

were able to present evidence of their prior tenancy were denied first right of refusal because the Agency had no record of them.

Another recommendation called for a staging plan. A staging plan providing a construction timetable was prepared and presented for community consideration in September 1966. One purpose of the plan was to provide tangible evidence to residents that they did not have to move out of the area in advance of construction timetables. In May 1967, the Agency's policy on demolitions was sharply challenged by the community, resulting in a new agreement, with steps outlined to guard against panic moves by residents and to maintain and improve the quality of the life of the community during redevelopment. A second purpose of the staging plan was to help residents identify with and participate in planning for new low- and moderate-income housing to which they would hold first priority to return.

The staging plan was not adopted as binding but as a plan subject to revisions which would better serve needs of residents. The following modifications in the staging plan have been supported, but not yet achieved, by the community:

(a) A new elementary school building (estimates of classroom shortages run to 1,000 seats).

(b) One of the housing complexes to include an early childhood center (preschool through first or second grades).

(c) The shopping center to include at least one community-owned business.

(d) Switch a public housing and moderate-income housing site to allow a construction speed-up.

(e) Provision of some new and rehabilitated units as sales housing (13 units scheduled to be ready July 1968).

(f) Extension of boundaries of the renewal project to include the approved section of the center leg freeway so as to provide air rights housing over the freeway and additional housing beside the right of way.

(g) Speed-up the beginning date of a community facilities building.

(h) Creative development of open spaces for recreation use.

(i) A public swimming pool.

Another recommendation included in the Pierce Street report was to reserve a pool of standard rehabilitated housing to be demolished in the final stage.

A pool of standard rehabilitated housing was not provided. Present legislation tends to bar urban renewal agencies from improving housing designated for demolition.

The community was successful, however, in getting the Department of Highways and Traffic to invest in the 1967 rehabilitation of a 34-unit building which was scheduled to be demolished in 1970 to accommodate the center leg freeway. (This area is scheduled to become a part of Northwest One.)

I would like to add, sir, that I think it is very important for citizens to be allowed to live near or in the project site in onsite housing. We have had a chance to help with the planning in our community. I served on the board of directors of Sursum Corda, the first nonprofit housing organization to build here; and assisting