

Site improvements included in project expenditures budget include streets, sewers, water mains, street lighting, parks, play areas, etc. Cost: \$2,238,740.

Noncash local grants-in-aid improvements include street, fire house, addition to school, offstreet parking, recreation deck, water main, street lights, and others. Cost: \$6,223,930.

Revised budget.—Submitted to regional office and pending approval.

Project expenditures	\$21,013,960
Noncash local grants-in-aid	16,278,583

Mr. WIDNALL. I notice that 832 structures have been rehabilitated in one of the largest rehabilitation projects in the country, involving 2,698 structures.

Do you believe that this is a more sound approach than the bulldozer method that has been used in many cities?

Mr. GRADISON. We firmly believe that the rehabilitation approach is far preferable to the clearance approach if it will work. In our view, this project, and many others like it around the country, have to be viewed as experimental in the sense that we do not have as much experience with the real results that might come about from them, and, furthermore, it has only been in the last year or two that we have had additional tools in the way of direct grants to low-income families in such areas which may provide the financial wherewithal for complying with the provisions of our code and our higher rehabilitation standards which we have set up in this area.

This particular area has about 600 acres, and it is a very important one to us, since it directly adjoins our great University of Cincinnati, and is similar in some respects to projects such as the very important Temple project in Philadelphia, which is somewhat similar in its intent.

Mr. WIDNALL. Within those areas, what do you find the reaction of the people who have been living there to be? Are they for rehabilitation, modernization, or would they prefer mass relocation?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman—it is a mixed reaction you get from the residents of the area. Many of the buildings, of course, in a rehabilitation area are not usable for rehabilitation, and must be cleared in order to remove these blighted ones which are beyond the possibility of rehabilitation.

It was very slow catching on, the rehabilitation idea. But with the added city improvements, the road and street improvements, the curbs and gutters, shopping centers which are being built on urban development land, it is sort of serving as a catalyst for those who were slow in getting the message. The tools in the 1965 Housing Act were in those under the \$3,000 income category, were provided a straight \$1,500 grant for the rehabilitation—also improved this thing. And I think over the years as we experiment with this, we are not only experimenting with legislative tools, but we are experimenting with methods in how to reach the people, and convince them this is a proper thing, a proper attitude for a neighborhood to try to settle their people on.

Adjacent to this area is the university. So the people are beginning to develop an identification with an institution. By the same token, or at the same time the institution is developing a relationship or a feeling for the area that is right next to them.

So to answer your question, again, it is a mixed emotion on the part of the people as to whether they prefer rehabilitation or clearance.