acquiescence" in the CHA's discriminatory housing programs violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In 1985, a district court in Texas responded to a suit by a group of public housing tenants by pointing out HUD's utter

10. Id. at 917. Housing projects receiving federal aid were operated under the federal public housing administration's policy of separate but equal. Id. Although the Supreme Court's seminal decision in Brown v. Board of Education "signaled the unconstitutionality of government-imposed racial segregation," federal officials declined to extend the Brown holding to housing programs. Id. at 917; see also Philip Tegeler, Race and Housing Rights in the United States: The View from Baltimore, 32-SUM HUM. RTS. 4 (2005) (identifying that "the role of the federal government in creating and sustaining a system of separate and unequal housing has been extensively documented by historians of urban policy").

11. Bair, supra note 5, at 772-73 (explaining that local housing authorities receiving federal aid have historically attempted to racially segregate public housing developments).

12. Id.

13. See Cheryl Weber, The Great Blight Hope: Despite Some Notable Successes, HUD's Hope VI Program May Prove There's No One-Size-Fits-All Solution to the Country's Public-Housing Crisis, 8 RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECT 1, 12 (2004) (noting that Pittsburgh's largest housing project, "Allequippa Terrace," consisted of 83 three-story apartment buildings that were completely cut off from the rest of the city). The project was actually located on top of an abandoned coal mine. Id.

14. Roisman, supra note 9, at 918.

15. Gautreaux v. Romney, 448 F.2d 731, 737 (7th Cir. 1971); see also Blackshear Residents Org. v. Hous. Auth., 347 F. Supp. 1138, 1148 (W.D. Tex. 1971) (ruling in favor of a group of minority tenants who claimed that the federal government had approved and funded a local housing agency's plan which was blatantly discriminatory). The court reasoned that the implementation of the housing agency's plan conflicted with the policy of equal opportunity in housing expressed in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968. Id.
failure to prevent racial segregation in public housing. After analyzing several reports, the judge concluded that:

(1) the vast majority of projects are predominately one race; (2) the percentage of one-race sites is highest in the low rent projects; (3) blacks participate disproportionately in older insured-assisted projects; (4) whites participate disproportionately in Section 8 new construction projects; and (5) the races have roughly equivalent needs for public housing.

B. The Birth of HOPE VI: A New Approach to Public Housing

In 1989, largely in response to the litigation blasting federally financed housing programs, Congress created the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing. The commission reported that the majority of public housing developments across the country were racially and economically segregated, infested with crime, and isolated from job opportunities for residents. The commission recommended that the federal government create mixed income developments to foster integration.

HUD institutionalized this recommendation and created HOPE VI in 1992. The concept of fostering integration between public housing tenants (through the development of mixed income communities) is one of the main goals of HOPE VI.

In many cities, housing authorities are using HOPE VI grants to demolish dilapidated public housing buildings and replace them with mixed income housing. HUD has allowed local housing
authorities a great deal of flexibility to demolish their properties at a rate that the agencies see fit.\textsuperscript{24} Also, the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA),\textsuperscript{25} along with other federal provisions, provide local housing authorities with wide latitude to determine who will live in the new units.\textsuperscript{26}

1. The Housing Choice Voucher System

The mixed income condominiums and town homes that are being built in place of the colossal towers simply cannot house all of the families that depend upon public aid.\textsuperscript{27} In response to this

condominiums and townhomes. \textit{Id.}

When it comes to the construction of the new mixed income developments, many HOPE VI projects are exercises in letting go of traditional thinking. Weber, \textit{supra} note 13, at 2. The new housing units at every income level must be "virtually indistinguishable from each other," and to avoid being labeled public housing, the design of the new developments "must create the impression that the community has evolved over time." \textit{Id.} at 3.

The new style of housing is far different from the barracks-style and "International-Style high rise template" which were used when public housing was constructed in the past. For example, the new development at Park Duvalle, in Louisville, Kentucky resembles "the classic prewar buildings of East Louisville's best addresses." \textit{Id.} at 10.

24. POPKIN, \textit{supra} note 22, at 915-16. Congress repealed the one-for-one replacement rule in 1995, which had required that local housing officials build a public housing unit for every unit destroyed. \textit{Id.} Now, housing authorities need only replace "occupied units" and they can replace them with either "hard units" (public or scattered site units) or "soft units" (Section 8 certificates or vouchers). \textit{Id.} at 916.


26. POPKIN, \textit{supra} note 22, at 916. The Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA) states: "[t]hat any criminal activity that threatens the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other tenants or any drug-related criminal activity on or off such premises, engaged in by a public housing tenant, any member of the tenant's household, or any guest or other person under the tenant's control, shall be cause for termination of tenancy." 42 U.S.C. § 1437(d)(1)(6). This federal statute has been called the "one-strike and you're out" provision. POPKIN, \textit{supra} note 22, at 916.

In \textit{Department of Housing & Urban Dev. v. Rucker}, 535 U.S. 125, 127-28 (2002), the Supreme Court upheld the authority of the CHA (as well as other housing authorities) to evict tenants, under the QHWRA, for the drug activity of household members and guests whether or not the tenant knew, or should have known, about the activity.

27. See Henry Korman, \textit{Underwriting for Fair Housing? Achieving Civil Rights Goals in Affordable Housing Programs}, 14 J. OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEV. L. 292, 310 (2005) (estimating that only between twenty to fifty percent of the original housing tenants actually return to the "revitalized communities"); see also Weber, \textit{supra} note 13, at 8 (pointing out that local housing authorities have been criticized (along with HUD for allowing it) for using HOPE VI money as an opportunity to move poor minorities out of "desirable areas of the city" to make way for more "lucrative
problem, HUD officials have created a federally funded Housing Choice Voucher system. Proponents point out that the poorest families can use the vouchers to find quality housing in the private market.

Because individuals who have used their housing vouchers "seem to be concentrated in high-poverty, high-minority, deprived communities," there has been a recent influx of litigation alleging that HUD and local housing agencies perpetuate segregation.

C. Launching the CHA's Plan for Transformation

The CHA's plan is to use federal grants to destroy all of Chicago's high-rise public housing buildings by 2009, as well as some mid-rise and low-level (row house) housing, and replace these units with mixed income housing. HUD approved the
CHA's plan and has provided the agency with funding.\textsuperscript{32} Although some have cheered the CHA's plan, others are skeptical.\textsuperscript{33} To some CHA inhabitants, the redevelopment plan "is a euphemism for 'land grab.'"\textsuperscript{34} Many CHA tenants consider guarantees that they will be able to live in the new mixed income developments to be empty promises.\textsuperscript{35} CHA tenants may have reason to be wary of the new plan. According to one report, fewer than twenty percent of CHA tenants will be able to return to the new developments.\textsuperscript{36} Instead of returning to their old neighborhoods, many CHA residents are given federally funded housing vouchers that assist the tenants in finding permanent housing in the private market.\textsuperscript{37}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[32] MOVING TO WORK AGREEMENT (MTW), U.S. DEP'T OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, CHICAGO HOUSING AUTHORITY, 1, 1 (Feb. 6, 2000). The Moving to Work Agreement granted CHA approval for its policy of demolition and relocation, as well as relief from regulations governing how CHA spends federal funds. \textit{Id.} The Moving to Work Agreement has allowed the CHA to begin implementing its plan. Currently, the CHA has raised more than half of Chicago's public housing high-rises. \textit{Tearing Down Cabrini-Green, supra} note 31. And when the CHA's Plan for Transformation is complete, there will be around 14,000 fewer public housing apartments than when the demolition first started. \textit{Id.}

\item[33] \textit{See} SUDHIR ALLADI VENKATESH, \textit{AMERICAN PROJECT: THE RISE & FALL OF A MODERN GHETTO}, Harv. Univ. Press, 267 (2000) (stating that those residents favoring the demolition of the Robert Taylor Homes "cheered the plans" while others proclaimed the initiative to be a conspiracy to remove blacks in order to shift voting power from the inner-cities).

\item[34] \textit{The Plan for Transformation, supra} note 31.

\item[35] \textit{Id.} Residents are skeptical of CHA officials' promises because the new mixed income housing units only contain between ten to thirty percent public housing units. \textit{Id.}

\item[36] \textit{See} Sudhir Venkatesh and Isil Celimli, \textit{Tearing Down the Community}, SHELTERFORCE ONLINE, http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/138/chicago.html. (last visited Oct. 8, 2007). One of the replacements at Cabrini-Green is North Town Village which consists of 261 condos and town homes. \textit{Tearing Down Cabrini-Green, supra} note 31. When the town houses at Cabrini are completed, half of the tenants will pay the full market rate, twenty percent will pay up to one-third of their monthly income, and around a third will be former public housing tenants who also will pay no more than one third of their income. Thigpen, \textit{supra} note 1, at 3. At North Town Village only seventy-nine units are reserved for Cabrini residents, whose rent is subsidized by the government. \textit{Tearing Down Cabrini-Green, supra} note 31.

Further, those who apply to live at North Town Village have to pass a strict screening process in order to gain access to the mixed income developments. \textit{Id.} Candice Howell, a vice president at Holsten's development company, in charge of the screening process states, "We're looking for things, red flags, like unemployment, criminal behavior against property, criminal behavior against people . . . [g]uns, drugs, convictions . . . " \textit{Id.} It was also required that families attend house training seminars before moving in. \textit{Id.}

\item[37] \textit{See} First Amended Complaint, at 21, \textit{Wallace}, 298 F. Supp. 2d 710 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 15, 2003) (No. 03 C 0491) (stating that the CHA is responsible constructed). \textit{But see POPKIN, supra} note 22, at 933 (noting that the CHA is not the only housing developer of mixed income housing).

\end{footnotes}
For CHA tenants, finding housing in the private market can be a difficult task. As a result, in 2001, the CHA entered into the Relocation Rights Contract with the Central Advisory Council to help ensure that tenants would have effective relocation services.

Although there have been success stories, the way in which the CHA has used vouchers to relocate has been widely criticized. The relocations in Chicago have come amid what some believe to be the worst affordable housing crunch in years. This has exasperated an existing housing squeeze for the city's poor.

Beyond the steep rents and the housing shortage, CHA residents using housing vouchers complain that building a new life away from the projects is blocked by the same obstacles that kept them caged in the concrete towers in the first place. Some obstacles include: racist landlords, a depleted job market, wary neighbors, and a lack of experience with CHA rules and policies.

for administering the HCV program, but the CHA has contracted with Quadel Consulting Corporation, and its subsidiary CHAC, Inc., to directly administer the program. The families who participate in the HCV program rent units that meet program standards. If the CHA approves a family's “unit and tenancy” after inspection, the CHA enters into a “housing assistance payment contract with the owner to make rent subsidy payments on behalf of the family.” (quoting 24 C.F.R. 982.1); see also THE CHICAGO HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER SYSTEM, http://www.chacinc.com/docs/companybrochure.pdf#search=%22housing%20vouchers%20in%20chicago%22 (last visited Oct. 8, 2007) (asserting that families participating in the HCV program pay thirty percent of their monthly income toward rent and utilities and CHAC pays the difference directly to the tenant's landlord).

38. See infra text accompanying notes 41-43 (noting criticism of the CHA's relocation system); see also infra text accompanying notes 62-64 (pointing out that tenants are most often relocated to impoverished neighborhoods).

39. See Wallace, 298 F. Supp. 2d at 715 (explaining that under the terms of the contract, the CHA must provide counseling on transition and moving to integrated neighborhoods, public transportation stipends, and moving assistance).

40. See Thigpen, supra note 1, at 4 (recounting the experience of Sharonda Harper, who after leaving Cabrini-Green in 1996, received a phone call from the CHA inviting her to attend a housing meeting. Harper put her name in a lottery, passed a drug test, and now lives in “a clean three-bedroom apartment in a new cluster of town homes within sight of the remaining condemned Cabrini towers.”).

41. Id.

42. Id. at 1-2. In the early 1990s, middle class buyers rapidly purchased condominiums and town homes in Chicago. Id. at 2. As a result of this “economic boom” Chicago lost about 52,000 rental units. Id. As more properties were converted to private ownership, the rates for remaining rentals climbed, pricing out people at the lower end of the market and pushing them into “marginal” neighborhoods. Id.

43. Id. at 2. There are already over 48,000 families on the waiting list for public housing in Chicago, and over 38,000 more are on the waiting list for housing vouchers. Id.

44. Id. at 3. A recent study by the Lawyers' Committee for Better Housing found that seventy-five percent of the city's landlords illegally refuse to rent
The ultimate question still remains: have HUD and the CHA learned their lesson from past court opinions denigrating housing agencies for failing to promote integration? Some of the residents being forced to leave allege that the majority of African American tenants are encouraged (or forced, because no other viable options are offered) to relocate into racially ghettoized neighborhoods, thus undermining the concept of integration.

1. The Controversial Plan for Transformation Leads to Litigation

In Wallace, CHA residents filed a thirteen-count suit against the CHA and HUD claiming that the CHA's plan reinforced segregation. The federal district court held that the plaintiffs had standing and stated claims under various sections of the Fair apartments to tenants who are using housing vouchers. Id. Verna Berryman explains that "it's tough dealing with landlords when they know you have a voucher." Id. Berryman went on to state that landlords "treat you different when they know you're coming from the projects." Id. Berryman feels that many of the landlords she came in contact with had unwarranted suspicions that "she or her teenage son was involved with drugs and subjected them to nasty interrogations before slamming the door in their faces." Id.

Also, the majority of CHA residents have lived in public housing their entire lives. Id. Moreover, "they lack the experience and skill to negotiate with private landlords." POPKIN, supra note 22, at 925. Some have "never paid a utility bill," and most understand even less about CHA rules. Id. This lack of experience has caused CHA tenants to unintentionally violate a number of rules which has led to a high number of evictions. Id. For example, some CHA residents allow relatives and friends to stay with them for an extended period of time. Id. This practice was generally tolerated in the public housing high-rises, however, "doubling up" gets tenants evicted from private market units and disqualifies them from receiving housing vouchers. Id. Experts argue that the high amount of evictions, combined with the shortage of quality housing in Chicago, is causing an increase in homelessness throughout the city. The Coalition to Protect Public Housing, Plan for Transformation Fact Sheet, FROM HOUSING TO HOMELESSNESS: THE TRUTH BEHIND THE CHA'S PLAN FOR TRANSFORMATION,(2006), available at http://www.limits.com/cpph/Public%20Housing%20Flier.pdf.

45. See Young, 628 F. Supp. at 1042 (criticizing HUD and a local housing agency for failing to desegregate public housing).

46. See Thigpen, supra note 1, at 3 (arguing that nearly eighty percent of families relocated by the CHA between 1999 and 2001 ended up in neighborhoods that were predominated by African Americans); see also John Bebow & Antonio Olivio, CHA Moves Tenants Out – But Not Up, Ex-residents Still Live In Struggling, Segregated Areas, CHI. TRIB., Feb. 27, 2005, at C1 (arguing that the relocations have perpetuated segregation).

47. See Wallace, 298 F. Supp. 2d at 710 (alleging threats of relocation to racially segregated housing). Plaintiffs' alleged claims of "racial steering, perpetuation of segregation, breach of contract and other various violations of the FHA, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1988 ("QHWRA"), the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and two Executive Orders issued by Presidents Kennedy and Clinton." Id. at 715.
Housing Act (FHA), as well as several HUD provisions that require a “duty to affirmatively further fair housing.”

A year after Wallace, a group of tenants challenged a CHA notice demanding that over three hundred Cabrini families relocate in one hundred and eighty days. The federal judge was persuaded that “similar planning practices [that quickly forced tenants out without a specific relocation plan in place] have resulted in other Chicago public housing residents being relocated to racially segregated, poverty-stricken, high-crime communities.” Although the court did not grant an injunction, the court found that an injunction would be an appropriate remedy for tenants because it would allow them more time before being forced out of their homes. Like in Wallace, the court also held that the CHA plaintiffs stated claims against HUD and the CHA under the FHA because of the discriminatory effects of the plan.

In summary, courts have only gone so far as to hold that the plaintiffs stated claims under the FHA against HUD and the CHA. The issue of whether or not the tenants will succeed on the merits is still pending.

III. ANALYSIS

A. Current Implementation of the Plan for Transformation Violates Section 3608 of the Fair Housing Act

1. The Requirements Under Section 3608 of the FHA

Section 3608(e)(5) of the FHA requires HUD and the CHA to “administer the programs and activities relating to housing and urban development in a manner affirmatively to further the

48. Id. at 718. The plaintiffs’ allegations that defendants violated the Quality Housing and Work Responsibilities Act (QHWRA), also survived dismissal. Id. at 719. “Section 1437c-1(d)(15)of the QHWRA requires a PHA to certify that it will carry out the public housing agency plan in conformity with [Title VI, the FHA, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act], and will affirmatively further fair housing.” Id.

49. Cabrini-Green, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 273, at *14. Plaintiffs complained that 180 days relocation notice was premature because there was no redevelopment plan in place when the notice was issued. Id. at *14-15. They also argued that the notice did not provide sufficient time in which to obtain relief with a Section 8 voucher. Id. at *15.

50. Id. at *16.

51. Id.

52. See id. at *19-20 (acknowledging that plaintiff state the same claims as in Wallace because the defenses raised here were already rejected in Wallace).

53. See Wallace, 298 F. Supp. 2d at 725 (holding that the plaintiffs stated claims under various sections of the FHA); see also Cabrini-Green, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 273, at *16 (explaining that the plaintiffs simply stated claims under the FHA based on Wallace).
policies of this [title]." The policies of the FHA are to "provide, within constitutional limitations, for fair housing throughout the United States."

The courts have consistently held that the purpose of the act should be interpreted broadly. Section 3608 requires that the housing agencies have an "affirmative" obligation, requiring them to do something "more than simply refrain[ing] from discriminating [themselves, or] from purposely aiding discrimination by others." The Second Circuit opined that the FHA requires housing agencies to promote "open, integrated residential housing patterns and to prevent the increase of segregation, in ghettos, of racial groups whose lack of opportunities the act was designed to combat."

2. The Plan for Transformation Is Failing to Promote the Fair Housing Required Under Section 3608

Instead of promoting integrated housing patterns, the CHA's plan is perpetuating racial segregation. A study based upon CHAC's (a private company under contract with the CHA) data revealed that "[a]lmost 80% of relocation families are living in greater than 90% African American census tracks." Out of the

58. N.A.A.C.P. v. Sec'y of Hous. and Urban Dev., 817 F.2d 149, 154 (1st Cir. 1987).
59. Otero, 484 F.2d at 1134. Section 3608 does not mandate any specific actions or plans that must be undertaken to desegregate housing. However, a high standard must be met in order to convince the courts that a housing agency has met its statutory obligations to promote fair housing under section 3608 of the FHA. Thompson, 348 F. Supp. 2d at 417; see also Adarand Constructors v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200, 228 (1995) (holding that even "benign discrimination" is subject to strict constitutional scrutiny).
60. Paul B. Fischer, Section 8 and the Public Housing Revolution: Where will the Families Go? (Sept. 2001), http://www.woodsfund.org/resources/articles/section8paper.pdf; see also Roisman, supra note 9, at 925 (reiterating these findings on a national level by stating that federal housing voucher recipients in general "usually end up in racially segregated
thirty census tracts in Chicago receiving the greatest number of African American families, all but two of the tracts are at least ninety-seven percent African American.\textsuperscript{61}

The results of the CHA’s plan reveal that the relocations, in effect, are also perpetuating economic segregation. A study conducted by the Urban Institute showed that a majority of CHA tenants relocate to impoverished neighborhoods with high crime rates and poor schools.\textsuperscript{62} Generally, displaced tenants have moved to neighborhoods just as isolated and just as poor as the ones they left.\textsuperscript{63}

But perhaps these negative effects of the plan are caused by conditions largely outside the CHA’s control. Community barriers such as racism,\textsuperscript{64} classism,\textsuperscript{65} and white flight\textsuperscript{66} undoubtedly

\textsuperscript{61.} Brian Rogal, \textit{CHA Families Moving to Segregated Areas}, \textit{CHI. REP.}, July-Aug. 1998, at 3; \textit{see also} G. Thomas Kingsley, Jennifer Johnson & Kathryn LS Pettit, \textit{Patterns of Section 8 Relocation in the Hope VI Program}, 25 \textit{J. OF URBAN AFFAIRS} 427, 437 (2003) (revealing that a national study of HOPE VI relocations found that Chicago was one of the poorest performing cities in reducing the concentration of African American residents).

\textsuperscript{62.} MARY CUNNINGHAM & SUSAN J. POPKIN, CHAC MOBILITY COUNSELING ASSIGNMENT: FINAL REPORT, 24 (2002), available at \url{http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410588_CHACReport.pdf}. A study conducted by the Urban Institute found that out of 105 tenants who moved, only eight percent moved to neighborhoods with a low poverty rate (below ten percent). \textit{Id.} Twenty-three percent of the tenants moved to a neighborhood with a mid-range poverty rate (ten to twenty percent poor), and the remaining sixty-nine percent moved to neighborhoods with mid-range or high poverty rates. \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{63.} Kristine L. Zeabert, \textit{Requiring a True Choice in Housing Choice Voucher Programs}, 79 \textit{IND. L.J.} 767, 795 (2004); \textit{see also} Susan J. Popkin et, al, \textit{The HOPE VI Program: What About the Residents?}, 15 \textit{HOUSING POLY DEBATE} 385, 387 (2004) (stating that recent reports show that most relocated HOPE VI tenants are living in neighborhoods that are “extremely poor” and “racially segregated”).

\textsuperscript{64.} \textit{See} Zeabert, \textit{supra} note 63, at 785 (indicating that whites have historically tried to prevent African Americans from moving into neighborhoods “that whites consider to be theirs”). Many voucher recipients do not consider renting housing in areas with high non-minority populations because they feel unwelcome in those communities. \textit{Id.} at 786; \textit{see also} Flynn McRoberts, \textit{Move from CHA High-Rise can Involve a Leap of Faith}, \textit{CHI. TRIB.}, Sept. 2, 1998 at A1 (reporting that six African American families asked to be relocated from scattered-site units after receiving violent threats, harassment, and various forms of intimidation from individuals of another race than the six families); Thigpen, \textit{supra} note 1, at 3 (emphasizing that landlords who harbor misguided suspicions of CHA tenants also contribute to the problem when they illegally refuse to rent apartments to those families with housing vouchers).

\textsuperscript{65.} \textit{See} Thigpen, \textit{supra} note 1, at 3 (quoting Verna Berryman who said she would not prefer to move into a mixed-income neighborhood because “[t]he
contribute to the racial and economic segregation of CHA tenants in Chicago. However, these problems do not diminish the CHA’s duty to “affirmatively” further fair housing. HUD and the CHA have knowledge of these community barriers, yet neither agency has taken enough of an initiative to combat them.

a. HUD and CHA Policies Are Overly Restrictive

For example, neither HUD nor the CHA has made enough of an effort to ensure that more CHA tenants obtain and remain in newly constructed mixed income housing. The federal “one strike and you’re out” policy, which bans households that have even one member with a criminal record from access, combined with other strict screening requirements, restrict most CHA tenants from gaining and maintaining tenancy in the new developments.

The Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA) has opened public and assisted housing to families with a much wider range of incomes. The QHWRA also allows local housing agencies to impose work requirements on unemployed tenants without ensuring that tenants have adequate job training.

The CHA’s Relocation Rights Contract specifies the rights of the CHA families and the obligations of the CHA. It offers to all lease compliant families the right to return. The contract has also been criticized for good reason. It makes it unnecessarily difficult for families displaced by redevelopment to return to the mixed income developments. Instead of reassuring that a high percentage of tenants will return, the contract states that tenants

first time something goes wrong in the neighborhood, I know they’ll blame it on the poor people”).

66. See Zeabert, supra note 63, at 788 (explaining that most African Americans would like to live in a neighborhood that is around fifty percent black, which is “a neighborhood that most whites would move away from [because of perceptions that voucher recipients will be disruptive, increase crime rates, and lower property rates] resulting in a neighborhood that is close to one hundred percent black”).


68. See POPKIN, supra note 22, at 916 (explaining that Chicago has interpreted the “one-strike and you’re out” policies broadly, thus, applying it to any evidence of drug-related or felonious activity, “such as drug-related arrest rather than an actual conviction”).


70. POPKIN, supra note 22, at 917.

71. Id.

72. Venkatesh, supra note 36, at 1. In order to be lease-compliant under the contract, “a public housing tenant should: 1) be current with rent or be in a payment agreement, 2) have no utility balance with the CHA or be in a payment agreement, 3) be in compliance with the CHA lease and 4) have a good housekeeping record.” Id.
choosing permanent vouchers forever forfeit their right to gain access to the new mixed income developments.\textsuperscript{73}

As a result of the strict rules and empty promises, most tenants end up depending on housing vouchers. And as the statistical data indicates, these tenants are relocating to segregated neighborhoods with high crime and poverty rates.\textsuperscript{74}

b. The CHA's Social Services Are Grossly Inadequate

The CHA's Relocation Rights Contract also states that "[m]obility counseling is available for [i]leaseholders interested in moving to opportunity areas."\textsuperscript{75} Because demolition has outpaced development of mixed income housing, some tenants are flushed out of their homes quickly and without much guidance from the CHA.\textsuperscript{76}

Those that do receive counseling are given inadequate social support. Tom Sullivan, an attorney with the Chicago law firm Jenner & Block was contracted by CHA from July 18, 2002, to April 30, 2003, to monitor the relocation process, and, in particular, to study the effectiveness of the CHA’s social support networks.\textsuperscript{77} His report states that "no serious effort was made to explain the availability of moves to opportunity areas, or provide counseling" to tenants using housing vouchers to relocate.\textsuperscript{78}

In the last year, the CHA increased funding for the service connector program in an effort to gain more counselors that would reduce caseloads.\textsuperscript{79} However, for some reason "the city has not tapped into all the federal funding available for social services."\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{73} Wallace v. Chi. Hous. Auth., 298 F. Supp. 2d at 714.
\textsuperscript{74} See supra notes 58-62 and accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{76} "Opportunity areas' are defined ‘as census tracts with no more than 23.49 percent of families with incomes below the poverty level and no more than 30 percent African American population.’" Id.
\textsuperscript{77} See Brian J. Rogal, Watchdog Criticizes CHA Plan, CHI. REPORTER, March 2003 at 6-7 (explaining that Thomas Sullivan’s report attributes many relocation problems to rushed conditions caused by the quick destruction of public housing units, which in turn forced hundreds of families to move in the final weeks before they had a chance to find quality housing in integrated communities); see also Cabrini-Green Local Advisory Council v. Chi. Hous. Auth., No. 04 C 3792, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 273 (N.D. Ill. 2005) (responding to plaintiffs’ complaints that they were forced out of their homes too quickly, without adequate time to access social services).
\textsuperscript{78} Johns, supra note 75, at 1.
\textsuperscript{79} Id. (quoting Thomas Sullivan, INDEPENDENT MONITOR’S REPORT NO. 5, Law Firm of Jenner & Block (2003)).
\textsuperscript{80} Id. “Up to 15 percent of $70 million in revitalization grants Chicago won in 2001 from the federal HOPE VI program could have been devoted to
CHA officials declined requests to turn over public documents charting the progress of the service connector.

c. The CHA Has Overtly Encouraged Tenants to Relocate into Segregated Neighborhoods

In some instances, the CHA (through its agents) has overtly encouraged the perpetuation of segregation. For example, in 1997, Diane Wallace (one of the plaintiffs in Wallace) was given a Section 8 housing voucher and offered (by CHAC) to be relocated to an apartment at 5241 South Bishop. Because she had no other choice (e.g., to be moved into a mixed income development), Ms. Wallace accepted. The apartment CHAC chose for her (which was infested with roaches and rats) was located in a racially segregated neighborhood with high poverty and high crime rates. Wallace’s daughter attended the closest public school, which failed to diagnose her learning disability and wrongfully expelled her.

Despite these serious problems, CHAC refused to allow Ms. Wallace to relocate from 5241 South Bishop. Finally, in 2001, CHAC allowed Ms. Wallace to move and began assisting her in the process. Although Wallace repeatedly told CHAC that she was interested in moving near the racially integrated and economically more prosperous neighborhood of Ford City, the apartment CHAC helped her find (and encouraged her to take) was located at 7925 South Peoria. This apartment was engulfed by a high poverty neighborhood made up of almost entirely African Americans. Other CHA tenants have similar stories that highlight the inability of the CHA’s services to foster integration in the relocation process.

---

81. "But, the CHA chose to spend less than 5 percent." Id.
82. See Amended Complaint, supra note 37, at 26 (recounting that Ms. Wallace was offered a voucher to be relocated after bursting sewage pipes flooded her apartment, placing her safety and that of her children at risk).
83. Id.
84. Id. at 27.
85. Id.
86. Id.
87. Id.
88. Id.
89. Id. at 28.
90. Id. at 29 (alleging that Ms. Maples and other CHA residents complained that CHA staff refused to show them “neighborhoods anywhere other than Englewood,” a community which is racially and economically segregated). Id. When Ms. Maples complained, CHA and Changing Patterns officials said that they would look into this matter immediately, but Ms. Maples never heard back from either official. Id. Ms. Maples was forced to use her housing voucher and ended up relocating into an impoverished neighborhood which is “almost entirely African American.” Id.; see also id. at 29-38 (detailing similar stories of other CHA plaintiffs); Thigpen, supra note 1, at 3 (highlighting...
B. The Plan for Transformation Violates Sections 3604(a) and (b) of the Fair Housing Act

1. Section 3604(a) – Denial of Housing

Section 3604(a) of the FHA makes it unlawful "to refuse to sell or rent . . . or otherwise make unavailable or deny . . . a dwelling to any person because of race."\(^\text{91}\)

When governmental entities are accused of this violation, the case law indicates that there can be a constructive denial of housing that would violate 3604(a).\(^\text{92}\) This means that a government entity violates 3604(a) when it denies a housing opportunity rather than an actual dwelling.\(^\text{93}\)

The minority plaintiffs in Wallace were denied the opportunity to live in integrated communities.\(^\text{94}\) Because of their race, some were overtly encouraged to use their vouchers to move into racially segregated areas.\(^\text{95}\) Others were forced to move to such areas because of overly restrictive policies, which denied access to mixed income developments, and poor counseling services that failed to affirmatively promote integration among relocated CHA tenants.\(^\text{96}\)

2. Housing Conditions and Services: Section 3604(b)

Section 3604(b) of the FHA expresses that it is unlawful "[t]o discriminate against any person in the terms, conditions, or privileges of sale or rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection therewith, because of race."\(^\text{97}\)

\(^91\) See Thompson, 348 F. Supp. 2d at 415 (quoting 42 U.S.C. § 3604(a)).
\(^92\) Id.; see also Resident Advisory Bd. v. Rizzo, 564 F.2d 126, 150 (3d Cir. 1977) (holding that an illegal denial of housing resulted when a housing authority denied housing opportunities by failing to complete a housing development).
\(^93\) Thompson, 348 F. Supp. 2d at 415. But see Edwards v. Johnston County Health Dep't, 885 F.2d 1215, 1222-24 (4th Cir. 1989) (holding that plaintiffs could not assert a § 3604 claim based on their allegations that they were afforded substandard housing). However, Edwards is not controlling in this situation because "there is a discernible difference between providing substandard housing and completely denying housing opportunities, which is what is being alleged in the complaints against HUD and the CHA in Wallace." Thompson, 348 F. Supp. 2d at 416.
\(^94\) See supra notes 78-80 and accompanying text (showing how the plaintiffs in Wallace were denied opportunities to live in more integrated communities).
\(^95\) Supra notes 82-90 and accompanying text.
\(^96\) See supra notes 75-90 and accompanying text (emphasizing how CHA counselors were not committed to finding housing for voucher recipients in more integrated neighborhoods).
\(^97\) 42 U.S.C. § 3604(b) (2000).
Courts have interpreted “services in connection with housing” to be within the scope of this subsection of the FHA. As discussed above in Part A.2.b, the CHA’s social services are grossly inadequate as applied to African Americans (and other minorities).

3. Proving Discriminatory Intent Is Not a Prerequisite to Relief Under Sections 3604(a) and (b)

Under some circumstances, a violation of the FHA can be established by showing a discriminatory effect without a showing of discriminatory intent. For example, after showing that HUD’s and CHA’s practices fall within the ambit of sections 3604(a) and (b), a plaintiff can make a prima facie case of liability by establishing that such practices either created a discriminatory impact, or arose from a discriminatory purpose.

However, the courts refuse to hold that every action that produces discriminatory effects is per se illegal. The courts use their discretion and consider the particular circumstances of each case in determining whether relief should be granted under the FHA. When analyzing these circumstances, the courts use a four-part test to determine if there has been a violation. The four elements of this test include:

---

99. Metro. Hous. Dev. Corp. v. Vill. of Arlington Heights, 558 F.2d 1283, 1290 (7th Cir. 1977); see also Hawkins v. Town of Shaw, 461 F.2d 1171, 1172 (5th Cir. 1972) (stating that “intent, motive, and purpose are elusive subjective concepts”); Hart v. Cmt’y Sch. Bd. of Educ., 512 F.2d 37, 50 (2d Cir. 1975) (explaining that attempting to discover the true intent of an entity, such as a municipality or housing agency is problematic); Trafficante, 409 U.S. at 208-11 (reasoning that conduct that has the consequence of perpetuating segregation can be just as harmful as intentional discriminatory conduct); Reading the Mind of the School Board: Segregative Intent and the DeFacto/DeJure Distinction, 86 YALE L.J. 317, 322-26 (1976) (arguing that a strict focus on intent permits racial discrimination to go unpunished in the absence of evidence of overt bigotry). “As overtly bigoted behavior has become more unfashionable, evidence of intent has become harder to find. But this does not mean that racial discrimination has disappeared. We cannot agree that Congress in enacting the Fair Housing Act intended to permit municipalities to systematically deprive minorities of housing opportunities simply because those municipalities act discreetly.” Vill. of Arlington Heights, 558 F.2d at 1290.
100. Thompson, 348 F. Supp. 2d at 417.
101. Vill. of Arlington Heights, 558 F.2d at 1290. Banning every action (under the FHA) that produced discriminatory effects “would go beyond the intent of Congress and would lead courts into untenable results in specific cases.” Id. at 1290.
102. Id.
103. See id. (explaining that there is a four part test that is used in order to discern whether a neutral (where there is no evidence of discriminatory intent) housing plan which produces discriminatory effects will violate section 3604(a) and (b)).
(1) the strength of plaintiffs' showing of discriminatory effects; (2) whether there is any evidence of discriminatory intent, (though not enough to satisfy the constitutional standard of Washington v. Davis); (3) the defendant's interest in taking the action complained of; and (4) the burden that defendants will suffer if the plaintiffs prevail on their claim.  

The four-part test is satisfied here. Although plaintiffs cannot prove discriminatory intent (on the part of HUD or the CHA), there is strong, startling evidence that shows the Plan for Transformation is, in effect, perpetuating racial and economic segregation. The actual effects of the plan cast doubt on the idea that the agencies have a real interest in trying to desegregate in an effort to promote more integrated housing and communities. Finally, if the CHA plaintiffs prevail on their FHA claim, the burden placed upon the CHA and HUD will not be excessive. As the next section addresses, changing the plan will produce more desirable effects without overburdening the housing agencies.

IV. PROPOSALS

A. Limit Caseloads

Part of the reason that CHA relocation services are so poor is because counselors' caseloads are too high. The CHA should consider limiting the number of CHA tenants in its program at any given time. If this proves unfeasible, the CHA should increase the plan's resources to allow the agency to hire more counselors and drive down the excessive number of caseloads.

B. Increase Training and Accountability for CHA Relocation Counselors

The CHA also needs to provide more effective training programs for its relocation counselors. The training programs

104. Id. at 1290.
105. See supra notes 58-61 and accompanying text (explaining the extent of the racial and economic segregation of CHA tenants).
106. See id. (discussing the negative effects of the plan).
107. CHAC MOBILITY PROGRAM ASSESSMENT, INTERIM REPORT, 1, 34 (November 2001), available at http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/410377_CHAC_Reports.pdf (reporting that counselors at times reported caseloads as high as 400 tenants). Counselors also stated that they spent the majority of their time on the phone. Id. Some counselors had as many as sixty messages from CHA tenants in one day. Id.
108. Id. Pushing back demolition deadlines is one way to help reduce the excessive amount of CHA tenants erratically seeking out CHA counselors.
109. Id.
110. See Amended Complaint, supra note 37, at 18, para. 70 (arguing that some inexperienced CHA counselors and officials overtly encourage tenants to relocate into racially and economically segregated areas).
should emphasize effective and innovative ways to help tenants relocate into more integrated communities.\textsuperscript{111}

Further, the CHA should require its counselors to keep much more detailed records of where their clients have relocated, and force the counselors to report this data to higher authorities.\textsuperscript{112} It should provide incentives such as salary increases or promotions to those counselors who have shown that a high percentage of their clients have relocated into more integrated communities. In addition, the CHA should implement serious repercussions (such as pay cuts or demotions) for those counselors whose reports show they have perpetuated segregation.

C. Allow Tenants More Time to Access Social Services Before Forcing Them to Relocate with a Housing Voucher

Providing better trained relocation counselors will not make much of an impact on promoting integration if many of CHA's tenants never get a chance to utilize such services. HUD policies have allowed the CHA to strictly adhere to its demolition deadlines, thus quickly destroying public housing without constructing adequate replacement developments.\textsuperscript{113} This has forced tenants out of their homes before they have had a chance to seek out and adequately utilize social services.\textsuperscript{114}

The CHA needs to ensure Chicago's public housing tenants receive adequate time to utilize social services before being forced out of their homes.\textsuperscript{115} The policy should also give tenants timely notice of when they are expected to leave, and adequate notice of the social services available to them.

\textsuperscript{111} The training programs should be longer in duration and shall provide more hands-on training, such as shadowing opportunities. The CHA could also engage in national studies in order to compare and contrast the best relocation techniques. The findings could be presented in training seminars.

\textsuperscript{112} See SUSAN F. POPKIN, ET AL., CHA RELOCATION COUNSELING ASSESSMENT INTERIM REPORT 1, 1-10 (2001) (providing an in-depth look at where a small sample of CHA tenants have relocated after leaving their homes). The CHA should employ similar tracking devices and force their counselors to keep detailed reports (like the reports conducted by Popkin) to get the counselors more personally involved and connected with the tenants they have assisted in the relocation process.

\textsuperscript{113} Provisions within the QHWRA (most notably 42 USC § 1437) allow the CHA to close a public housing building on short notice if there are threatening health and safety concerns. Given this flexibility, CHA officials can pretty much declare that any of the old public housing high-rises in Chicago have threatening health and safety concerns. 42 U.S.C § 1437 (1988).

\textsuperscript{114} See Cabrini-Green, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 273, at *16 (explaining that the cause of the litigation was that CHA plaintiffs felt that they were being forced to leave their homes too quickly, without a chance to utilize social services for guidance in their move to the private market).

\textsuperscript{115} See id. (portraying how the CHA has abused its discretion by forcing its tenants out very quickly, while avoiding to violate any federal law or HUD provision).
Therefore, CHA policy should state that public housing tenants must be expressly warned, in writing, of the exact date they will be expected to leave their home. This written notice should be sent out to the public housing tenants at least one year prior to the date in which they are expected to leave their dwellings.\textsuperscript{116} The notice given to tenants should also provide residents with adequate and understandable information about their housing choices, and should explain their right to seek social services including relocation counseling, and/or job-training and drug-counseling services. This would give public housing tenants at least one year to utilize social services. Furthermore, the mandate would also ensure that the tenants have notice of when they will be expected to leave and of the services available to them.

\textbf{D. Start Providing Social Service Early, and Maintain Adequate Briefings Throughout the Relocation Process}

Sending out the notice described above will not be enough to help tenants relocate into more integrated communities. Some tenants, who do not trust the CHA, will disregard the letter. Some tenants are illiterate and will not be able to understand the letter. Thus, CHA policy should encourage its counselors and officials to affirmatively contact individual families living in public housing that is destined for demolition.\textsuperscript{117} A personal visit by a counselor or official will show tenants that the CHA is serious about helping its tenants. These visits will allow CHA tenants to begin to trust the CHA, and as a result, the tenants will be more likely to cooperate and utilize social services.

Additionally, the CHA should consistently provide more understandable and innovative mobility briefings to tenants throughout the entire relocation process to provide effective relocation counseling.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{116} See \textit{id.} at 15-16 (holding that 180 day relocation notices do not provide tenants with enough time to access and adequately utilize social services).

\textsuperscript{117} See MARGERY AUSTIN TURNER ET. AL., THE URBAN INSTITUTE, SECTION 8 MOBILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH 49 (1999) (arguing that it is better to affirmatively contact housing project tenants earlier, instead of waiting for tenants to come to the counselors before the tenants will be forced out). Some experts suggest that housing authorities should begin their counseling process as soon as they receive HOPE VI grants. \textit{Id.} at 49.

Beginning the counseling process early allows families to make more informed choices about relocation. \textit{Id.} However, presenting basic information at a group meeting or through a brief flyer is often not sufficient. \textit{Id.} Some residents will be too distressed about having to move to absorb the information, some may not be able to understand the information because of literacy problems, and others may simply disregard the information. \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{118} See CHAC MOBILITY PROGRAM ASSESSMENT, \textit{supra} note 107, at 34 (pointing out that CHAC has "invested considerable time and funds" in revamping mobility briefings in order to ensure that the materials are easier to read and "visually attractive"). However, more than half of the respondents
E. Provide More Sufficient Information to CHA Tenants About the Demographics of Neighborhoods

Assisting CHA tenants will be futile if the neighborhoods that counselors select for their clients are no longer integrated communities. CHAC, like all mobility programs, relies upon census data to guide its participants into opportunity areas. However, in many cases, “census data may be so outdated that households are moving to neighborhoods that have ‘tipped’ and are no longer low-poverty [or are no longer highly ‘integrated’].” The agency should take steps to obtain current data so that relocating tenants have a better chance of moving to a truly integrated neighborhood.

F. Make Efforts to Combat Discrimination in the Private Market

Finding a home for a CHA minority tenant in an integrated community is only half the battle. Often times, landlords refuse to rent or sell dwellings to former CHA tenants solely because of the individual’s race, or because the individual once lived in public housing. The CHA needs to take a stand against landlords who discriminate for improper reasons. During briefings, mobility counselors emphasize that it is illegal for landlords in Chicago to deny an individual an apartment because he or she is using a housing voucher (and also for other reasons such as race). The counselors inform the tenants to contact fair housing agencies and file a complaint if they have been discriminated against.

However, many tenants feel that filing a complaint is an overly burdensome process that is often times unnecessary. And some tenants simply choose not to file a claim because they do not understand whether or not they have a legally cognizable discrimination claim.

The CHA should work to provide tenants with direct and effective legal assistance. With adequate legal counsel, tenants will have a clear understanding of whether or not their rights have been violated. Armed with this knowledge, more tenants will file claims against landlords who discriminate. Successful claims against these landlords should help to deter this type of

in one study reported that they had not been shown the video on making a “mobility move.” Id. And around eighteen percent of CHA tenants did not enroll in the Mobility Program because “they did not understand it.” Id.

119. CUNNINGHAM & POPKIN, supra note 62, at 32.
120. Id.
121. TURNER, supra note 117, at 34.
122. Id.
123. Id.
124. Id. at 34-35. It is extra burdensome for tenants using housing vouchers to file these complaints because many of them are in the process of attempting to relocate to the private market. Id.
discrimination, which is all too prevalent in Chicago's private market today.

G. Place CHA Tenants into Mixed Income Developments by Relaxing Strict Screening and Improving Drug Counseling and Job Training

What about the tenants who have been promised new homes in the mixed income developments? A majority of CHA tenants are not allowed to return to mixed income developments because they are not passing the strict screening requirements.

Strict screening must be relaxed so that low income tenants can move into the mixed income developments. It should be a federal offense to deny lease applications in federally funded housing developments on the basis of employment status or past convictions where those individuals obtain job training or drug-related counseling. Failure to complete job training or drug counseling would result in immediate eviction.

For this policy to work, the CHA must provide effective job training and drug counseling services. Furthermore, the CHA

125. See Thigpen, supra note 1, at 3 (explaining that many of Chicago's landlords illegally refuse to rent apartments to families attempting to use housing vouchers).

126. See Diana K. Levy & Deborah R. Kaye, How are HOPE VI Families Faring?: Income and Employment, METRO. HOUS. & CMTYS. CTR., URBAN INST. (Series Policy Brief No. 4, 2004) (explaining that the new mixed income developments often require the tenant to be employed).

127. See id. at 4 (stressing that strict employment requirements bar former CHA residents with health or other barriers who would otherwise be ideal tenants for the mixed income developments). The strict employment requirements also bar former residents who have "cyclical employment history(s)," and who might not be employed at the precise time they are seeking access to the mixed income development, but who will seek employment "once poor health, child care responsibilities or transportation difficulties ease." Id.

128. If these new screening requirements are not adopted, HUD and the CHA should at the very least hold seminars with officials in charge of screening in the mixed income developments and stress screening criteria that takes "employment history, health status, and family-care-related employment barriers into consideration." Id.

129. See Nandita Verma et. al., Raising Hope with Jobs-Plus, Promoting Work in Seattle Public Housing During a Hope VI Redevelopment, Oct. 2005 MDRC i, iii (stressing that "a program like Jobs-Plus can be effective in a very diverse public housing community"). The Jobs-Plus Model (which could be implemented in Chicago) is based upon three principles. Id. First, the "employment-related services and activities" are set up to help residents secure and retain employment by providing "job search instruction, education programs, vocational training, and support services, such as child care and transportation assistance." Id. at 3. Second, "financial incentives to work" consists of significant "changes in public housing rent rules." Id. The program helps "to 'make work pay' by reducing the extent to which higher earnings from work result in increases in rent, which may discourage work." Id. And
must make sure that tenants have access to these job training and drug counseling services as early as possible.

H. Increase Funding for HOPE VI

HUD announced that there was a two hundred and eighty-three million dollar public housing operating subsidy "shortfall" for 2006. Congress did not pass the Fiscal Year 2007 (FY07) HUD Appropriations Bill in 2006. Thus, Congress should enact legislation to provide two hundred and eighty-three million dollars in "supplemental funds" necessary to make up for an "unexpected" and "devastating" shortfall in operating funds.

Congress should also adjust the President's request for FY07 operating funds to four and a half billion dollars, which would "ensure that public housing authorities are able to maintain housing units." With increased funding for HUD, the federal agency could award more HOPE VI grants to local housing agencies like the CHA. The CHA could use a substantial amount of the money obtained from these grants to improve its social services.

V. CONCLUSION

In terms of federally financed public housing, how far have we come? HUD has a longstanding history of housing programs promoting segregation rather than integration. Thousands have

...
suffered through decades of inadequate housing because public housing tenants have been forced to live in impoverished, crime-ridden, racially segregated neighborhoods. Court opinions such as Young forced HUD and local housing agencies to implement new policies to promote integration. But, is HOPE VI the program that has ended what many considered to be a national housing disaster?

It is difficult to answer such a perplexing question. Scholars, philosophers, and lawyers all feel differently about the issue. But when we ask the actual tenants themselves, the unequivocal answer is the “Plan for Transformation” is failing in Chicago. The stories of the plaintiffs in Wallace reveal tenants being relocated into apartments filled with rats and roaches, and into racially segregated neighborhoods dominated by violent gangs. These stories hauntingly highlight the fallacies of the relocation efforts in Chicago. For many of these relocated tenants, life is even worse than it was before they were forced to leave the concrete towers. Further, statistical evidence supports the tenants’ notion that the program is desperately failing to promote integration.

There have been a few success stories, and the CHA has recently made some significant changes, but due to strict screening requirements and a limited amount of mixed income units, the amount of tenants who are allowed into the new

136. Id.
137. See Young, 628 F. Supp. 1037 (pointing out that HUD and a local housing agency failed to desegregate public housing and mandating that HUD make more efforts to integrate public housing).
138. See Amended Complaint, at 26-38, Wallace, 298 F. Supp. 2d 710 (discussing the personal experiences of several CHA tenants that were relocated into racially segregated neighborhoods). Many of the individuals were actively encouraged by CHA agents to relocate into racially segregated neighborhoods, and denied access into the newly built mixed income developments. Id.
139. See Amended Complaint, at 39, Wallace, 298 F. Supp. 2d 710 (describing the many negative aspects of public housing tenants who have been relocated into private housing markets in Chicago).
140. See id. (reiterating the hardships that relocated tenants are forced to endure in their new neighborhoods).
141. See Fischer, supra note 60 (noting that nearly eighty percent of relocated families are living in census tracts which are over ninety percent African American).
142. See Thigpen, supra note 1, at 3 (describing a successful relocation).
143. See CHAC MOBILITY PROGRAM ASSESSMENT, supra note 107, at 33-34 (finding “several key reforms” including: substantial efforts to improve monitoring and tracking, improved housing inspections, an innovative security deposit loan program (which offers zero-interest loans on security deposits to participants who move to opportunity areas), and more adequate follow-up services).
developments is small when compared to the vast number of tenants forced to relocate into racially segregated neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{144} 

If the HUD and the CHA fail to make the necessary changes discussed above, people must continue to keep fighting the housing crisis through litigation. As seen in the past, successful litigation (where the courts have found a violation of a federal law such as the FHA)\textsuperscript{145} forces housing agencies to make major changes in order to attempt to desegregate housing.\textsuperscript{146} Perhaps a ruling in favor of the CHA plaintiffs could lead to the development of new policies that could turn the Plan for Transformation into a success story. While these issues remain unresolved, the lives of thousands of tenants hang in the balance.

\textsuperscript{144} See Venkatesh, \textit{supra} note 36 (reporting that less than twenty percent of the tenants will be able to return to the newly constructed mixed income developments).

\textsuperscript{145} See Young, 628 F. Supp. at 1052 (pointing out that HUD and a local housing agency failed to desegregate public housing).

\textsuperscript{146} See Roisman, \textit{supra} note 9, at 918 (emphasizing that what little HUD did to desegregate was largely in response to litigation that ruled against the agency).
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