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INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

This report presents an evaluation of the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program. The report was conducted at the request of the Village Board of Trustees to aid them in evaluating and directing future policy regarding the Program. This report is not seen as a public relations document but as a working document for the Board and Village staff. As such it assumes a working knowledge of terms such as integration maintenance and affirmative marketing as well as knowledge of the basic history of the Program. This is not to say that there is no statement by the researchers of what they understand to be the history of the Program -- such a statement is an essential part of our evaluation. But there is no perfunctory historic overview of the Program such as is usually found at the outset of a public document. Our history is presented as part of the legal evaluation of the Program in Chapter II and is given as a "statement of known facts" upon which the legal evaluation of the Program will be based.

Chapter I presents a comparative analysis of the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program with similar programs from around the country. This chapter places the Park Forest Program in perspective by comparing both municipal and program characteristics. The chapter reveals that municipal integration maintenance programs are very new and still very rare and very individualistic, yet the Park Forest Program stands out as unique in size, number of activities and implementation strategy.

Chapter II, as indicated above, presents a legal evaluation of the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program. Along with "the statement of relevant facts" about the Program, this chapter presents a history of the ways integration maintenance programs and activities can be, and
have been challenged in courts of law. The chapter then evaluates how the relevant facts regarding the Park Forest Program stand up to the various legal challenges, as well as the implications of recent court decisions on affirmative marketing and quotas for future actions that the Village might consider as part of its Integration Maintenance Program.

Chapter III evaluates the comments of 23 key informants. These key informants represent various interests and views in the community regarding integration maintenance--some supportive, some neutral, some antagonistic. All the key informants are considered representative of some constituency or institution in the community so that their combined opinion is important to assess the success and failure, visibility and acceptability of the Integration Maintenance Program.

Chapter IV presents the results of two primary surveys of Village residents conducted over the telephone as part of this evaluation. One survey interviewed new residents in the community, the other long-term residents. The goals of the New Resident Survey was intended to profile the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of recent buyers and renters, the location and size of the housing market that new residents considered when choosing Park Forest, and the role integration maintenance activities had on their choice of Park Forest. The long-term Resident Survey also describes the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of respondents, as well as their attitudes and perceptions of the community, interracial trends, and Integration Maintenance Program goals and activities.

Other secondary data on the functioning of the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program, racial breakdowns for school districts in the Chicago metropolitan area and 1980 census figures were assembled and used to complete the various evaluations found throughout the four chapters of this report. There is also a second volume to this report entitled Integration
Maintenance Program Evaluation: Survey Responses, which presents frequency counts of respondent answers to the two primary surveys of Park Forest residents.

In order to summarize what has become a lengthy report, key findings are presented in the following section along with notes on where the detailed evaluations can be found. The summary section is followed by a list of major recommendations resulting from the evaluation. Finally, in order to further shorten the report, key phrases such as the Integration Maintenance Program and South Suburban Housing Center will be shortened to the IM Program and SSHC.

Summary

This summary is a composite of the most important findings found throughout the report. Some of these summary findings just highlight what was found in the chapters; others answer questions posed by the Board at the outset of our investigation; and still others address common beliefs about the Village and the IM Program as related by key informants or respondents to the resident surveys.

1. Would Park Forest Have the Racial Mix It Has Today if There Had Been No IM Program?

Compared to other IM programs nationwide, Park Forest had a moderate but significant increase in minorities from 1970 to 1980 (Chapter I, Table 1). Compared to racial change in other South Suburban communities over the decade, Park Forest was average. Some communities experienced almost total racial transitions, others only experienced their first in-migration of minority households over the decade. We found it was impossible to determine what effect the Park Forest IM Program had on racial change for two reasons. First, there are too many variables beyond the control of any village that
can affect racial change, e.g., how national and regional economic trends affect minority and white buyer demand in the local subregion. Second, and more important, the question is not applicable. There is nothing in the IM Program as defined and administered by Park Forest or the SSHC that proports to control rates of racial change. The Program only proports to keep housing markets open to all seekers, to stop panics, and to encourage, through voluntary affirmative marketing, purchase or rental by persons of a race that is under-represented in a sub-area. Since there are no goals or quotas it is impossible to say whether the rate of change that did occur should be considered good or bad, fast or slow. What we did find, however, is that the change that has occurred happened smoothly, without panic and without clustering of races (with a minor exception to be discussed below). Those residents interviewed are, for the most part, very tolerant and somewhat blasé about racial integration. We feel the IM Program can be credited at least in part for this. Park Forest has the reputation of being an open and friendly community and this is attracting white and minority families who want to live in a stable integrated setting.

2. Would Park Forest Have More Racial Clustering Without the IM Program?

Based on our observation of other interracial communities in the south suburbs, in Metropolitan Chicago and municipalities with IM programs nationally (Chapter 1), Park Forest is one of the most physically integrated municipalities in the country. Many interracial communities, if not the typical interracial community, appears to be integrated based on overall racial proportion, but is, in fact, composed of several subareas predominated by one race. Based on 1980 census figures just released, there
is only one small subarea of Park Forest that is approaching the dimensions of a minority enclave, otherwise all subareas and housing types bare a racial mix similar to the overall racial mix of the Village. The one area is the Arbor Trail: rental complex. This area represents only 3.6 percent of the total Village population, but 52.7 percent of this subarea population is minority. This small area does warrant additional attention by the Village Board and IM staff. Because these are rental units, and often federally subsidized rental units, it will mean coordinating affirmative marketing activities with the manager and federal sponsors.

Our experience with residential racial change patterns tells us that far more racial clustering would have occurred in Park Forest without the IM Program. Institutional and self steering have been too pervasive over the past decade for the distribution of races that exist today to have occurred randomly (see statement of facts, Chapter II). For this reason alone, we feel the Park Forest IM Program warrants praise and retention.

3. How Socially Integrated is Park Forest?

Several key informants criticized the IM Program for failing to produce significant amounts of social integration among residents of Park Forest to date (see Chapter III). These criticisms are not based on resident surveys or comparative analyses with other communities but upon empirical observations by the informants. In commenting on this, we too must rely on empirical observation, but perhaps with some perspective, having studied interracial social patterns in other municipalities and center city neighborhoods. Stable social integration, especially when it involves breaking down both racial and socioeconomic barriers, is far more difficult, and takes much more time to achieve than integration defined by the stable physical proximity of diverse racial groups. It may
well be that interracial friendship patterns are slow in forming in Park Forest, but there is no evidence that this is more or less of a problem than found in other interracial communities. There are also several factors which make interracial friendship patterns more difficult at this stage in the Village's interracial evolution. In interracial communities where we found a sizable proportion of the residents (20-30 percent) claiming close interracial friendships, there had been a sizable minority population (3-5 percent) for 15 to 20 years. Park Forest has only had a minority population of 3-5 percent for eight to ten years. At best, 40 percent of Park Forest's current minority residents have lived in the community for less than four years. Second, Park Forest residents will probably have a more difficult time forming interracial friendships because they often have to overcome socioeconomic "class" differences as well. Stable socioeconomic integration has traditionally been more difficult to achieve within a racial group than racial integration within a socioeconomic group. Most suburbs have socioeconomic homogeneity. That is, they provide one housing type and one life style model for one income group. We expect Park Forest, with its mix of single family owner occupancy, cooperative ownership and rental housing types, and fairly wide income range for a suburb, to experience more difficulty achieving a high percentage of interracial/inter-economic group/inter-age group friendships. We feel the Village is now entering the stage in its evolution where the IM Program activities might turn inward and address the community social integration needs. The more regional IM Program activities can be left to the SSHC.
4. Are Recent Movers to Park Forest Older and More Likely to Possess Working Class Characteristics?

This is another fairly widespread belief among key informants and longer-term residents (see Chapter III and IV). Our New Resident Survey of Park Forest contained a far smaller sample than we would like (Chapter IV). Nevertheless, we are confident it is a random sample and therefore should be representative of recent entrants. We found the new residents have a higher socioeconomic status on average than the longer-term residents. They are also younger and therefore have a slightly lower income than the long-term residents on average. Nevertheless, their level of educational attainment and occupational status are slightly higher than the long-term residents suggesting upward mobility as the new residents age.

5. Should the IM Program be Active Outside the Political Boundaries of Park Forest?

Our response to this question is an emphatic "yes". There are five reasons for our response. a) Several relevant institutions (in particular, schools) that help define the Park Forest housing market, overlap surrounding political boundaries. Our research shows that school district boundaries are often more important than political boundaries in defining housing markets. This appears to be true for Park Forest (Chapters III and IV). Park Forest has more school districts overlapping other municipal boundaries than any other IM Program in our national sample (Chapter 1). b) Most of the housing service industry (banks, savings and loans, and real estate brokers) active in Park Forest does not limit its activities to Park Forest; in fact, most of it is not even located in Park Forest. The Village cannot hope to influence integration patterns without cooperation from, and auditing of, this industry. c) The majority of recent movers to Park Forest considered and looked at housing throughout surrounding south suburban...
villages (Chapter IV). Park Forest cannot expect to satisfy all the demand for open housing in the south suburbs. It can only survive as an inter-racial community if the entire market area is opened up to all races. d) Court decisions provide solid support for extraterritorial actions on the part of municipal IM Programs (Chapter II). The courts recognize that housing markets transcend political boundaries. Action by a village to combat unlawful steering can be legally conducted anywhere in the housing market. e) Extraterritorial actions are not only consistent with, and protected by the Fair Housing Act, they may be mandated by the Act. If a municipality is going to have an affirmative action program that discourages households from moving into an area of the municipality where they are overrepresented, the municipality may be required to do everything it can to assure other interracial housing opportunities are available in neighborhoods of surrounding municipalities (Chapter II).

6. National Comparison of IM Programs (Chapter I)

a. There are very few municipal IM Programs nationally. Between 20 and 25 are currently active. There are only two or three programs older than Park Forest's.

b. Park Forest's IM Program is among the two or three largest programs in budget size and number of activities.

c. Park Forest is unique in how it implements and funds its IM activities. Most programs use their own municipal staff to complete their activities and rely exclusively on municipal and/or CDBG funds to finance the activities. Park Forest contracts out six times as many activities as other IM Programs (mostly to the SSHC) and claims the highest leveraging of grants and donations from other local political and service districts.
This uniqueness in the Park Forest Program is, we feel, warranted. The long range success of Park Forest's IM Program is highly dependent on the success of stable racial integration throughout the south suburbs. Increasingly, the regional image of the south suburbs is becoming more important to long-term stable racial integration than the image of any one of the 36 villages. The importance of the regional market image may be more relevant in Park Forest's case than almost any other IM program in our national sample. Therefore, it is in the Village's interest to divest itself of its own very visible IM activities and invest in a strong and very visible South Suburban Housing Center.

7. Is Confidence in Park Forest Eroding?

This study did not allow time or money for a sophisticated analysis of the Park Forest economy. However, the key informant (Chapter III) and resident interviews (Chapter IV) did uncover a strong belief on the part of residents that the economy is faltering. Whether it is true or not it is believed and can, therefore, become a self fulfilling prophecy. The single most important attraction of home buyers to Park Forest has been, and continues to be, that the housing is affordable. Among all the affordable housing available, the housing in Park Forest is considered to be of better quality by buyers (Chapter IV). This, accompanied by high quality community services has kept demand high for Park Forest homes. Now there is concern that real estate values in the Village are not keeping up with surrounding villages, that school quality is declining, that new residents do not meet the high socioeconomic status of long-term residents, and, most of all, that the viability of the shopping plaza is declining. These concerns are greater among an element of the long-term residents than among very many new residents (Chapter IV, Table 12).
The decline of the Plaza is of the greatest concern to residents, and seems to some to be the most dire indicator of general economic decline (Chapter III and Chapter IV, Table 9). While these economic problems indicate a clear shift from the most important problems indicated by residents in the 1974 Jaffe study, we must emphasize that most residents, and particularly most of the newest residents, are quite happy with, and confident in, Park Forest. As we indicated above, the Village appears to be attracting new residents who retain the high socioeconomic status the Village has known in the past, despite what some residents believe. We only wish the resident samples had been larger.

8. Overall Legality of Park Forest's IM Activities

It is our evaluation that the Park Forest IM Program was enacted to serve the national goal of open housing. IM related actions taken since then demonstrate beyond all doubt that the Village's support of stable integrated living is genuine. Furthermore, Park Forest's IM activities have not resulted in racial steering within the meaning of the Fair Housing Act (Chapter II).

9. A Lack of Knowledge About the Program and Confusion and Bitterness Surrounding the Program Title.

One of the most important findings of this study is that only about half of the Park Forest residents know an IM Program even exists. Far fewer understand what integration maintenance means or how the Program operates (Chapters III and IV, Table 11). This also seems to be true of many members of the housing service industry. Central to everyone's confusion may be the title "integration maintenance". There are those who argue that stable racial integration has not yet been achieved in the Village.
The Village may not yet have its fair share of minorities, and social integration of minority and white residents is not yet widespread. So they may feel they have a right to wonder what is meant by integration maintenance—the title seems at best somewhat premature.

There are others, admittedly strong antagonists of the Program, who feel the word "maintenance" was very carefully and deliberately chosen; that it represents a "flag" to signal the white community that a program exists which is designed to deter further black entry into the community while attracting new white buyers. Thus, they feel the term integration maintenance is an affront to minority communities. They see the IM Program as a sham and a thin facade for a new and more subtle form of racial segregation that allows only limited minority access to an otherwise white community. On its face, they feel the Program espouses liberal rhetoric about "making integration work", while in fact it is saying we can and will tolerate only so many minority residents.

There is no doubt that an IM program could be used to keep minorities out. There may well be those in Park Forest who see the IM Program as a means of achieving just that end. However, our evaluation does not find this to be true of those in charge of directing and staffing the Program, or the vast majority of residents who know of and understand the Program. Nor do we feel the courts would ever feel this way. As practiced in Park Forest, integration maintenance seeks to achieve what the courts have come to define as an important goal of American society, stable integrated communities and a unitary and open housing market. Nevertheless, many Park Forest residents do not understand this to be the goal. We feel the Program's antagonists are at least right in that the term can be misinterpreted in a community still struggling to define and achieve stable racial integration.
Recommendations

The following are the recommendations from our evaluation of the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program.

- The Program serves a worthwhile purpose and should be retained.

- Continue to shift the regional IM activities to the SSHC. Work to get more involvement and financial support of regional activities from other South Suburban villages.

- In our opinion Park Forest has not used IM Program activities for the purpose of exclusion, but for the purpose of long range stable integration. Nevertheless, a program such as this will always be open to the accusation of serving exclusionary ends. The best way to minimize this accusation is to stress regional open marketing activities, eliminate racial steering by brokers, and stress, as well as achieve, social integration within the community. It also means minimizing all forms of counter-steering or the use of quotas and tipping point standards. Benign steering techniques will always be subject to different interpretation and just add another among many constraints already placed upon minority households in search for better housing.

- Inform Park Forest residents about the Program. Get more resident input on Program priorities. A public relations effort to build confidence in Park Forest among local residents may be warranted.

- Park Forest is entering a new stage of integrated living. When minority residents make up more than a token number, stable co-habitation in the community is no longer enough. This is now happening in Park Forest. Some white dominated institutions that have been silent or even accepting of minority integration so long as it was token may now see minorities as a challenge to their dominance. How they react is critical. One result may be a duplication of institutions; separate, and we hope, equal. However, if this is the solution we do not feel Park Forest will be able to lay claim to being a truly integrated community, and such a solution ultimately may result in a new round of white out-migration. The Village IM Program now needs to work on internal social integration of its many institutions from churches to clubs, from elected boards to voluntary civic organizations. True stable integration means minority and white accommodation at all levels of community life.

- Other IM programs have far more informal social contacts with the real estate industry on a daily basis. Regular informal relations by both the Board members and staff are needed. An ultimate goal of the Program is for the real estate industry to become a full supportive partner in IM. Even if brokers will not become proponents of the Program over the short run this effort must be initiated. A short range benefit is that some misconceptions, ill-will, and suspicion between the industry and the Village can be eliminated.
Eliminating racial steering by real estate agents is one of the most effective ways to achieve permanent stable racial integration. Efforts to win over some real estate brokers to the goals of a unitary housing market using the means suggested above will not work. These brokers must be audited and prosecuted to the letter of the law. Toward that end, the Village and the SSHC must develop a pervasive institutional commitment to fight their actions. Token law suits using someone else's lawyer will not suffice. These brokers must know they will be held accountable. The body of law in this area is complex and growing. It requires a full-time legal specialist. The Village and SSHC need to develop a fund and find a lawyer knowledgeable in, or willing to commit him/herself to this area.

To protect your own actions from counter-suits, the Village and the SSHC need to develop a clear, precise and common standard for determining when an area is overrepresented in persons of a specific race and affirmative marketing activities are required.

A commitment in resources is also needed to collect current and accurate data on racial composition of areas to be used to determine under- or overrepresentation of one race.

Change the title of the Program.

If funds are scarce and priorities need to be made, continue to support regional aspects of the Program. If only one new project can be funded internally it probably should involve the Plaza. It seems to be an important symbol. A strong and successful Plaza, whether for commercial or some other use would also benefit long range stable integration.

In the long run small and fragmented municipal efforts at IM activities as well as other government decisions that spill over political boundaries are futile. Park Forest must not only work for regional open housing but appropriate regional or metropolitan-wide government as well. Integrated suburbs and central cities may have to ultimately join in a coalition to achieve a true unitary housing market on a metropolitan-wide basis.
I. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTEGRATION MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS

A comparative analysis of similar suburban municipalities with integration maintenance programs from across the country was designed in order to gain perspective on Park Forest's IM Program activities. In order to assure that this comparative analysis was between Park Forest and similar municipalities, we limited our search to existing IM programs in suburban locations of larger metropolitan areas. From this group we selected municipalities with population size, housing value, housing type, housing tenure and current racial composition that was as similar to Park Forest as possible. We immediately found that there are less than 25 suburban municipalities with IM programs. From this universe we identified 16 programs in communities that were "reasonably" comparable to Park Forest in population and housing characteristics. All 16 programs are located in midwestern or north eastern states. No comparable program was found in the South or west of Missouri. Suburban IM programs are clearly unique and very recent. There are only three suburban municipal IM programs that are as old or older than the Park Forest program.

A survey instrument was designed (see Appendix) in September of 1980. Twelve of the 16 IM program directors chosen for the study were given the questionnaire at the annual Exchange Congress of IM programs held in Oak Park, Illinois, in October of 1980. The remaining four were mailed the questionnaire with an explanatory cover letter (see Appendix). Ten questionnaires were returned after numerous follow-up phone calls and a follow-up mailing of the questionnaire. There were three types of nonrespondents. One director felt his program was too new and thus most of our questions did not apply -- this also turned out to be true for
one of the ten respondents. Three program directors refused to respond claiming they were too busy. One of these programs is among the oldest and most active programs and is currently involved in a major IM law suit. Its absence from the study is unfortunate but understandable. The final two nonrespondents were from older but apparently inactive programs. No contact was made with these program directors despite numerous phone calls and two mailings of the questionnaire.

Before beginning the analysis, two points are warranted which are pertinent to the conclusions we have drawn and any separate conclusions the reader might draw. First, no statistical significance can be assigned to the differences found between these IM programs. They are just too few in number and, despite all our efforts to compare similar programs, integration maintenance is too new and unique a concept, with no standardized activities, implementing and funding procedures. Second, even though many of the questions deal with objective facts, the respondents did not possess equally reliable data. Some statistics are the "best guess" on the part of a program director. Good examples of this are the estimates on current racial distributions within the municipalities or school districts. At times these "guesses" may reflect what the director "hopes" exists or what is publicly expedient, rather than objective empirical observation.

Table I-1 presents some basic population and housing demographics for the ten respondents. All of the tables in this chapter will employ this format, listing the nine respondent municipalities from around the country first, then Park Forest, followed by the average for all ten respondents. Park Forest is very near the average in population and medium income of responding IM municipalities. As we had expected, Park
Forest is more of a "bedroom" suburb than most IM municipalities with only 10 percent of the population locally employed. One issue of interest to the trustees was how other IM program directors perceived their housing market areas. Column 3 of Table I-1 shows that the average IM director sees his local municipality as only 13.4 percent of the total market area population within which buyers seek comparable housing. However, this average hides a wide range of answers; staff from two municipalities did not answer, and presumably did not know their housing market area, and two felt their municipality constituted the majority of their market area (i.e. there was no comparable housing markets in their subregion). The Park Forest respondent was Mr. DeMarco; his market area estimate places Park Forest among those IM municipalities with the largest market areas. The two directors who estimated that their municipality constituted a majority of the total area may be legitimate exceptions. In the one case we know well, the municipality contains many high priced historic homes and is an old "inner city" suburb. Its neighbors for several miles on one side are far lower priced and all black center city neighborhoods. With only one exception, all the surrounding suburban municipalities contain modes priced homes and/or are openly and actively committed to remaining all white.

The last three columns of Table I-1 show that Park Forest has among the highest percentage white population and has experienced one of the lowest rates of racial change over the last ten years. Of course a great deal depends on the accuracy of estimates reported. Park Forest's figures include estimates from the 1980 Census, data not available for other municipalities. Figures for all other programs are the respective IM director's best estimate.

Table I-2 presents housing stock characteristics. Park Forest is near the average in total housing units, average number of persons per unit,
### TABLE I-1: Population and Housing Market Characteristics of Integration Maintenance Program Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Municipal Population (in 000's)</th>
<th>Housing Market Population (in 000's)</th>
<th>Municipality as % of Housing Market</th>
<th>Median Income (in 000's)</th>
<th>% Locally Employed</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>Rate of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>64.0 -34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>D.K.</td>
<td>D.K.</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>77.5 -10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>24.8$^1$</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>93.7 -3.8$^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>75.0 -14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>D.K.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>63.0 -25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>13.6$^2$</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>85.0 -14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>63.0 -29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>13.9$^3$</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>85.0 -14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>85.0 -10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Forest</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>84.7 -12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>13.4$^5$</td>
<td>$25.3$^3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>93.1$^5$</td>
<td>77.7$^5$ -16.9$^5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1As of 1977.
2As of 1970.
3This average assumes an increase in median income similar to that of Park Forest between 1970 and 1980 for municipalities 6 and 8.
4Percent white as of 1978; change in percent white 1970-1978.
5Wherever a column is made up of raw figures the Average is derived by dividing the raw total by the total number of municipalities.
Wherever the column is a ratio or percentage the Average is derived by dividing the Average for the raw figures that make up the ratio or percentage.

N.A. = Not Answered
-- = Not Applicable
### TABLE 1-2: Housing Stock Characteristics of Integration

Maintenance Program Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Persons/Unit</th>
<th>Single Family Housing Price Range (in 000's)</th>
<th>% Single Family of Total Owner Occupied</th>
<th>% Renter Occupied</th>
<th>% Rental Subsidized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,603</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>45 - 80</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>40 - 200</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>40 - 90</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>50 - 750</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>60 - 250</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>35 - 80</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,090</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>35 - 90</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>40 - 125</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29,527</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>27 - 250</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Forest</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>38 - 120</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11,639</td>
<td>2.79&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>41 - 204</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Wherever a column is made up of raw figures the Average is derived by dividing the raw total by the total number of municipalities. Wherever the column is a ratio or percentage the Average is derived by dividing the Average for the raw figures that make up that ratio or percentage.
percent rental subsidies and housing price range. The low percent in single family units among total owner occupied units, and the high percentage of rental units reflect Park Forest's origins as a planned community that provides rental and cooperative ownership alternatives in a suburban setting. Stated another way, Park Forest has of all IM program communities the smallest percentage of single family owner occupied housing stock percent. Park Forest has only 38 percent such units while the average IM municipality has 64 percent such units. This can have varied effects on the long range potential for Park Forest remaining a stable racially integrated community. On one hand, the great variety of housing in Park Forest may attract a wider variety of residents. Rentals and cooperative purchases require less of an initial financial commitment on the part of new households and could allow white and minority households the opportunity to experience life in the community before making a more substantial financial commitment. On the other hand, the cooperative and rental housing could become disproportionately attractive to one racial group and a higher proportion of low income households. Higher turnover in this housing could also accelerate deterioration of the housing stock and decrease the number of residents with a strong commitment to interracial living or the IM program. It is clear that Park Forest has a more complex housing market to monitor than most communities, and probably does compete for a broader spectrum of new residents than most suburban municipalities, whether they have an IM program or not.

Table I-3 presents school district characteristics. School districts are often selling points for new housing buyers and are used as "barometers" of racial change by real estate investors. The school district picture in Park Forest compounds the planning problems associated with its IM program. Most IM municipalities share their boundaries with a single elementary and single high school district. Park Forest shares four elementary and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Number of Public School Districts</th>
<th>% Minority Children in School District(s) Elementary High School</th>
<th>Ratio: % School District(s) Minority Children To Municipality's Minority Population Elementary High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75.0 25.0</td>
<td>2.08 0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.3 49.9</td>
<td>2.22 2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D.K. D.K.</td>
<td>D.K. D.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.0 40.0</td>
<td>1.60 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.0 45.0</td>
<td>0.84 1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.0 35.0</td>
<td>2.33 2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.0 49.0</td>
<td>1.32 1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.0 14.9</td>
<td>2.00 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.5 26.0</td>
<td>1.07 1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Forest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.0 20.0</td>
<td>2.46 1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>40.0 35.0</td>
<td>1.60 1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Wherever a column is made up of raw figures the Average is derived by dividing the raw total by the total number of municipalities. Wherever the column is a ratio or percentage the Average is derived by dividing the Average for the raw figures that make up that ratio or percentage.
two high school districts with other municipalities which have different racial make-ups and different commitments to interracial living. The total sample averages for Columns 5 and 6 of Table I-3 show that the percent minority children in the schools is greater than the percent minority in the municipality. This phenomena is common to all the IM municipalities. The actual percent minority in Park Forest's school districts is still below the average for all the IM programs studies (Columns 3 and 4 Table I-3). However, Park Forest has clearly the greatest disparity between the percentage of minority elementary school children and minority in the municipal population. The great disparity between municipal percent minority and school district percent minority could become a factor in the stable integration of the municipality in the near future, if it has not already. Regional real estate, banking and other private market institutions which are highly influential in "selling" Park Forest to potential buyers may choose to use school district statistics to depict the entire area and the disparity in municipal and school district minority percentages to depict rate of change in percent minority in the subregion. We could not get a clear picture of whether this is actually happening in Park Forest. This is definitely a situation worth further analyses. The very fact that Park Forest shares its all-important school districts with so many other municipalities is justification for an IM program which includes monitoring racial change activities in surrounding communities and monitoring regional institutions that can affect the traffic in potential buyers seeking housing in Park Forest's price range.

Tables I-4 to I-6 focus on specific characteristics and activities of the IM programs. Table I-4 presents staff and budget characteristics. As stated earlier, Park Forest is among the oldest and more active IM programs in the nation. This is borne out by Columns 1-3 of Table I-4. Park Forest
has the second largest IM budget in absolute dollars, and the third largest IM budget relative to the total municipal budget. Columns 4 and 5 give the title of the IM program director and the chain of authority between the director and higher officials of the municipality. As we indicated at the outset of this section, there is no standard procedure for administering an IM program. Columns 4 and 5 of Table I-4 begin to bare this out. Both the program director title and the line of authority from the director to elected officials are quite varied. Most programs, unlike Park Forest, give the IM director a specific title. In three cases this director reports directly to the highest elected officials. In three cases, including Park Forest, the program director reports to a city manager, and in three cases the program director reports to a person below the city manager level.

Professional staff size and roles are similar among most programs. Most municipalities have only one employee spending 50 percent or more of his/her time on integration maintenance and this is invariably the director. In only four of the ten programs surveyed did this director spend all of his/her time on integration maintenance. In two of those four cases the director was the only paid professional in the program. Other programs employed from three to ten professionals (Park Forest lists five professionals). The typical program (which includes Park Forest) lists the program director, a municipal planner and/or housing inspector, a grant writer, and a personnel and/or community relations person. The programs with the largest professional staff include various field staff who report to the director and are involved in monitoring and auditing real estate activity, community organizing, and the like.

The use of volunteers, listed in Column 7 of Table I-4, reflects all voluntary committees no matter how active or pertinent to the IM program, and is therefore misleading. In Table I-5 we asked the respondents to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Age of Program (in years)</th>
<th>1980 Budget (in 000's)</th>
<th>Ratio: Program Budget to Total Budget 1980</th>
<th>Program Director Title</th>
<th>Director Reports To</th>
<th>FTE Professionals</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Mayor/ Community Relations</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Town Manager</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>1.0+</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Assistant Coordinator</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>Director Housing Office</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Public Information Consultant</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>Director Human Relations</td>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Director Community Relations</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Director Human Resources Services</td>
<td>Director Community Resources Services</td>
<td>6.5+</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Forest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 5 78 0.56 --- 1.9 13.8

1 Program is now being planned.
define their program on an activity by activity base and identify whether municipal staff, subcontractors, or voluntary organizations had "minor", "major" or "total" responsibility in implementing the activity. We feel the answers to this question is more accurate and revealing.

Page six of The Questionnaire (see Appendix) presents the respondent with various popular IM activities based on our research, and provides the respondent space to list all other activities. Eight major activity areas are included: public relations/education, public relations/advertising, legal, housing counseling, evaluation/monitoring, planning, commercial development/revitalization, and school desegregation. The respondents were asked to identify those activities they initiated and whether each activity is implemented by municipality staff, voluntary organizations, or implemented by more than one source. The respondent was asked to rank the source as having a minor or major role in implementing that activity.

Table I-5 presents summary findings for all 31 activities. Column 1 presents the total IM activities that involve municipal staff, and Column 2 shows the percent of those activities for which the municipal staff has total or major responsibility for implementation. Columns 4 and 5 present similar figures for contractors and subcontractors and 6 and 7 for voluntary organizations. The reader should keep in mind that municipal staff, voluntary organizations and contractors could all have a "major" role in a single activity. For example, advertising aspects of the IM program through the media could be carried out in equal proportion by the IM director (e.g., municipal staff), the chairman of a human relations committee (e.g., voluntary organization), and by a public relations firm under contract with the municipality. Thus, the same activity could appear under all three implementation groups in Table I-5.
### TABLE 1-5: Implementation of Integration

#### Maintenance Program Activities

| Municipality | Municipal Staff | | Contractor/Subcontractor | | Voluntary Organizations | |
|--------------|----------------||--------------------------||--------------------------||--------------------------|
|              | % of Total Activities | % Major Responsibility | # of Activities | % of Major Responsibility | # of Activities | % Major |
| 1            | 24               | 75.0                | 0               | ---                      | 4               | 75.0    |
| 2            | 20               | 100.0               | 4               | 100.0                    | 5               | 100.0   |
| 3            | 18               | 100.0               | 2               | 0.0                      | 17              | 0.0     |
| 4            | 19               | 100.0               | 0               | ---                      | 7               | 0.0     |
| 5            | N.A.             | ---                 | N.A.            | ---                      | N.A.           | ---     |
| 6            | 28               | 89.3                | 5               | 100.0                    | 16              | 0.0     |
| 7            | 14               | 71.4                | 1               | 100.0                    | 10              | 80.0    |
| 8            | 26               | 92.3                | 3               | 0.0                      | 14              | 7.1     |
| 9            | 21               | N.A.                | 3               | N.A.                     | 1               | N.A.    |
| Park Forest  | 29               | 58.6                | 24              | 62.5                     | 7               | 71.4    |
| **Average**  | **22**           | **84.8**            | **5**           | **59.5**                 | **8**           | **27.5** |

1. No program gives total responsibility for an activity to a voluntary organization.

2. Wherever a column is made up of raw figures the Average is derived by dividing the raw total by the total number of municipalities. Wherever the column is a ratio or percentage the Average is derived by dividing the average for the raw figures that make up that ratio or percentage.

N.A. = Not Answered

--- = Not Applicable
Park Forest clearly stands out as the exception in the number of IM activities and the way those activities are implemented. The typical IM program surveyed concentrates most of its activities in-house. That is, municipal employees have major or total responsibility for implementing the majority of IM activity. A few activities are contracted out, most typically real estate audits. Voluntary organizations are used in one of two ways. Either these organizations are given major responsibility for implementing a few activities usually in the housing counseling area, or they are given minor responsibility across a wide spectrum of activities.

Park Forest shows the largest number of staff-related activities, but the lowest proportion of staff-involved activities are a major or total responsibility of the municipal staff. The apparent reason for this is the heavy use of contractors. Park Forest contracts out six times as many activities as the average municipality sampled and, for a high percentage of those activities, the contractor has total or major implementation responsibility.

Park Forest involves voluntary groups in an average number of activities, but expects voluntary groups to take a major responsibility for these activities. In summary the typical IM program surveyed concentrates responsibility for activities on a specific implementation source, usually its own municipal staff. Park Forest, however, spreads out the implementation responsibility among staff, contractors and voluntary groups with heavy emphasis on contractors.

Table I-6 presents a similar format to Table I-5 but looks instead at the funding source for each IM activity. Once again Park Forest is the exception to the norm. The typical IM program activity is funded by municipal revenues. Where other funds are used they typically involve only a few activities or are a minor contribution to the total operating budget.
TABLE 1-6: Funding of Integration Maintenance Program Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Own Grants or Donations</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Major</th>
<th>Other Local Districts (school, etc.)</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Activities</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td># of Activities</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td># of Activities</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Forest</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>---</strong></td>
<td><strong>---</strong></td>
<td><strong>---</strong></td>
<td><strong>---</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 No program relies totally on funding from other municipalities.
2 An average for these columns would not be statistically meaningful.
3 Wherever a column is made up of raw figures the Average is derived by dividing the raw total by the total number of municipalities. Wherever the column is a ratio or percentage the Average is derived by dividing the Average for the raw figures that make up that ratio or percentage.

N.A. = Not Answered
--- = Not Applicable
The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) is most frequently mentioned as a funding source. The only exception other than Park Forest is Municipality 2 which for the past few years has received a major grant from a private industry located in its housing market area which has funded all of its IM activities.

Park Forest shows a remarkable spread of funding sources. Of the total of 30 activities in which Park Forest is engaged, 27 are funded by municipal funds, but only 59 percent of these activities (or 16) receive major or total funding from the municipality. A remarkable amount of activities receive funding from other sources, according to Mr. DeMarco. Twenty-one activities (75 percent of 28) receive total or major funding from grants and donations. Another five activities (45.5 percent of 11) receive total or major funding from other local districts. Both of these are the highest number of activities by far in their respective funding class. However, most remarkable, Park Forest is the only IM municipality that claimed major funding for 13 of its activities (54.2 percent of 24) from other municipalities. We presume this is the South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association. Either Mr. DeMarco is interpreting the meaning of a "major" funding source different than other IM directors, or he is including the internal IM activities of other municipalities in the Chicago South Suburban region as part of Park Forest's housing market and thus Park Forest's IM activities, or Park Forest is truly leveraging its own financial commitment to integration maintenance far better than any other IM program in the country.
II. Legal Evaluation of the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program

Statement of Facts

The Village of Park Forest is located near the southern limits of Cook County and has a population of about 27,000 persons. The Village was a "planned community" constructed in the post-war period by the American Community Builders, and was incorporated on Feb. 1, 1949.

Early in its history, the Village took an interest in open housing. A Commission on Human Relations (CHR) was created by the Village Board of Trustees on July 24, 1951 to study the issues surrounding the entrance of minority residents into the Village, and to make plans for peaceful integration of the community. Black families did not in fact begin to move into the Village until 1959. Just prior to the arrival of the first black resident, the President and the Village Board issued a directive to Village employees guaranteeing that "the Village Government will assure that [Black] family the same protection of the law that is afforded to any other resident or property owner in the Village." From 1959 to 1965, Village officials and members of the CHR regularly visited the neighbors of new black residents to reassure them of continued Village support.

In 1965, the Village began to be concerned with the phenomenon of "clustering" of black residents caused by the tendency of real estate agencies to market homes near black residents exclusively to other minority purchasers. In a 1965 memorandum to real estate agencies, Village President Cunningham urged brokers to aggressively
market the homes near black residents so they did not remain vacant, and to encourage purchases by white buyers. A similar memo was again sent to the real estate agents in 1968. On January 29, 1968, the Village formally adopted a comprehensive fair housing ordinance.

In 1972 the Village took notice of an area in the adjoining City of Chicago Heights that had undergone a rapid racial change and deterioration of public services. The Village government and the CHR both decided that the deterioration of this area on the borders of the Village posed a threat to the long range goals of stable integration of Park Forest. The CHR worked in cooperation with HUD and the City of Chicago Heights to alleviate the lack of city services in the City of Chicago Heights neighborhood. The Village Board also adopted a resolution supporting a bussing plan to desegregate the school system shared by Park Forest and the Chicago Heights area. The bussing plan was successful and is still in operation.

By 1973, black residents comprised between five percent and seven percent of the population of Park Forest. The increasing black population gave rise to concerns that clustering and eventual resegregation of parts of the Village might occur unless affirmative actions were taken to avoid this result. The Village Board heard recommendations from the CHR, housing activists from other cities, and from the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities urging adoption of a comprehensive program to maintain the integrated status of Park Forest. In response, the Village formally adopted an integration maintenance program in 1973. The resolution creating the Integration Maintenance Program provided in relevant part:
WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees recognize that an open community is not necessarily synonymous with a stably integrated community; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Park Forest places a positive value on its heterogeneity and ethnic integration and the maintenance of same is an implicit goal of the Village of Park Forest:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED ... that we reaffirm our earlier commitments to open housing and to them add a commitment to the official policy: integration maintenance, defined as "the use of education and service programs to encourage the continuation of integration in the community," which in operation will ensure the continuance of a stable, multi-racial community ....


In its early formulation, the program emphasized public promotion of the Village as an attractive place to live, auditing of real estate firms to identify racial steering practices, and the establishment of a non-profit corporation supported by public funds to counsel local real estate brokers and their sales staff. By 1980, the Integration Maintenance Program involved both direct actions by the Village government and actions taken by the non-profit corporation, the South Suburban Housing Center (SSHC) pursuant to a contract with the Village and other units of government in the area. The Village government has continued a program promoting the community, which has included the making of a short motion picture, slide films and brochures. These promotional items are designed to alert both real estate personnel and potential residents to the attractive qualities of the integrated community of Park Forest. In 1980 the Park Forest Program cost approximately $110,000, the second largest amount spent for integration maintenance by any community in the nation.

The Village has taken several direct actions aimed at maintain-
ing the integrated character of Village neighborhoods. A reinspec-
tion ordinance for rented dwellings was passed in 1980 requiring a
Village inspection of single-family dwellings each time they are
rented to new tenants, and the inspection of multi-family apartment
units annually. The ordinance is intended to ensure the continued
habitability of the dwellings and to encourage landlords of single
family dwellings to rent to longer-term tenants. The inspections
conducted pursuant to this ordinance also present the Village with
some opportunities to monitor the racial composition of the various
neighborhoods of Park Forest. At present the Village has no regular
inspection program for single-family dwellings that are occupied by
their owners.

The Village has occasionally purchased homes that have become
seriously dilapidated due to poor maintenance. After rehabilitation,
the homes have been offered for sale to new owners on the open market.
Four such homes have been rehabilitated, using federal Community
Development Block Grant funds. Rehabilitation is usually carried out
by non-profit agencies, acting as subcontractors. Three of the homes
were rehabilitated by the Far South Suburban Housing Service, and the
fourth was rehabilitated by the South Suburban Housing Center. After
rehabilitation, the homes were affirmatively marketed to persons
whose race was underrepresented in the neighborhood where the homes
were located. In the most recent case, the contract between the
South Suburban Housing Center, the real estate broker, and the
Village required the broker to make efforts to refer persons of the
underrepresented race (in this case whites) to view the property,
and required him to keep records of referrals, but restricted him
from refusing to sell the home to anyone on a racial basis. The home was purchased by a white family, the first family to see it. Agreements between the Village and the Far South Suburban Housing Service were less formal. In each case, however, the homes were eventually sold to persons of races underrepresented in the area, two homes to white families and one to an Asian family.

In order to effect repairs the Village has also made grants and interest subsidies for loans available to owners of homes with housing code violations. The funds for these grants are also obtained from federal Community Development Block Funds. Federal restrictions on the use of the funds limit availability of the grants and interest subsidies to specific neighborhoods. Within the neighborhoods, however, the funds are made available to residents for repair of housing code violations on a basis of financial need without regard to race. These Village programs serve the purposes of the Integration Maintenance Program, as the rehabilitation programs do, by preventing Village neighborhoods from deteriorating and becoming unattractive to a wide spectrum of potential purchasers.

The Village continues to monitor real estate brokers for compliance with Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, and several complaints have been filed by the Village charging racial steering by local real estate firms. Evidence for the complaints is obtained primarily by the use of "auditors," persons who pretend to be prospective buyers. These auditors keep records of the location of the homes they are offered by real estate salesmen, and the records are analyzed to determine if persons of different races are referred to different locations by the real estate sales staff. Information
thus obtained by the Village is often shared with other towns and villages affected by these real estate practices, and suits against the real estate firms are often filed by several villages as co-plaintiffs.

The Village also has some direct contact with the real estate firms and urges them to make available to prospective buyers information on homes in areas where the buyer's race is underrepresented. Occasional seminars have been held in the past by the Assistant to the Village Manager to urge real estate brokers to adopt affirmative marketing techniques. Most of the direct contact with the real estate firms at present, however, is made by the South Suburban Housing Center (SSHC).

Financial ties between SSHC and the Village are close. The center is under contract with the Village to provide a variety of services related to the Integration Maintenance Program. While SSHC has contractual arrangements with other villages as well, Park Forest has had, and continues to have, the largest contracts for SSHC services. At certain times in the past Park Forest provided virtually all of the funds for the operation of the Center.

The working relationship between the Village and the Housing Center is also close. The SSHC office is located less than a block from the Village Hall, and there is a great deal of personal contact between the staffs of the two agencies. The Assistant to the Village Manager for Community Relations commented that he and other Village personnel use the Housing Center office like it was an office of the Park Forest government. The same official has conducted seminars with real estate brokers and their sales staff for the
Housing Center at times when the Center staff were unable to do so, and his wife has served as a member of the Housing Center's Board of Directors.

Housing Center staff have primary responsibility for gathering information about the racial composition of the thirty-six towns and villages of South Suburban Cook County and Northern Will County. Center staff obtain this information from a number of official and unofficial sources, including school district officials, census reports, figures from a 1978 study, and more "casual" reports from residents of the Village neighborhoods. Certain cooperative apartment complexes must keep records of racial composition of their residents in order to meet HUD requirements, and these figures have also been obtained by the Housing Center.

The information obtained by the Housing Center is used to determine the areas of Park Forest and other nearby villages that are underrepresented in either black or white residents. Just how the underrepresentation is determined remains unclear; perhaps no agreed upon definition exists between the Village and SSHC. Assistant to the Village Manager DeMarco indicated that the Village considered an area underrepresented when the proportion of black residents in the area was lower than the proportion of black citizens in the greater metropolitan area at the same income level. By contrast, the SSHC staff members responsible for the actual plotting of the underrepresented areas on maps used in seminars with real estate firms did not mention income levels as a factor in determination of underrepresentation. Instead, the housing staff used the proportion of total black residents in the greater metropolitan area as their general
standard. This standard was tempered, however, by consideration of other unidentified subjective factors. At this time, no part of Park Forest is considered by the Housing Center to be underrepresented in either black or white residents.

The SSHC staff conduct seminars for local real estate brokers and their staff in which the areas identified as underrepresented are pointed out on maps of Southern Cook and Northern Will Counties prepared by the Housing Center staff. The real estate brokers are urged to make special efforts to show homes in these areas to persons of the underrepresented race. The Housing Center staff explain this process as one of "option expansion," making available information on additional opportunities to persons who have not considered living in particular neighborhoods. In practice, this process usually involves informing white prospective buyers of available homes in areas where blacks overrepresented, and informing black potential buyers of housing opportunities in areas where whites overrepresented. It is usually unnecessary to make special efforts to refer black buyers to racially mixed areas since the normal demand of black purchasers for property in such areas is sufficient to maintain the mixed character of the areas.

Participation in the seminars is voluntary, as is participation in the marketing strategy advocated by the Housing Center. The Center charges the real estate firms a fee for the seminar. Center staff persuade the real estate firms to hold the seminars as educational sessions to make the sales staff aware of their responsibility under federal and state fair housing laws. The marketing program is
characterized by the SSHC staff as a way for brokers and sales personnel to avoid racial steering charges by the Village auditors.

There is no indication that the Village makes any special effort to audit real estate firms which decline to participate in the Housing Center seminars, nor does the Housing Center have any enforcement to ensure compliance with the Center's affirmative marketing strategy.

The South Suburban Housing Center also does a small amount of direct counseling of potential residents. This occurs on occasion as a result of referrals by Chicago social service agencies of minority persons seeking housing in the Park Forest area. Some prospective residents also appear without referrals. No systematic effort is made by the Housing Center staff to keep comprehensive records of available housing in the area. However, the staff is often aware of vacancies as a result of their data collection activities. The Housing Center staff only offer information of such openings to potential residents where it serves the purposes of integration maintenance. If the potential resident desires information on housing opportunities in areas where his race is already overrepresented, the Center staff refer him to commercial real estate agencies. Center staff estimate that they have direct contact with fewer than 3% of the persons seeking housing in the Park Forest area.

This concludes the relevant facts regarding the operation of the Integration Maintenance Program since its inception by the Village of Park Forest and the agencies with which the Village contracts (namely SSHC) to carry out Integration Maintenance activities. The legal evaluation of the Integration Maintenance Programs which follows is based upon these relevant facts. We are assuming that the staffs
of both the Village of Park Forest and the SSHC have been accurate
and candid with us in our numerous meetings and telephone conversa-
tions; and that we, in turn, have accurately recorded what was
related to us.

The Legal Challenges to Integration Maintenance

The Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program could be subject
to challenge on a variety of different legal theories. A complaint
could allege that the program violates Title VIII of the Civil Rights
Act of 1968 (The Fair Housing Act), 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 et seq.; that
the program violates the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981
and 1982; that the program violates the Fourteenth or First Amendments
to the United States Constitution; or that the program exceeds the
jurisdiction of the Village of Park Forest because the program has
major effects on areas outside the Village's borders. Each of these
legal theories will be examined in turn and evaluated in light of the
facts of the Park Forest situation.

Challenges Under the Fair Housing Act

A. Standing to Sue

Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, the Fair Housing
Act, was enacted to bar all racial discrimination, private as well
as public, in the sale and rental of real property. United States v.
Real Estate One, Inc., 433 F. Supp. 1140, 1144 (E.D. Mich. 1977);
old task in an analysis of the Act is the determination of which per-
sons are permitted access to the courts under the federal standing
doctrine to enforce the Act.
The enforcement provisions of the Fair Housing Act are found in Sections 3610 and 3612, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3640 and 3612. Section 3610 provides, in relevant part:

§ 3610. Enforcement

(a) Any person who claims to have been injured by a discriminatory housing practice or who believes that he will be irrevocably injured by a discriminatory housing practice that is about to occur (hereafter "person aggrieved") may file a complaint with the Secretary . . . 42 U.S.C. § 3610.

Section 3610 also provides for an informal procedure to resolve the complaint of the "person aggrieved." The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is authorized to attempt to eliminate or correct the alleged discriminatory housing practice by conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Only if the Secretary fails to resolve the complaint within 30 days is the complainant allowed to sue in federal court. The suit may be brought without regard to the amount in controversy. 42 U.S.C. § 3610(d). However, if State or local fair housing laws provide for rights and remedies substantially equivalent to the federal Act, the complainant must avail himself of the State judicial remedy instead of the federal remedy. 42 U.S.C. § 3610 (d).

The informal procedure of Section 3610 contrasts with the immediate access to the federal courts allowed by Section 3612. That Section provides, in relevant part:

§ 3612. Enforcement by private persons

(a) The rights granted by sections 3603, 3604, 3605, and 3606 of this title may be enforced by civil
actions in appropriate United States district courts without regard to the amount in controversy and in appropriate State or local courts of general jurisdiction.

Unlike Section 3610, Section 3612 does not use the "person aggrieved" terminology, nor does it require a complainant to submit to an informal resolution process prior to bringing suit.

In order to be granted standing to sue in federal court, a plaintiff must fulfill the constitutional requirement of demonstrating "injury in fact, economic or otherwise." Association of Data Processing Service, Inc. v. Camp, 397 U.S. 150, 152 (1970). This injury must be one "that fairly can be traced to the challenged action of the defendant," and must be of such a nature that the court can provide a remedy. Simon v. Eastern Kentucky Welfare Rights Organization, 426 U.S. 26, 41 (1976). In addition, there is a judicially imposed, nonconstitutional requirement that the interest of the plaintiff be "arguably within the zone of interests to be protected or regulated by the statute or constitutional guarantee in question." Association of Data Processing, Inc. v. Camp, supra, at 153.

Potential purchasers or renters of housing who have suffered a direct injury by being denied access to housing for discriminatory reasons would satisfy the requirements for standing under either Section 3610 or Section 3612. Such parties may elect whichever of the two sections they wish in order to pursue a remedy. See, e.g., Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood, 441 U.S. 91 (1979); TOPIC v. Circle Realty, 532 F.2d 1273 (9th Cir. 1976); Fair Housing Council of Bergen County, Inc. v. Eastern Bergen County Multiple
Listing Service, Inc., 422 F. Supp. 1071 (D.N.J. 1971). The legislative history of the Fair Housing Act and the use of the "person aggrieved" terminology in Section 3610, however, left unclear whether parties suffering only indirect injuries were also to be granted standing to enforce the Act. Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood, supra, at 105.

In Trafficante v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 409 U.S. 205 (1972), the Supreme Court held that Section 3610 conferred standing on persons who had suffered indirect injuries as a result of the discrimination toward prospective tenants by the landlord of an apartment complex. In Trafficante, the plaintiffs were two tenants of the apartment complex, one white and one black. They alleged that, as a result of the discriminatory rental practices of the landlord, they had been indirectly injured in the following ways: (1) they had lost the social benefits of living in an integrated community; (2) they had missed business and professional advantages which would have accrued if they had lived with members of minority groups; and (3) they had suffered embarrassment and economic damage in social, business, and professional activities from being "stigmatized" as residents of a "white ghetto." Id. at 208. The Court found these allegations sufficient to grant standing to the plaintiffs since Congress intended standing under Section 3610 to be as broad as is permitted by Article III of the Constitution. Id. at 209.

Left unanswered by the Trafficante Court, however, was whether Section 3612 also allowed standing to persons who had suffered only indirect injuries.
The Supreme Court recently resolved this issue in *Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood*, 441 U.S. 91 (1979). In this case the Court held that both Sections 3610 and 3612 were intended by Congress to offer standing as broad as is permitted by Article III of the Constitution. Persons who have suffered indirect injuries as a result of discrimination may now elect either of the remedies provided by the two sections, in the same way as can persons directly injured by the discriminatory acts. *Id.* at 109.

Courts have found sufficient indirect injuries to grant standing to plaintiffs in a variety of circumstances. Incumbent residents of the area where the discriminatory housing practices occurred have standing. *Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood*, *supra*; *Trafficante v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.*, 409 U.S. 205 (1972); *TOPIC v. Circle Realty*, 532 F.2d 1273 (9th Cir. 1976); *Zuch v. Hussey*, 394 F. Supp. 1028 (E.D. Mich. 1975). Residents who have acted as "testers" to discover if realty firms are complying with the Fair Housing Act also have been granted standing. *Sherman Park Community Association v. Wauwatosa Realty Co.*, 486 F. Supp. 838 (E.D. Wisc. 1980); *Wheatley Heights Neighborhood Coalition v. Jenna Resales Co.*, 429 F. Supp. 486 (E.D.N.Y. 1977); *Zuch v. Hussey*, 394 F. Supp. 1028 (E.D. Mich. 1975). It is unclear, however, whether their standing is because they are testers, or because they are residents. See, *Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood*, *supra* at 111 (refusing to rule on whether testers had standing independent from their standing as residents); but see, *Wheatley Heights Neighborhood Coalition v. Jenna Resales Co.*, *supra* at 488 (holding that testers had standing to allege violations of Section 3604(b) of the Fair Housing Act).
It is not clear under what circumstances non-residents may be able to demonstrate injuries sufficient to satisfy the "injury in fact" aspect of the standing test. The Court in Gladstone, Realtors, supra at 112 n.25, found no injury had been suffered by two non-resident testers. The two testers could not claim indirect injuries by virtue of their status as testers. Since neither of the two non-residents actually intended to purchase or rent any of the property shown by the real estate agent, neither suffered any obvious direct injury by being denied access to housing. The Court left open the possibility that the testers might be granted standing if they could demonstrate some direct injury. However, on remand to the lower court, the testers failed to demonstrate any direct injuries, and the court ruled that they therefore had no standing. Village of Bellwood v. Dwayne Realty, 482 F. Supp. 1321 (N.D. Ill. 1979).

Courts have also found sufficient indirect "injury in fact" to grant standing to towns and villages affected by the discriminatory practices, Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood, supra, and to a non-profit corporation that could demonstrate direct financial losses from the discriminatory acts. Park View Heights Corporation v. City of Blackjack, 467 F.2d 1208 (8th Cir. 1972). However, non-profit organizations with only a general interest, but no direct financial stake, in promoting integration have been held to have no standing apart from that which their members could assert as individuals. Topic v. Circle Realty, 532 F.2d 1273 (9th Cir. 1976); Fair Housing Council v. Eastern Bergen County Multiple Listing Service, Inc., 422 F. Supp. 1071 (D.N.J. 1976).
By contrast with the controversy surrounding interpretation of the "injury in fact" aspect of the standing test, courts have generally had little trouble finding sufficient "protected interests" to satisfy the "zone of interests" inquiry. Generally an allegation that the "injury in fact" occurred because of any one of a number of discriminatory housing practices is sufficient to satisfy the "zone of interests" requirement. Thus, courts have found infringement of a protected interest where the plaintiff alleged that the defendant engaged in blockbusting tactics, United States v. Bob Lawrence Realty, Inc., 474 F.2d 115, 119 (5th Cir. 1973); refused to rent apartments on a non-discriminatory basis, Trafficante v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 409 U.S. 205 (1972); Smith v. Sol D. Adler Realty Co., 436 F.2d 344 (7th Cir. 1971); or that the defendant engaged in racial steering practices, Johnson v. Jerry Pals Real Estate, 485 F.2d 528 (7th Cir. 1973); Village of Bellwood v. Dwayne Realty, 482 F. Supp. 1321 (N.D. Ill. 1979).

In Arquilla-DeHaan Realtors v. Village of Country Club Hills, No. 80 C 2070, slip op. (N.D. Ill. Oct. 31, 1980), the plaintiff realtor alleged that the defendant Village had conspired to force compliance with integration maintenance programs by filing several suits against him. Arquilla-DeHaan further alleged that the Integration Maintenance Programs violated anti-steering provisions of the Fair Housing Act, and that forcing his compliance with the programs violated the protections of Section 3617 of the Act, which prohibit coercion, intimidation, threats, or interreference with anyone exercising his rights to buy, sell, rent or finance property. The court found these allegations insufficient to constitute an infringement.
of a "protected right" because Arquilla-DeHaan was not deprived of the right to buy, rent or finance housing. It is not entirely clear whether the court might have found infringement of a protected interest if Arquilla-DeHaan had alleged he was denied the right to buy or sell housing as a result of the defendant's integration-maintenance programs.

In summary, current interpretations by the courts of the standing requirements of the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3610 and 3612, allow standing to a variety of complainants, including persons alleging direct denial of housing, current residents of the area where the discriminatory acts took place, local governments, and corporations that can demonstrate actual injuries. The standing tests utilized by the courts are liberally interpreted under the Fair Housing Act, and we may anticipate that additional party plaintiffs may be able to demonstrate an "injury in fact" sufficient to gain standing in future cases. Specifically, non-resident testers who are able to show that they have suffered some direct harm may gain access to the courts, as may some real estate firms or other commercial enterprises that can demonstrate an actual harm to a protected interest.

Assuming that a potential plaintiff has succeeded in gaining standing to challenge the Integration Maintenance Program of Park Forest, the next question is which aspects of the Integration Maintenance Program are subject to attack under the substantive provisions of the Fair Housing Act.

B. Substantive Grounds for Challenge

A legal challenge to the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program is most likely to be directed at the activities of the Village
and the South Suburban Housing Center (SSHC or Housing Center) in
counseling real estate firms to market homes to persons of racial
groups underrepresented in the community where the homes are situated.
Specifically, the charge could be made that the affirmative marketing
program is actually a form of racial steering that violates Section
3604 of the Fair Housing Act. Such a challenge could come from a
potential purchaser alleging that the Integration Maintenance Program
denies him access to housing opportunities that he would otherwise
have, or from a current resident of Park Forest, or of any other area
affected by the marketing program, alleging that he was deprived of
the social benefits and the business and professional opportunities
that otherwise would have accrued to him if the potential purchasers
had not been referred elsewhere. See, e.g., Trafficante v. Metropolitan
Life Insurance Co., 409 U.S. 205, 208 (1972). In addition a real
estate agent might complain that the integration maintenance program
compelled him to participate in an illegal act of racial steering in
violation of Sections 3604 and 3617 of the Act. See, e.g., Arquilla-
DeHaan Realtors v. Village of Country Club Hills, No. 80 C 2070, slip

Racial steering, which is prohibited by Section 3604(a) of the
Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3604(a), is "the use of any word or
phrase or action by a real estate broker or salesperson which in-
fluences the choice of a prospective buyer on a racial basis, or
which in any way impedes, delays, or discourages on a racial basis
a prospective homebuyer from purchasing housing." United States v.
Real Estate One, Inc., 433 F. Supp. 1140, 1144 (E.D. Mich. 1977);
racial considerations need not be the sole or primary motivation for the broker or agent's actions; such consideration need only be an element of the real estate broker's or salesman's conduct. United States v. Mitchell, supra at 791; Zuch v. Hussey, 394 F. Supp. 1028, 1047 (E.D. Mich. 1975). Racial steering is a violation of the Fair Housing Act because it makes housing available on a racial basis and fosters the perpetuation of segregated communities. United States v. Real Estate One, 433 F. Supp. 1140, 1144 (E.D. Mich. 1977); cf., United States v. Mitchell, supra at 791 ("Conduct that has the necessary and foreseeable consequence of perpetuating segregation can be as deleterious as purposefully discriminatory conduct in frustrating the national commitment to fair housing."); Barrick Realty, Inc. v. City of Gary, Indiana, 491 F.2d 161, 164 (7th Cir. 1974) (If a ban of real estate for-sale signs were used to perpetuate segregation instead of preserving integration, the court would apply the strictest scrutiny.).

Although the Park Forest program does employ racial considerations in its operation, this program clearly does not have as its aim the perpetuation of segregated communities. The fact that there is a racial component to the program is of significance and will be discussed at a later point in this analysis. However, since there is no intent to perpetuate segregated communities, it seems clear that the Park Forest program is not racial steering within the meaning of the Fair Housing Act.


We turn next to a consideration of the challenges possible under the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981 and 1982. These
sections provide:

§ 1981. Equal Rights Under the Law

All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other.

§ 1982. Property Rights of Citizens

All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property.

As in the consideration of the Fair Housing Act, an initial task in an analysis of these statutes is to determine who has standing to sue under these statutes.

Courts generally have limited standing under Sections 1981 and 1982 to direct victims of racial discrimination. See, e.g., Fair Housing Council of Bergen County, Inc. v. Eastern Bergen County Multiple Listing Service, Inc., 422 F. Supp. 1071, 1083 (D.N.J. 1976). Persons suffering indirect injury as a result of discriminatory acts of a third party do not have access to the courts under these statutes as they do under Sections 3610 and 3612 of the Fair Housing Act. Id. at 1083. See generally, Jones v. Alfred Mayer Co., 392 U.S. 409, 413-417 (1968). Despite this narrower coverage of Sections 1981 and 1982, these sections remained in full force and effect after the enactment of the Fair Housing Act. Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co., supra at 416-17. Unlike the Fair Housing Act, these statutes deal only with racial discrimination. Id. at 413. Complaints resting on
Section 1982 alone are rare since the enactment of the Fair Housing Act, and the Section is most often cited in tandem with complaints under the Fair Housing Act. See, e.g., TOPIC v. Circle Realty, 532 F.2d 1273, 1274 (9th Cir. 1976); Wheatley Heights Neighborhood Coalition v. Jenna Resales Co., 429 F. Supp. 486, 487 (E.D.N.Y. 1977).

Where Sections 1981 and 1982 are the sole basis for a complaint, they usually involve complaints against persons exempted from coverage by the Fair Housing Act, Sections 3603(b) (exempting certain sales by private owners and rentals by certain live-in landlords) and 3607 (exempting certain religious organizations and private clubs), 42 U.S.C. §§ 3603(b) and 3607. See, e.g., Smith v. Sol D. Adler Realty Co., 436 F.2d 344 (7th Cir. 1971). See, also, the discussion in Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co., supra at 413 and 415.

Inasmuch as the coverage of Sections 1981 and 1982 is generally narrower than the coverage ofSections 3610 and 3612, only the portion of the plaintiffs claiming direct injury under Sections 3610 and 3612 could include complaints against the Village of Park Forest under Sections 1981 and 1982. Sections 1981 and 1982 would not permit additional plaintiffs to file suit against the Village.

Complaints under Sections 1981 and 1982 would be identical to those under the Fair Housing Act and would, in all likelihood, be combined with complaints under the Fair Housing Act. Complainants would, of necessity, be persons actually searching for housing or attempting to sell or rent housing within the area generally affected by the Integration Maintenance Program of the Village of Park Forest. They might allege that the Program denied them an equal right to
make contracts for housing in violation of Section 1981, and denied them an equal right to purchase, lease, or sell real property in violation of Section 1982. Because of the historical interrelationship of these two sections, complaints under either of the two sections are not generally construed differently from one another. Tillman v. Wheaton-Haven Recreation Ass'n, Inc., 410 U.S. 431 (1973).

Congressional authority for Sections 1981 and 1982 springs from the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution. Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co., 392 U.S. 409, 437-38 (1968). This is the same source of authority as for the Fair Housing Act. United States v. Bob Lawrence Realty, Inc., 474 F.2d 115, 120-21 (5th Cir. 1973). The Supreme Court has never decided a case involving benign race-conscious action (such as that involved in the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program) by the state under Sections 1981 and 1982. However, legal commentators believe that nothing in the wording of the sections or in the apparent intent of Congress mandates an absolutely colorblind standard in the application of Sections 1981 and 1982, particularly since the Fair Housing Act, which permits benign race-conscious measures, rests on the same constitutional foundation. Under this view, benign race-conscious activity is consistent with Sections 1981 and 1982. See, Note, Benign Steering and Benign Quotas, 93 Harv. L. Rev. 938, 948 n.74 (1980); Brown, Givelber & Subrin, Treating Blacks as if They Were White: Problems of Definition and Proof in Section 1982 Cases, 124 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1, 7 n.20, 15-16 n.53 (1975).

Fourteenth Amendment Challenges

We turn next to attacks under the Fourteenth Amendment to the
Constitution of the United States. The Fourteenth Amendment provides, in relevant part:

AMENDMENT XIV.

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Two complaints are possible under the Fourteenth Amendment. One is that the Integration Maintenance Program violates the "equal protection of the laws" clause of the Amendment; the other that the methods by which areas are designated for special attention by real estate firms violate the "due process of law" clause.

A threshold issue in any complaint brought under the Fourteenth Amendment is whether the incident or situation complained of was brought about by "state action." Generally, the courts look at the challenged actions to see if a sufficiently close nexus exists between the state (in this case the Village government) and the action, so that it is fair to regard the action as governmentally sponsored. See, e.g., *Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co.*, 419 U.S. 345, 351 (1974); *Moose Lodge No. 107 v. Irvis*, 407 U.S. 163, 173 (1972). Where no state action has caused the event, there is no violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. *See, e.g., Dayton Board of Education v. Brinkman*, 433 U.S. 406 (1977); *Austin Independent School District v. United States*, 429 U.S. 990, 991 (1976); *Pasadena City Board of Education v. Spangler*, 427 U.S. 424 (1976).
The direct actions of Park Forest officials and employees are, of course, governmental actions when they occur as a normal incident of the employee's or official's job. It is also likely that the actions of the South Suburban Housing Center would be viewed as "state action" for the purposes of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Housing Center is supported by Park Forest funds, and undertakes its integration activities at the direct request of the Village. Other governmental bodies contribute additional funds to the Center's operation. The working relationship between the Center's staff and Village officials is close and abiding, as indeed it must be in order to effectuate the aims of the Integration Maintenance Program. Frequent and informal communication between the Village and the Center is vital to achieve smooth coordination of the different aspects of the Integration Maintenance Program under the control of each of these bodies. However, this close coordination clearly demonstrates the unity of purpose and direction shared by the Village and the Housing Center. Viewing the activities of the Village and the Center in their totality, it seems that they have a sufficiently close nexus to make it fairly likely that they would be regarded as "state action" for the purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment.

A. Equal Protection Challenge

It is possible that a complaint could be made that the operation of the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program constitutes a violation of the equal protection clause by favoring one group over another in the provision of housing. Such a challenge could come from a real estate firm if the Village sought to apply sanctions to real estate agents who did not comply with the Village's expectations,
or from potential purchasers or residents who are denied access
to rehabilitation grants or other Village resources because their
needs are not consistent with the aims of the Integration Maintenance
Program. In analyzing complaints of denial of equal protection of
the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment, an initial task is to
identify the standard of review that a court would utilize on its
review of the benign (i.e. lack of intent to promote segregation),
but racially conscious, Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program.
The courts have traditionally invoked a standard of "strict scrutiny"
whenever governmental actions are alleged to injure protected groups
(such as blacks), or infringe upon a fundamental individual right or
protected interest. See, e.g., In re Griffiths, 413 U.S. 717, 721
(1973); Korematsu v. United States, 323 U.S. 214, 216 (1944). The
strict scrutiny test has been variously formulated by the courts as
requiring the state to justify its actions by showing that they served
an "overriding interest," McLaughlin v. Florida, 379 U.S. 184, 196
(1964), or a "compelling interest," Graham v. Richardson, 403 U.S. 365,
375 (1971). After a state demonstrates that a compelling interest
exists to justify its actions, it must then demonstrate that no al-
ternative, less intrusive action would substantially achieve the
compelling interest. Hunter v. Erickson, 393 U.S. 385, 392 (1969);
however, on whether the strict scrutiny test should apply with full
force to governmental actions based on racial considerations, but
with a benign objective such as the promotion of integration or the
elimination of segregation, or whether some standard of review less
demanding on the government should be applied to the government's actions taken with such a benign purpose in mind. See Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265, 359-362 (1978) (Brennan, White, Marshall, and Blackmun, JJ., applying a less demanding standard than strict scrutiny to benign racial actions); Linmark Associations, Inc. v. Willingboro, 431 U.S. 85, 95 (1977).

While there is no definitive resolution of the issue of the proper standard of review to be used in benign race-conscious cases, even the strictest standard of scrutiny adopted by the courts allows for some race-conscious actions where they are necessary to serve a compelling state objective. While the courts may ultimately adopt a less restrictive standard of review for benign race-conscious activity, a prudent course for purposes of this analysis is to assume that the Integration Maintenance Program of Park Forest would be reviewed by a court utilizing the strict scrutiny standard. We must then determine if the Integration Maintenance Program of Park Forest can survive such a test.

Peaceful and stable racial integration of housing is clearly a national goal of very high priority. Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood, 441 U.S. 91, 111 (1979); Linmark Associates, Inc. v. Willingboro, 437 U.S. 85, 95; United States v. Real Estate One, Inc., 433 F. Supp. 1140, 1144 (E.D. Mich. 1977). While the Fair Housing Act and other federal laws do not establish an outright duty to affirmatively market housing so as to integrate communities, United States v. Real Estate One, supra at 1150, voluntary integration programs which go beyond statutory and constitutional requirements

The courts also repeatedly have emphasized that stable integration of housing, not a brief period of integration followed by a resegregation of the neighborhood into a new black ghetto, is the real goal of the Fair Housing Act and other federal laws. Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood, 441 U.S. 91, 111 (1979). Barrick Realty v. City of Gary, Indiana, 491 F.2d 161, 164 (7th Cir. 1974); Otero v. New York Housing Authority, 484 F.2d 1122, 1140 (2d Cir. 1973); Zuch v. Hussey, 394 F. Supp. 1028, 1050 (E.D. Mich. 1975). A feigned or exaggerated fear of white flight and consequent resegregation, however, may not be used by governmental authorities as a mask to disguise actions taken in reality to perpetuate and accommodate the prejudices of whites. See Parent Association of Andrew Jackson High School v. Ambach, 598 F.2d 703, 719 (2d Cir. 1979); Monroe v. Board of Commissioners, 391 U.S. 450, 459 (1968); cf., Wright v. Council of the City of Emporia, 442 F.2d 570, 573 (4th Cir. 1971), reversed on other grounds, 407 U.S. 451 (1972).

The intent of a governmental body to cause racial segregation, rather than racial integration, is shown by its policy and practice, see Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 402 U.S. 1, 18-19 (1971), or by its pattern of behavior, Parent Association of Andrew Jackson High School v. Ambach, 598 F.2d 705, 713 (2d Cir. 1979).
The Integration Maintenance Program of Park Forest was clearly enacted to serve the national goal of open housing. See Village Resolution R-73-72 (Nov. 12, 1973) (creating the integration-maintenance program). The long history of Park Forest's promotion of integrated housing demonstrates beyond all doubt that the Village's support of integration is genuine, and not simply a sham. See, e.g., Fair Housing Ordinance of the Village of Park Forest, Ord. No. 649 (Jan. 29, 1968); Village Resolution R-73-72 (Nov. 12, 1973) (reaffirming the Village commitment to open housing and establishing the integration-maintenance program); Village Resolution R-77-2 (Jan. 10, 1977) (calling for national and state integration-maintenance programs); "Instructions to Village Employees For Answering Questions With Respect to Local Residence of Members of the Negro Race" (Village Memorandum, July 27, 1959) (guaranteeing Negro residents the same protection of the law as afforded to whites). This commitment to the national goal of open housing should survive scrutiny as a compelling state interest.

The second facet of the standard of review requires a showing that the challenged program is necessary to the achievement of the compelling state interest. Linmark Associates, Inc. v. Willingboro, 431 U.S. 85, 95 (1977). The necessity for the integration-maintenance program is shown in the history of integration in Park Forest.

Several times in the history of Park Forest, concentrations of black families in a small geographical area have threatened to spark a flight of white families from the area. See, DeMarco, "A History of the Housing Integration of Park Forest," reproduced in, Onderdonk, DeMarco & Cardona, Integration in Housing: A Plan for Racial Diversity
90 (1977). In 1971 and 1972, residents of the Eastgate and Lincolnwood subsections of the Village were concerned about possible declines in property values resulting from overconcentrations of black students in the school system and clustering of black families in the area. Id. at 97. The school concentrations had been caused largely by the rapid resegregation of an area of Chicago Heights adjoining Park Forest which utilized the same schools as Park Forest residents. The Village supported a school desegregation plan that reduced the minority concentrations in the schools, and reduced, but did not eliminate entirely, the flight of white families from the district. Id. at 97-98. Residents of the area were also assured of continuing Village services, and real estate brokers were alerted to the concerns of the residents about the clustering. Id. 97-98.

Again in 1973, the residents of West Lincolnwood became alarmed when several homes in close proximity to one another were all sold to black families within a short period of time. The Village President urged residents not to panic, and he asked real estate brokers to make special efforts to show other homes in the area to whites as well as blacks to avoid creation of a mini-ghetto. Id. at 100.

At about the same time, another clustering problem arose in three of the five housing cooperatives in a different section of the Village. Investigation showed that the increasing concentrations of minority residents in these cooperatives were partly the result of racial steering practices by another cooperative, and partly caused by the "self-steering" of the tenants as they chose apartments in sections near others of their own race. The Fair Housing Board took action to halt the illegal steering practices. However, the
cooperatives had to adopt a mini-integration maintenance plan to
counter the self-steering of the tenants. Incoming tenants were
urged to take apartments in such a way as to even out the distrib-
ution of minority and majority families. Advertising was selectively
aimed at attracting additional white tenants to offset the already
large black demand for the apartments. Id. at 103.

It is significant that the clustering of black residents in the
cooperatives, and in other Park Forest situations, has often been
partly caused by self-steering of the residents themselves rather
than racial steering by a real estate broker or salesman. Simple
enforcement of the Fair Housing Act's prohibition of racial steering
is ineffective in preventing self-steering by prospective residents,
because the real estate agent has not violated the Act. The high
mobility of Americans in general may result in racial change of a
neighborhood without any overt illegal behavior by real estate
agents, if white demand for housing declines while black demand in-
creases. See, e.g., Note, Benign Steering and Benign Quotas: The
Validity of Race-Conscious Government Policies to Promote Residential
Integration, 93 Harv. L. Rev. 938, 942 (1980); C. Rapkin & W. Grigsby,
The Demand for Housing in Racially Mixed Areas 52-53 (1960).

Further, most analysts of racial change in residential neigh-
borhoods agree that there is a "tipping point" in the process, a point
when the proportion of black residents is so high that white depart-
ture from the area is greatly accelerated and becomes irreversible.
See, e.g., Otero v. New York City Housing Authority, 484 F.2d 1122,
1135 (2d Cir. 1973); King v. Harris, 464 F. Supp. 827, 842 (E.D.N.Y.
1979); Zuch v. Hussey, 394 F. Supp. 1028, 1032 (E.D. Mich. 1975);
accord, Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood, 441 U.S. 91, 110 (1979); Parent Ass'n of Andrew Jackson High School v. Ambach, 598 F.2d 705, 709 (2d Cir. 1979); Barrick Realty, Inc. v. City of Gary, Indiana, 491 F.2d 161, 163 (7th Cir. 1974); see also, Note, Benign Steering and Benign Quotas, 93 Harv. L. Rev. 938, 942 (1980); Kaplan, Equal Justice in an Unequal World -- The Problem of Special Treatment, 61 NW. U. L. Rev. 388, 390 (1966). Actual determination of when the "tipping point" has been reached is very difficult to make, and estimates of what proportion of black residents is sufficient to constitute a tipping danger vary greatly. See, e.g., Note, Benign Steering and Benign Quotas, supra at 942 (estimating 25% to 30%); Navasky, The Benevolent Housing Quota, 6 How. L. J. 30, 34-35 (1960) (estimating 20% to 60%); Levin & Moise, School Desegregation Litigation in the Seventies and the Use of Social Science Evidence: An Annotated Guide, Law & Contemp. Prob., Winter 1975, at 50, 97 n.277 (estimating 6% to 50%).

Criteria considered by the courts in determining whether an area has reached or is approaching the "tipping point" include: (1) the gross numbers of minority group families in a measurable economic or social group which are likely to affect adversely Area conditions; (2) the quality of community services and facilities; and (3) the attitudes of majority group residents who might be persuaded by their subjective reactions to the first and second criteria to leave the Area. King v. Harris, 464 F. Supp. 827, 842 (E.D.N.Y. 1979); Trinity Episcopal School Corp. v. Romney, 387 F. Supp. 1044, 1065-66 (S.D.N.Y. 1974), affirmed on tipping 523 F.2d 88 (2d Cir. 1975).
The difficulty of determining precisely when an area has reached the "tipping point" is due primarily to the wide range of possible subjective reactions of incumbent white residents towards the entry of minority families. King v. Harris, supra at 843. A village that ignores the reactions of incumbent white residents until whites begin to flee the area in earnest may find the situation already beyond salvage. See, e.g., Lauber, Integration Takes More than a Racial Quota, Planning Apr.-May 1974 at 14 (describing the case of South Shore, a Chicago neighborhood which began a program of integration maintenance only after the area was already 30% black. Whites continued to exit from the area, and seven years later the neighborhood was nearly all black); DeMarco, "A History of the Housing Integration of Park Forest," supra at 95 (Beacon Hills, a neighborhood of Chicago Heights that attempted to stabilize integration when the black population constituted about 25% of the total, failed to stem white flight when an adjoining area's resegregation increased white fears).

The fear expressed by white residents of the Eastgate and Lincolnwood areas that their neighborhoods were undergoing a racial change and resegregation was sufficient to arouse a reasonable concern by Park Forest officials that whites would begin to depart the area unless something was done. Similarly, the general increase in numbers of black residents in the Village throughout the early 1970's increased the likelihood that self-steering would lead to other clusters of minority families, such as those experienced by the cooperatives. Traditional enforcement methods against real estate firm steering were ineffective in preventing self-steering. Only an affirmative marketing plan that maintained housing demand by whites
to offset the normal attrition of white residents could prevent increasing danger of tipping of Park Forest neighborhoods. Further, it would be unreasonable, and perilous, to require the Village to wait to take action until whites actually began to move out of Park Forest in large numbers. Decisive action was, and is, necessary while the situation can still be controlled.

It is also hard to conceive of less intrusive alternative actions available to the Village that would have served the same needs. The Integration Maintenance Program does not prevent blacks from access to Park Forest neighborhoods, nor does it deny blacks or whites information about available housing where they have requested such housing information. The Program, at most, makes additional information available without request, in a manner that will serve to protect the integrated status of Village neighborhoods. Prospective residents are free to choose whether the marketing aspects of the Integration Maintenance Program are congruent with their own needs, and free to disregard the advice of the marketing aspects of the Program if they so choose.

Simple advertising aimed at attracting white demand for housing in the Village produces some similar positive results. However, such advertising may not reach all prospective residents, and is less effective in countering self-steering when prospective residents begin looking at housing in the Village. Only a plan that makes such potential residents aware of integrated housing opportunities at the time they are actually making their decision can be truly effective in preventing clustering.
In summary, the Integration Maintenance Program of Park Forest should meet the twofold test of the standard of review. It clearly serves a compelling state interest of very high priority, the creation and maintenance of stable integrated residential neighborhoods. The Program is also clearly necessary to effectuate the compelling state interest. Clustering and decline of white demand for housing can slowly erode the proportion of white residents in Park Forest until a "tipping point" is reached, and white departure becomes irreversible. Unfavorable white reactions to past minority clustering demonstrate that the danger is real, not merely academic. Only a program undertaken in advance of actual white flight can be effective in preventing resegregation. While enforcement of anti-steering provisions of the Fair Housing Act may prevent racial steering by real estate agents it is not effective in preventing self-steering by potential residents. Only the affirmative marketing program may prevent self-steering. The Park Forest Integration Maintenance program is therefore consistent with the "equal protection of the laws" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

B. Due Process Challenge

The actions of Village officials or of the staff of the South Suburban Housing Center, particularly in making decisions necessary to carry out the Integration Maintenance Program, could be subject to attack as being in violation of the procedural due process guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment. As we will discuss below, however, the likelihood of such a challenge being successful is quite small.
An initial task facing a complainant alleging denial or procedural due process lies in demonstrating that the government's actions threaten to deprive him of a protected interest in life, liberty, or property. Although this task would be formidable in a challenge of the Integration Maintenance Program, it is conceivable that a real estate broker could argue that the program has damaged his real estate business and thus injured a protected property interest.

Assuming arguendo that a real estate broker could demonstrate injury to a protected interest, we must consider what procedural requirements the courts might impose upon Park Forest and the South Suburban Housing Center to satisfy due process. While the protections of procedural due process are usually invoked to provide the injured party with a hearing before he is finally deprived of his property interest, see Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254 (1970), some courts are receptive to the argument that a governmental program administered without discernible standards constitutes a violation of procedural due process. See Holmes v. N.Y. City Housing Authority, 398 F.2d 262 (2d Cir. 1968). In this context, while a real estate broker could not contest under the due process clause the general necessity for a plan such as the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program, he could argue that the standards for determining which geographic areas are racially underrepresented are arbitrary, inconsistently applied, based on inadequate information, or are even nonexistent.

The apparent confusion between staff of the Housing Center and the Assistant to the Village Manager for Integration Maintenance over
the standard to be used in determining whether an area is underrepresented in persons of a specific race may only reflect differences in the way these parties articulate their understanding of the standard. However, if the difference in the articulation is reflective of a genuine misunderstanding of the methodology to be used in determining whether an area is underrepresented, then the Integration Maintenance Program is vulnerable to a complaint of arbitrary and inconsistent application of the substantive rules enacted by the legislative body. This vulnerability would be easily eliminated by a clear articulation by Village officials of the standard to be used in deciding whether an area merits special attention by real estate firms, and by making certain that the Housing Center staff responsible for carrying out the program understand the standard they are to use.

Perhaps more serious is the inefficient and incomplete method of gathering information about the racial composition of the neighborhoods affected by the Integration Maintenance Program. Some of the information used by the Housing Center staff is stale, some is inefficient as a guide to actual housing patterns, and some is based on little more than the illfounded personal impressions of acquaintances of the Housing Center staff. This is not the fault of the Housing Center staff. They have used considerable ingenuity and initiative in obtaining information about housing patterns from a variety of indirect sources. However, the data obtained in this manner is far less enlightening than would be data from an accurate survey.

In King v. Harris, 464 F. Supp. 827, 840-41 (E.D.N.Y. 1979), the district court reviewed the action of HUD in placing a low-income
high-rise apartment complex in an area that had undergone a recent rapid increase in the number of resident minority families. HUD had relied on outdated 1970 census data taken prior to the demographic changes in the neighborhood, and HUD resisted obtaining more current data on its own. The court held that HUD acted arbitrarily and capriciously when it based its determination on outdated census statistics. Mere administrative convenience cannot justify the use of such data where the effect is to prolong and intensify an unhealthy situation, the court held. As a result, HUD was required to look beyond the census statistics and the census' arbitrary boundaries to ascertain the real changes in the neighborhood. Id. at 840-841.

While the King decision can be distinguished from the Park Forest situation, because HUD has an affirmative duty to determine the racial composition of an area so that its policies will foster stable integrated neighborhoods, see King v. Harris, supra at 841, the decision is still disquieting in its implications for other benign race-conscious programs using outdated or inaccurate information. The collection of racial information for legitimate purposes has been upheld by the courts for some time. Contractors Ass'n of Eastern Penn. v. Secretary of Labor, 442 F.2d 159, 166, 173 (3d Cir. 1971); Smith v. Board of Educ. of Morrilton Sch. Dist. No. 32, 365 F.2d 770, 779 (8th Cir. 1966); Hamm v. Virginia State Board of Elections, 230 F. Supp. 156, 158 (E.D. Va. 1964), aff'd sub nom., Tancil v. Woolls, 379 U.S. 19 (1964). It therefore seems prudent that the Village establish some permanent and ongoing mechanism to obtain current data on racial composition of neighborhoods it designates as underrepresented by persons of a specific race, and therefore
meriting affirmative action in the sale or rental of housing.

First Amendment Challenges

AMENDMENT. I.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establish­ment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a re­dress of grievances.

A real estate agent affected by the affirmative marketing program of Park Forest, or affected by the anti-steering testers used by the Village to ensure compliance with the Fair Housing Act, might allege that these programs interfered with his rights of free speech by re­quiring him to provide information to his clients in a selective fashion. See, e.g., Arquilla-DeHaan Realtors v. Village of Country Club Hills, No. 80 C 2070, slip op. (N.D. Ill. Oct. 31, 1980). An­other attack might be launched by the customers who allegedly were denied information. The first task in an analysis of this challenge is to determine whether the type of speech engaged in by the real estate salesman is protected by the First Amendment.

Until recently, the Supreme Court considered "commercial speech" such as advertising, unprotected by the First Amendment, and thus subject to regulation by state or federal laws without regard to in­fringement of free speech rights. See, e.g., Valentine v. Chrestensen, 316 U.S. 52, 54-55 (1942). Breard v. Alexandria, 341 U.S. 622, 642-43 (1951). Although individual Justices disagreed from time to time with the "commercial speech" exception to the First Amendment pro­tections, see, e.g., Cammarano v. United States, 358 U.S. 498, 514

In Bigelow v. Virginia, 421 U.S. 809 (1975), the Court overturned a conviction for violation of a Virginia statute outlawing the circulation of any publication encouraging or promoting abortions. While the Court noted that the Virginia courts erred in their assumptions that advertising, as such, was entitled to no First Amendment protection, id. at 825-26, the Court's ruling was not a clear refutation of the "commercial speech" doctrine because the advertisement did "more than simply propose a commercial transaction. It contained factual material of clear public interest." Id. at 822. In a later decision, Virginia Pharmacy Board v. Virginia Consumer Council, 425 U.S. 748 (1976), the Court again held that commercial speech was not wholly outside the protection of the First Amendment, this time in the context of a state law prohibiting advertising by pharmacists of prescription drug prices. Id. at 761. While the Court recognized that some restrictions could be placed on speech of a commercial nature, such as restrictions on the time, place and manner of the advertising, or prohibitions of false or misleading advertising, Id. at 770-72, the fact that speech was only of a commercial nature, and not of general public interest, did not in itself remove it from the protection of the First Amendment. Id. at 762.

The demise of the commercial speech doctrine was, therefore, virtually complete by the time the Supreme Court rendered its decision in Linmark Associates, Inc. v. Township of Willingboro, 431
U.S. 85 (1977). In Linmark, the Court was presented with a First Amendment challenge by a real estate broker to a township ordinance prohibiting the posting of real estate for-sale and sold signs. The ordinance had been enacted for the purpose of stemming white flight from the community after increasing numbers of blacks became residents. Id. at 87-88. In overturning the ordinance, the Court first found that the ordinance was not simply concerned with the place or manner of the prohibited speech for aesthetic values or any other value unrelated to the suppression of free speech. Instead, the township prohibited the signs precisely because it feared their primary effect, that people receiving the information would act on it. Id. at 94. The Court noted that where the township wished to regulate the content of the communication and not just its form, the township first must demonstrate a strong state interest to be served, and then, second, demonstrate that the ban was necessary to achieve the interest. Id. at 95.

The Court agreed that promotion of stable integrated housing was a sufficiently strong national goal to meet the first test, but disagreed that the ordinance was necessary to achieve the goal so as to satisfy the second test. Id. at 95. The Court found that the facts in Linmark were unpersuasive in demonstrating an actual panic among white residents, or that a ban of signs would halt the exodus if a panic existed. More seriously, however, was the township's action in denying information to residents that was neither false nor misleading, because it feared they would act on the information in a way inconsistent with the township's interest. Followed to its logical conclusion, such a doctrine would allow any community to suppress
information that reflected poorly on it. A better method, the Court held, was to open the channels of communication rather than close them, and provide enough additional information so that citizens could make an informed choice in their own self interests. *Id.* at 96-97.

The three recent Supreme Court cases indicate with substantial certainty that the Court would consider the information given by a real estate agent to his customers to be within at least some protections of the First Amendment, especially where the Village attempted to restrict the content, rather than the form, of the communications between the real estate agent and his clients. We must consider, then, whether the affirmative marketing program of the Village can survive the test articulated by the Court in *Linmark*: First, that a strong interest exists to justify the Village's actions, and second, that the actions themselves are necessary to achieve the interest.

The first test is easily met. The preservation of stable, integrated housing is an important national goal, as recognized in *Linmark* itself, *supra* at 95, and in the discussion earlier.

The second test, necessity of the program, has been discussed above with reference to the strict scrutiny test. As noted in that discussion, the marketing program is necessary to overcome the self-steering of prospective residents at the time they are actually making their decisions about housing. No other alternative action available to the Village would be as effective as direct input of housing "option expanding" information at this critical decision-making moment.

Perhaps even more significantly, the actions of Park Forest and the Housing Center can be distinguished from the ban of for-sale
signs adopted by Willingboro. Unlike that ordinance, which sought to limit information available to citizens of the township, the Park Forest program encourages intelligent decisions by prospective residents by opening the channels of communication and providing the information that will lead to an informed choice in the new resident's own interests. This approach is precisely in line with the suggestions of Linmark, supra at 97, and Virginia Pharmacy Board v. Virginia Consumer Council, 425 U.S. 748 770 (1976), and in accord with the First Amendment. The affirmative marketing program should, therefore, survive an attack under the First Amendment.

Challenge to the Jurisdiction of the Village

A final issue to be considered concerns the jurisdiction of the Village of Park Forest to take actions under its Integration Maintenance Program that have effects outside the borders of the Village. These actions include the testing of real estate firms whose offices are beyond the Village's borders, and the encouraging of real estate agents to refer clients to areas outside of Park Forest that are underrepresented by persons of the race of the client. Objections might be lodged by citizens of other communities, governmental units of other communities, or by citizens of Park Forest that these actions overstep the jurisdiction of Park Forest and that they are, therefore, a misuse of tax revenues.

Constitution, Ill. Const. art. VII, § 6(a) (1970). Section 11-11.1-1 provides, in relevant part:

The corporate authorities of any municipality may enact ordinances prescribing fair housing practices, establishing Fair Housing or Human Relations Commissions and standards for the operation of such Commissions in the administering and enforcement of such ordinances, prohibiting discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, creed, ancestry, national origin, or physical or mental handicap in the listing, sale, assignment, exchange, transfer, lease, rental or financing of real property for the purposes of the residential occupancy thereof, and prescribing penalties for violations of such ordinances.

The home rule provision of the Illinois Constitution provides, in relevant part:

A county which has a chief executive officer elected by the electors of the county and any municipality which has a population of more than 25,000 are home rule units. Other municipalities may elect by referendum to become home rule units. Except as limited by this Section, a home rule unit may exercise any power and perform any function pertaining to its government and affairs including, but not limited to, the power to regulate for the protection of public health, safety, morals and welfare; to license; to tax; and to incur debt.

While these provisions clearly legitimize enactment of a Fair Housing Ordinance within the Village of Park Forest, neither clearly grants the Village authority to go beyond its borders to serve the cause of open housing. We must, therefore, look further to find a legal basis for these extraterritorial actions.

Federal courts have often relied on the Fair Housing Act to uphold the authority of municipalities to use testers to check whether real estate salesmen comply with the anti-steering provisions of that
the use of testers by Park Forest, and they provide a basis for argument that other extraterritorial actions of the Village are similarly protected under the Fair Housing Act.

Federal courts have recognized that housing markets and neighborhoods transcend the political boundaries of governmental units. See, e.g., Hills v. Gautreaux, 425 U.S. 284, 299 and n.15 (1976). Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County, 402 U.S. 33 (1971). King v. Harris, 464 F. Supp. 827, 539 (E.D.N.Y. 1979). United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago, No. 80 C 5124, slip op. (N.D. Ill. Jan. 6, 1980) (Consent Decree provided for Chicago School Board to involve other local governments in the desegregation process, encourage voluntary interdistrict pupil transfers to promote integration in the larger metropolitan area, and required the Department of Justice to investigate the possibility that the school districts outside of Chicago may have acted in effect as a metropolitan school district and may have contributed to the segregation of Chicago schools.). The implication of these decisions is that the stability of integration in one area is dependent on the events occurring through the larger housing market.

Park Forest's experience substantiates this view. The rapid resegregation of the Beacon Hills and Forest Hills neighborhoods of Chicago Heights continues to depress white demand for housing in the adjacent areas of Park Forest. The influx of large numbers of minority children into the school system shared by Chicago Heights and Park Forest has, at times, placed additional stress on the racial stability of Park Forest. Clearly, the Village could not ignore these events simply because they occurred outside its political boundaries.
Further, the continued refusal of nearby suburbs to encourage entrance of minority residents limits the housing choices available to minority buyers, and increases the minority demand for housing in villages with an open housing policy, like Park Forest. The resultant increase in numbers of minority residents in Park Forest endangers the stability of the integration of Park Forest neighborhoods. Limiting Park Forest to efforts with effects only within the political boundaries of the Village itself ignores the effect within the Village of these actions by others outside. Such a limitation creates "the anomaly that the few communities conscientiously battling housing discrimination and racial prejudice are extremely vulnerable to tipping and eventual resegregation." Note, Benign Steering and Benign Quotas, 93 Harv. L. Rev. 938, 956-57 (1980), see, also, T. Clark, Blacks in Suburbs, 11 (1979). Unless the Village is allowed to attack the limitations on minority housing opportunities created by prejudicial actions of other neighborhoods external to the Village itself, but within the larger housing market, the stability of integration within Park Forest ultimately remains questionable, and the purposes of the Fair Housing Act are not served. Action by the Village to combat these housing abuses beyond its borders is therefore authorized by Sections 3601 and 3604 of the Fair Housing Act. 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 and 3604 (1977).

In addition, since the Village's actions are aimed at encouraging other persons, "in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected" by the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3617, the actions are not only consistent with the Act, they are affirmatively protected by the Act from interference, coercion, threats or intimidation.
by others. The district court in *Northside Realty Associates, Inc. v. Chapman*, 411 F. Supp. 1195, 1199 (N.D. Geo. 1976), held that the protection of Section 3617 included not only the right to be free of actual punishment for actions to aid others in exercise of their fair housing rights, but the right to be free from any attempt to punish the actions. The court granted removal to federal court of a civil suit by real estate agents against testers in the state court, since the testers had a right to be free of any prosecution in state court for their actions to guarantee minority housing rights under the Fair Housing Act. Id. at 1199. A similar interpretation of Park Forest's rights under the act would insure that any challenge to the jurisdiction of Park Forest's Integration Maintenance Program would be heard by the federal courts under the Fair Housing Act, and not by state courts under state laws. The decisions discussed above regarding the Fair Housing Act would, therefore, likely be controlling in any determination of the Village's authority to act beyond its borders.

A final argument should be considered, that the extraterritorial actions of Park Forest may be not only consistent with the Fair Housing Act and protected by it, but actually mandated by the Act. At present, the affirmative marketing program encourages real estate sales staff to refer minority buyers to areas other than Park Forest where minority residents are underrepresented. Thus, minority persons searching for housing in the south suburbs of Cook County are aided by the marketing program in finding alternate housing at the same time as they are encouraged not to take up residence in areas where other minority persons already live. The minority buyer's overall freedom of choice is therefore not denied by the affirmative
marketing program. If, however, the program simply encouraged the prospective minority resident not to seek housing in Park Forest without offering alternate choices in other suburban areas, the prospective resident might easily be left with only the housing choice of residing in an existing ghetto. The chance of living in an integrated community might be effectively denied him.

While the courts have recognized that it may be necessary to limit some immediate minority opportunities to achieve longer range beneficial results, Parent Association of Andrew Jackson High School v. Ambach, 598 F.2d 705, 719 (2d Cir. 1979); Barrick Realty, Inc. v. City of Gary, Indiana, 491 F.2d 161, (7th Cir. 1974); Otero v. New York Housing Authority, 484 F.2d 1122, 1125, 1134 (2d Cir. 1973); Shannon v. Department of HUD, 436 F.2d 809, 812, 820-21 (3d Cir. 1970); King v. Harris, 464 F. Supp. 827, 837 (E.D.N.Y. 1979); Zuch v. Hussey, 394 F. Supp. 1028, 1050 (E.D. Mich. 1975), none of the courts has placed the entire burden of desegregation on minority persons. An affirmative marketing program that was insensitive to the continuing segregation of neighboring white communities might easily fail the strict-scrutiny test, and be disallowed by the courts altogether. It is therefore possible that efforts by Park Forest to deflect minority purchasers and renters from Village neighborhoods, without concurrent good-faith efforts by the Village to open up the closed communities nearby, would violate the aims of the Fair Housing Act. This view strongly suggests that the extraterritorial actions of the Village of Park Forest should continue as a component of the Integration Maintenance Program.
Implications for Other Actions

As challenges are mounted in the courts against integration maintenance programs around the nation, the courts may articulate a more relaxed standard of review for the programs than the strict scrutiny test employed in this analysis. One possible test discussed earlier was the less demanding, intermediate standard used by the four concurring Justices in Bakke. In the absence of such an expression by the courts, however, prudence dictates that any new component being considered for inclusion in the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program be evaluated in light of the strict scrutiny test.

It is the nature of the strict scrutiny test that greater justification is needed for greater intrusion by the state into the protected rights and privileged of citizens. Where less intrusive practices would serve essentially the same governmental purposes, the courts invariably disallow the more intrusive methods.

The implication of this standard for Park Forest's Integration Maintenance Program is that so long as the current methods suffice to prevent danger of resegregation of the Village's neighborhoods, more aggressive methods will not be allowed if those methods intrude upon protected rights and privileges. By the same token, if conditions change, and resegregation becomes more likely, more aggressive and intrusive practices might survive the strict scrutiny test.

This does not imply, however, that no changes can occur in the Integration Maintenance Program unless the external situation deteriorates. Some conceivable programs might be no more intrusive than the current program, such as an increase in the direct counseling efforts by the Housing Center to potential residents of the Village.
and surrounding areas. Other programs would not intrude upon any protected rights or privileges, such as advertising efforts to picture the Village as a wholesome place to live, or an increase in Village efforts to rehabilitate deteriorated or abandoned houses. Generally, such increases in the current program would not be likely to fail the strict scrutiny test.

It is instructive to consider how the strict scrutiny test might be applied to some more intrusive measures. One possible measure that the Village might enact would be a ban of real estate for-sale signs from the lawn of Park Forest residences. Such bans have been reviewed by the courts in two major cases. In Barrick Realty, Inc. v. City of Gary, Indiana, 491 F.2d 161 (7th Cir. 1974), the Seventh Circuit upheld such a ban. The court found that the ban was necessary to halt a wave of panic selling by white residents that was caused by the presence of large numbers of for-sale signs. The wave of panic selling justified the intrusion by the city on First Amendment rights. Id. at 163-64.

In Linmark Associates, Inc. v. Township of Willingboro, 431 U.S. 85 (1977), the Supreme Court passed upon a similar ban enacted by the defendant township. In overruling the ban of for-sale signs, the Court noted that the record did not establish that a wave of panic selling existed in the township, and did not establish that the ban would be effective in halting the exodus if in fact a panic did exist. Id. at 95. The Court went further, however, in implying that no sign ban would be allowed where it denied citizens information that was neither false nor misleading. Id. at 97. The Court clearly
preferred methods that opened up communication to those that closed off information from the public.

These two decisions taken together emphasize the importance of the factual situation to the operation of strict scrutiny by the judiciary. Where the situation warranted a ban on the signs in Barrick, the court upheld the ban. In Linmark, by contrast, the factual context failed to establish the existence of a panic, and the ban no longer survived the Court's scrutiny.

Additionally, the Court in Linmark articulated a serious reservation about any ban of information in the absence of an emergency. Id. at 97. The implication of this reservation is that future sign bans will be viewed as very intrusive on First Amendment rights, and will only be justified by the most clear and serious of threats to an important state interest. The Court reserved judgment on whether the facts of Barrick Realty would be sufficient in future cases to meet this higher standard. Id. at 95 n.9. Given the serious reservations of the Court, total bans of real estate signs should only be enacted by Park Forest in the most compelling of circumstances, where the facts can demonstrate the existence of a panic directly attributable to the placing of the real estate signs on Park Forest lawns.

Another possible action by Park Forest might be an adoption of an outright quota system for minority residency in some neighborhoods. A quota system differs from the current affirmative marketing program primarily in its non-voluntary nature. Where sales or rental decisions are made in violation of a quota, the Village would intervene to prevent the transaction. Various types of quota systems are possible. One system might simply establish a maximum ratio of
minority residents that would be permitted to inhabit a given area. Another system might be defined in terms of the proximity of black residents to one another, and establish some minimum distance that must exist between residences occupied by minority families. Yet another system might require that sales be exclusively to either black or white families whenever the ratios of either group fell below a certain figure. Still other systems might be defined in terms of the numbers of persons referred to view the housing, the "traffic" in real estate sales jargon, rather than the actual numbers of persons who take up residency. These quotas might be imposed on real estate firms rather than on the buyers or sellers of housing, and require certain ratios of minority families be offered the property, but not require that the actual sale or rental be made to a person of any specific race. Such a system would essentially be a non-voluntary version of the present affirmative marketing program. Obviously some of these quota systems are more intrusive than others; all are more intrusive on individual rights than current Park Forest programs.

Racial quotas can be classified either as restrictive quotas, which limit access of minorities, or as affirmative action quotas which reserve certain opportunities exclusively for minorities, effectively restricting access of majority persons. The courts have reviewed benign restrictive racial quotas primarily in housing project cases. Affirmative action quotas have been reviewed mainly in context of affirmative action programs designed to recruit minorities to offset racial imbalance.

Restrictive racial quotas in residential housing have been allowed by the courts in certain housing projects financed by HUD,
where the quotas were necessary to prevent tipping of the neighborhood where the project was located. See, e.g., Otero v. New York City Housing Authority, 484 F.2d 112, 1136 (2d Cir. 1973) (accepting in principle that the housing authority could refuse housing to families on racial grounds where granting them housing would probably lead to eventual ghettoization of the community). Additionally, HUD is required to consider the impact of proposed housing projects on neighborhoods, and to avoid concentrating projects in areas already containing large concentrations of minority or low-income persons. See, e.g., Hills v. Gautreaux, 425 U.S. 284, 302 (1976); Karlen v. Harris, 590 F.2d 39, 43 (2d Cir. 1978); Shannon v. United States Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, 436 F.2d 809 (3d Cir. 1970). This might be viewed as a type of quota, inasmuch as projects avoid areas where excessive numbers of minorities already live, and prospective tenants are not given the opportunity of living in the avoided area. HUD's actions therefore restrict entry of persons to neighborhoods where their race is overrepresented.

In many ways, the housing project quotas are the closest analogy to quotas on private residential housing. In both cases the aim of the quota is to reduce the danger of white flight and prevent tipping of the neighborhood. The quotas that HUD is allowed to use, however, are linked with the affirmative duty to integrate neighborhoods placed on HUD by the Congress. See, Hills v. Gautreaux, 425 U.S. 284, 302-03 (1976); Graves v. Romney, 502 F.2d 1062, 1063 (8th Cir. 1974); Otero v. N.Y.C. Housing Authority, 484 F.2d 1122, 1125 (2d Cir. 1973); King v. Harris, 464 F. Supp. 827, 837 (E.D.N.Y. 1979); City of Hartford v. Hills, 408 F. Supp. 889, 897 (D. Conn. 1976). This affirmative duty
obligates HUD and the housing authorities "to promote racial integra-
tion even though this may in some instances not operate to the imme-
diate advantage of some non-white persons." Otero v. N.Y.C. Housing
Authority, supra at 1125. No such duty is placed on the Village of
Park Forest, however, and in its absence, the Village does not have
the same congressional mandate to limit the freedom of minority per-
sons that HUD and the housing authorities have. The Supreme Court
has never considered whether the Fair Housing Act allows imposition
of benign restrictive racial quotas on private residential housing to
preserve the integrated character of neighborhoods.

Benign affirmative action racial quotas have been the subject
of several recent Supreme Court decisions concerned with forms of
discrimination other than residential housing. These decisions, how-
ever, have failed to establish clear constitutional guidelines for
benign racial quotas.

In University of California Regents v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1977),
the Court held that a medical school admissions program reserving
sixteen of one hundred spaces in each incoming class for economi-
cally or educationally disadvantaged non-whites was an impermissible racial
quota. Id. at 319-20. There was no majority opinion in Bakke, how-
ever, only several separate opinions concurring in the result. Four
Justices, Chief Justice Burger, and Justices Stevens, Stewart and
Rehnquist, based their decisions on the language and legislative his-
tory of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d
(1976), and did not reach constitutional issues. They argued that
the statute mandated "color-blind" state actions, and forbade all
actions to benefit one race at the expense of another. The five
remaining Justices did adopt a constitutional analysis, and their opinions are of interest for racial quotas in residential housing.

Justice Powell in Bakke took issue with the University over its unilateral determination that a generalized societal discrimination against blacks justified an affirmative action quota. Determination that discrimination existed should be made by judicial or legislative bodies, not by isolated educational institutions, so that the impact of remedial measures on innocent parties could be minimized. Id. at 307-09. In order to justify relief, the discrimination must be traced to its source, and the relief must be tailored to the type of discrimination that had occurred. Id. at 307-09. Justice Powell found no evidence in the record that the University's admissions policies had been racially biased prior to the adoption of the special admission quota. Justice Powell rejected an argument that the racially disparate impact of the earlier admission program standing alone could justify such a quota. Disparate impact analysis was only appropriate to cases of employment discrimination arising under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e (1976), where Congress had determined that disparate impact could be traced to specific sources of discrimination. Under Title VI, however, findings of discrimination must precede the fashioning of remedies. Id. at 307-09. Since no such finding had been made in Bakke, the University could not adopt a racial quota as a remedy.

Justices Brennan, White, Marshall and Blackmun disagreed that the Constitution required a color-blind standard in the absence of a legislative or judicial finding of discriminatory state action. Id. at 327. Instead, affirmative action plans should be permitted
wherever there is a reasonable finding of generalized societal discrimination. Id. at 362. The Justices concluded that the low percentage of minority persons in the medical profession was due to societal discrimination, and justified the University's admission policy. Id. at 365-66. The University could only achieve its goal of recruiting minority students by restricting the sixteen class spaces to non-whites. Otherwise, the number of applications from white economically disadvantaged students would have overwhelmed the number of non-white applicants. Id. at 376-77. The University admission policy therefore should survive scrutiny by the Court.

Although Bakke does not establish a per se ban on racial quotas, the overruling of the University's affirmative action admission policy casts a shadow on other benign racial quotas adopted without express judicial or congressional findings of state discrimination. Racial quotas adopted by Park Forest, of course, might be predicted on findings by the Village Board that past housing discrimination had occurred. These findings might be buttressed by court decisions finding some local real estate agents guilty of racial steering. It is unclear, however, whether these findings would be sufficient to justify racial quotas that limited black access to housing. A remedy more closely tailored to the discrimination by real estate agents and homesellers would appear to be one that expanded access to the housing market by minorities. Quotas guaranteeing access to the market might, therefore, be somewhat easier to justify to the Court than quotas limiting access. Both types of racial quotas, however, would be subject to strict scrutiny by the Court, and would only be approved if other, less intrusive measures were ineffective.
Two decisions of the Supreme Court subsequent to Bakke reinforce the conclusion that the Court has not banned all racial quotas. In United Steelworkers of America v. Weber, 443 U.S. 193 (1979), the Court upheld a voluntary affirmative action training program that reserved 50% of all training openings for blacks. The plan had been negotiated between the Steelworkers and Kaiser, and was intended to remedy the low percentage of minority skilled employees in the Gramercy plant (1.83%) despite the high percentage of minority persons in the local workforce (39%). Kaiser did not claim the company had discriminated in its hiring policies, so the plan was not clearly a remedy for past discrimination.

Writing for the majority, Justice Brennan took judicial notice of past discrimination against blacks in the craft unions. Id. at 198 note 1. Since the affirmative action plan did not involve governmental action, there was no issue involving the Fourteenth Amendment as in Bakke. The narrow issue presented to the Court was whether Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e (1976), forbade voluntary plans to remedy generalized societal discrimination. Id. at 200. The majority reviewed the legislative history of Title VII and concluded that the Congress did not intend to "condemn all private, voluntary, race-conscious affirmative action plans." Id. at 208. Chief Justice Burger and Justice Rehnquist dissented, concluding that Title VI forbade any discrimination in employment on the basis of race, even where the discrimination was intended to correct racial imbalance. Id. at 230.

Although both the majority decision and the dissent in Weber were based on the statutory language of Title VII, the decision has
implications for racial quotas in other areas. First, a majority of Justices in Weber were willing to accept generalized societal discrimination as a justification for a remedial quota, without any specific finding that the parties affected by the quota had themselves engaged in any prohibited discriminatory conduct. Second, Chief Justice Burger and Justice Rehnquist appear to read narrowly the permissible actions allowed by both Title VI in *Bakke* and Title VII in *Weber* to correct racial imbalance. This view was shared by Justices Stewart and Stevens in *Bakke*. Justice Stewart, however, did not read Title VII in *Weber* to require color-blind actions by employers. A similarly narrow reading if applied to the Fair Housing Act might prohibit racial quotas in residential housing altogether.

In *Fullilove v. Klutznick*, 100 S. Ct. 2758 (1980), the Court reviewed the constitutionality of the "minority business enterprise" provision of the Public Works Employment Act of 1977, 42 U.S.C § 6705(f)(2), which reserved 10% of each federal grant under the Act for use by minority business enterprises. A divided Court reminiscent of *Bakke* upheld the provision. As in *Bakke*, the rationales offered by the Justices differed widely from one another.

Chief Justice Burger, joined by Justices White and Powell, found that the Congress had made reasonable findings that the low percentage of minority businesses was caused by discrimination, *Id.* at 2768, and the provision was aimed at correcting this discrimination. *Id.* 2769. Both the objective of remedying the past discrimination, *Id.* at 2773 and 2775, and the means chosen to remedy the discrimination, the minority business provision, *Id.* at 2777, were within Congress's powers.
Justice Powell, in a separate concurring opinion, applied the same strict scrutiny test to the minority business provision that he had used earlier in Bakke, and concluded the provision was a "reasonably necessary means of furthering the compelling governmental interest in redressing the discrimination that affects minority contractors." Id. at 2794. Justice Powell specifically refused to limit Congress to the least intrusive alternative available to remedy the discrimination. Id. at 2794 note 14. He noted, however, that "the degree of specificity required in the findings of discrimination and the breadth of discretion in the choice of remedies may vary with the nature and authority of a governmental body." Id. Justice Powell did not clarify further the degree of discretion he might allow governmental units such as the Village of Park Forest to determine the existence of discrimination and to fashion a remedy.

Justice Marshall, joined by Justices Brennan and Blackmun, concurred with the decision, utilizing the same test that they had applied in Bakke: the racial classification must serve important government purposes, and be substantially related to those purposes. Id. at 2796. Justices Stewart and Rehnquist dissented, holding that the Constitution required government to be wholly neutral in its actions; and color-blind to the race of its citizens. Id. at 2798. Justice Stevens disagreed that the Constitution absolutely prohibited racial classifications, Id. at 2811, but he nevertheless dissented from the majority. The minority business provision was adopted with such little debate in Congress, and it was so sweeping in scope, that Justice Stevens concluded the provision was not narrowly tailored to the discrimination that may have occurred. Id. at 2813.
The line of decisions from Bakke to Fullilove suggests that a majority of the Supreme Court has not entirely closed the door to racial quotas. Only two Justices found a constitutional prohibition of racial quotas in Fullilove, although two additional Justices found a similar statutory prohibition in the language of Title VI in Bakke. Four Justices in Bakke, and three in Fullilove, clearly grant government bodies some discretion in the choice of racial quotas to remedy generalized societal discrimination, and Justice Powell in Fullilove implied that he too would not always restrict government bodies to the least intrusive alternative available. Beyond this, however, no clear guideline emerges from the deeply divided Court. The law in this area is still being defined.

Prudence suggests that in an area of such legal uncertainty, the Village should only consider a racial quota in the most compelling circumstances. Although some of the Justices have implied a willingness to allow government bodies the discretion to adopt quotas even where less intrusive measures might be effective, the extent of this discretion remains undefined. The Village should not, therefore, rely on the Court's granting discretion to the Village to adopt a quota in any circumstances where less intrusive measures may be effective. This is especially true if the Village is contemplating a quota that restricts access to housing on a racial basis. The decisions from Bakke to Fullilove dealt with affirmative action racial quotas that granted access to minorities. The Court is likely to look more closely at restrictive quotas, and require greater showings of necessity to justify them.
Two of the decisions provide some clues to the type of evidence that the Court might find persuasive for a finding that the quota was necessary. In Bakke, Justice Brennan would have upheld the medical school's affirmative admissions policy based on the statistical underrepresentation of minorities in the medical profession and the general disabilities in education suffered by blacks. 438 U.S. at 362-66. Justice Powell, on the other hand, was unpersuaded that the special admissions program was justified because nothing in the record demonstrated that the grades or test scores used by the school in the regular admission program were racially or culturally biased. Id. at 308 note 44. This suggests that arguments justifying a racial quota in residential housing might demonstrate the statistical underrepresentation of minorities in some areas and the overrepresentation in others, coupled with some indication that the unequal distribution of races was caused by unlawful discrimination.

In Fullilove, the Court noted that an earlier version of the Public Works Act had been ineffective in awarding grants to minorities in areas of high unemployment. 100 S. Ct. at 2764-65. Extensive debate in Congress made clear that the Congress had determined the low percentage of minority grants was caused by the longstanding barriers impairing access by minority business to public contracting opportunities, Id. at 2767, and that the minority business provision was intended to correct this discrimination. Id. at 2769. This suggests that racial quotas in residential housing ought to be clearly based on determinations by the legislative body that racial underrepresentation was caused by discrimination, and that the quota was fashioned to cure the problem.
In conclusion, it should be reemphasized that intrusive measures such as racial quotas or bans of real estate signs are unlikely to survive judicial review if less intrusive measures might be able to achieve the same results. A precondition to adoption of such measures should be the failure of less intrusive present integration maintenance programs. The most persuasive argument for intrusive measures might demonstrate rapid racial change of neighborhoods despite integration maintenance efforts.
III. KEY INFORMANT SURVEYS

In order to gain additional insight into the Village Integration Maintenance Program, a number of personal interviews were conducted by the Housing Research and Development staff with key citizens and professionals who either work or live in Park Forest. Twenty-three individuals were selected and surveyed from a list of about fifty persons which had been forwarded to the research team from the Assistant Village Manager with the approval of the Board of Trustees. The interviews were carried out during three days in January and February. These "key informants" included realtors, school personnel, business and civic leaders, Village trustees and Village staff. Although it was originally intended that we would use a structured questionnaire, we soon found that it was most useful to concentrate on a few salient issues and thus keep the interviews as informative and informal as possible. The six key issues discussed below were largely identified by the informants themselves. The comments presented represent only the opinions of the key informants; they do not reflect views held by the Housing Research and Development Program.

Importance of Integration Maintenance Program

When asked to discuss the importance of the Integration Maintenance Program, most of the key informants had positive responses. The most important functions of the program, as viewed by the key informants, seem to be those of education, responding to inquiries, and monitoring rental and real estate activities. It was generally felt that the real estate industry is a large cause of the problem the Village has maintaining a stable racial composition; without the Program the Village would be likely to go all black as a result of realty firms' actions. Thus, auditing and
litigation are viewed to be the most expedient means of preventing that result. The opinion was also expressed that the Integration Maintenance Program was necessary to generate an awareness of racism, both social and economic, in order to prevent people from acting in biased ways.

The above are generally philosophical reasons why the Integration Maintenance Program is viewed as necessary. Some key informants also indicated that there are programmatic functions which are important. The purpose of the program was defined by several people as that of maintaining traffic in the housing market that is representative of the metropolitan area, and not to give special treatment to any one group. One of the ways to fulfill this purpose is by monitoring the changes in racial composition to always know where the "problems" lie (by "problems", we assume, the respondents meant the potential for resegregation). The view was also expressed that it is necessary to prevent both the clustering of minorities and an increase in the percentage of minorities.

Several people attached qualifications on their positive assessments of the Program. The rationale behind these qualified positive views is that market forces have the greatest influence on residential living patterns, not an Integration Maintenance Program. Therefore, the Program is viewed as necessary just to break down the initial barriers to minority in-migration, but then the market should be allowed to work alone, despite the consequences.

Regional Aspects

One of the key facets of the Integration Maintenance Program, according to the Village staff, is its emphasis on the whole South Suburban region, rather than only the municipal boundaries of the Village of Park Forest. When asked to comment on this emphasis, however, the key informants' views
were quite mixed. Several people did feel that stable racial integration is a national problem that cannot be solved on a wholly localized basis. These people felt that a regionalized plan is the only way to eliminate the possibility of residents being able to run somewhere if they want to live in a racially homogeneous community.

More of the key informants, however, felt that the Village of Park Forest should not have to bear the full burden of integration maintenance activities, that there had to be some way to get other municipalities involved without direct interference by Park Forest. Several ways to achieve this end were given, including: providing leadership and an example to follow, without coercion, and allowing agencies such as the South Suburban Housing Center to be the principal actors in the program. One key informant felt that the Village should not get involved in integration maintenance activities, it should not even give financial support to agencies that work on a region-wide basis. This person indicated that this philosophy should be maintained even if it results in resegregation.

Real Estate Industry Impact

It has already been noted that the real estate industry is viewed as the major threat to the maintenance of a stable racial composition; this is borne out by the opinions of the key informants. They claimed that real estate agents have the greatest influence on the racial composition in a municipality and can actually resegregate a community by their actions. Even a real estate broker among the key informants made such a statement. Most lay informants further stated that real estate agents have exercised this potential to some extent by steering and it is the job of the Integration Maintenance Program to control this. However, many of the key informants felt that the existing relationship between the real estate
firms and the Park Forest staff who administer the program is not a constructive one. One key informant said that the original intent of the Integration Maintenance Program was to maintain a working relationship with the real estate broker and staff in the area, an intent that has been lost. Several people expressed the opinion that the success of the Program lies in this cooperation and Park Forest's biggest mistake was in alienating the real estate firms because they are the key to avoiding clustering and maintaining representative traffic. It was pointed out that the friction between the real estate agents and the Village may be a result of a long-standing misunderstanding as to what real estate agents are doing. According to this key informant, the principle of benign steering requires real estate agents to act against their clients (the sellers), when their job is to increase their clients' options by matching needs and ability to pay with available housing.

The most common opinions on the subject of the real estate agents' part in this Program are that they must be prevented from manipulating the housing choices of residents. At the same time, the respondents noted that the "benign" kind of manipulation for integration must also be avoided. Above all, the respondents felt that prevention of all forms of influencing housing choice should be achieved by real estate brokers and the Village cooperating with each other.

Other Problems Identified

During the course of the interview, many key informants expressed the opinion that there were other problems the Village faced which are at least as important as maintaining stable racial integration. These other problems involve issues concerning the Village's image, its economic decline, as well as other race-related issues.
In some respects the Village's image problem is often seen as being a result of the Integration Maintenance Program. Some of the key informants felt that all the publicity which the Program receives draws minorities to the Village, and thus makes it more difficult to maintain stable residential patterns. Part of the image problem within the Village is seen as a result of dissension within Village Hall and the fact that the Village too often acts without input from the residents. Then, there are image problems, which affect the Integration Maintenance Program, that are the result of the whole South Suburban region being viewed in a particular way that is less favorable than the image held of the West and North Suburbs. These image problems clearly must be solved on a region-wide basis.

The key informants also perceived many important economic-base related problems, outstanding among them being the Plaza. The delivery of services in general must be kept high in order to maintain the traffic needed to ensure a stable racially integrated community. In the natural evolution of the Village, it is felt the demographic composition is becoming older, more blue collar and minority. This change could be a result of the image problem discussed above, it could be a result of a declining economic base; whatever the cause, it too is making the job of the Integration Maintenance staff more difficult. One positive feature of the Village's economic base which was mentioned by many key informants is the existence of cooperative housing. This alternative is seen as being attractive to potential new residents.

Finally, several key informants did note that, despite the Integration Maintenance Program, a racial problem exists in Park Forest. Although the housing is integrated, the races are still socially segregated, a fact which has been noted in the schools, in the shopping centers, and on the
streets. Although a tough problem to solve, everyone who mentioned it felt it was a high priority problem which needed to be addressed immediately.

**Use of the Term**

The term "integration maintenance" has also received considerable criticism, the greatest being a simple lack of understanding of its definition. Many key informants expressed the feeling that this misunderstanding represents a real problem when residents form the wrong conclusions about the Program's intent.

**Informing the Public**

The above issue leads to the final key issue, that of the need to disseminate more information throughout the Village as to what the Village staff actually does to maintain integration. Most of the key informants believe that too few of the residents of Park Forest could define "integration maintenance", and many attempts to define it would be wrong. These same informants believe that information about the program should be made more available so that residents can be aware of what the Village is doing.

When it comes to advertising outside the municipal boundaries, however, informants did not believe that the program should be given too much public attention. These people felt that many in-migrants choose Park Forest based on economic considerations not racial considerations. Thus, over-advertising would not help in attracting these potential new families. On the other hand, they felt that heavy advertising of the Integration Maintenance Program does attract a disproportionate number of minorities to the community who fear racial discrimination elsewhere. Thus, they
felt that heavy advertising outside the municipal boundaries actually worked against the long-run goals of stable racial integration.

These six key issues involving the program's importance, its area of operation; the impact of real estate agents; other worries with which the Village must deal; the use of the term "integration maintenance" and the validity of disseminating information about the program should be evaluated on the basis which they were identified. The people we interviewed were leaders in their particular fields and therefore we assumed they would have a well-informed overview of the community. They were residents of the Village who we believed would be most capable of telling us what the most salient issues in the community are and how the Integration Maintenance Program affects the community. Their opinions, thus, may not be highly representative, but they present the Village's needs and Integration Maintenance Program problems as viewed by highly influential and often powerful people in the community.
IV. LOCAL PRIMARY SURVEY RESULTS

Two separate surveys of residents were designed as part of the analysis of the Park Forest Integration Maintenance Program; one deals with New Residents (length of residency two years or less), the other with Residents (length of residency more than two years). The New Resident survey was designed to yield a profile of recent movers into the Village, it had five goals;

1) To discern the interracial buyer patterns and characteristics of recent movers to Park Forest.
2) To help determine the size and character of the housing market being considered by households choosing Park Forest.
3) To determine the manner in which new residents found their home.
4) To determine the reasons why new residents are choosing Park Forest over other municipalities, and
5) To determine the impact of IM activities on recent movers.

The Resident survey is designed to measure attitudes and perceptions of long-term residents regarding the community, interracial trends, and the IM program goals and activities. Wherever possible, the Resident survey was designed to allow comparison with the 1974 Jaffe survey of Park Forest residents.

The Sampling and Interview Scheme

The research team felt 300 interviews of randomly selected heads of households from among both the new and long-term residents would allow adequate representation, crosstabulation of variables and comparability with the Jaffe study. In both cases we over sampled to 400 in order to cover refusals and unavailable or ineligible respondents.
Four hundred respondents represents close to 100 percent of the new residents entering Park Forest over the past two years. The desired 300 long-term resident respondents would cover 3.6 percent of the total households in Park Forest.

As researchers, we only budgeted for the design of the survey instrument and analysis of the survey responses. The Village of Park Forest was left with the responsibility of administering the questionnaires. Through consultation with the Village staff, we decided to administer the questionnaires by telephone using voluntary interviewers who were members of the Park Forest Commission on Human Relations, and other Village residents who had volunteered to help with the interviewing. We arranged for an evening training session for the interviewers with an expert from the University of Illinois Survey Research Laboratory. The original interviewer design was to have 15 to 20 interviewers each completing 30 to 40 interviews over a two month period (December 1980 - January 1981). The new resident sample was assembled from computerized water hook-up records. Each new water connection was presumed to be a new resident. We felt oversampling by 100 would cover ineligible respondents including water shutoffs and reconnections for various reasons where the resident did not move as well as moves by long-term residents within Park Forest. The long-term resident sample was assembled by phoning every 15th resident listed in the R. H. Donnelly reverse telephone directory. The reverse telephone directory lists phone numbers in order of street address instead of the last name of the resident.

Actual Surveys Completed

The use of volunteers to complete a major survey involving as many as 600 telephone interviews carries considerable risk of which both the Village
### TABLE IV - PARK FOREST SURVEY RESPONSE RATES

#### New Resident Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total questionnaires/respondents</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refusals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response after three tries</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interview postponed three times</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineligible as a new resident</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys not attempted</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected completed rate had all interviews been attempted</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed interviews as a percent of projected completions</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Resident Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total questionnaires/respondents</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refusals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response after three tries</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interview postponed three times</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineligible as a new respondent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys not attempted</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected completion rate had all interviews been attempted</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed interviews as a percent of projected completions</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and researchers were aware in advance. Due to a poor effort on the part of some volunteers, the interview time was extended six weeks. Still, by the middle of March, when we began to analyze the completed returns, we had only 42 new resident respondents and 91 resident respondents. Table IV-1 shows the response rate. Two points are noteworthy. First, 86 percent of the new resident interviews and 69 percent of the long-term resident interviews were never attempted. Second, of the interviews that were attempted, the rate of refusals, incomplete and ineligible responses was much higher than expected. Even if all the surveys had been attempted the project completion rate would have only been 50 percent for the New Resident surveys and 89 percent for the Resident surveys.

The 91 Resident and 42 New Resident surveys completed represent a far smaller sample than we had anticipated. Nevertheless, we feel these responses represent a random sample of the two survey universes because those volunteers who completed interviews were assigned random addresses. The small number of respondents does, however, increase the probability of sampling error. Evidence of this error, which we feel is minor, will be discussed below in a section entitled "Are the Samples Representative?".

**Error Introduced by Sampling Technique**

The use of water hook-ups to identify new residents should introduce no bias. All new residents are apparently included using this method. The only problem is that a large number of non-moves and moves within Park Forest are also included using this method. However, since we terminated all interviews resulting from water hook-ups that were not related to a new mover into Park Forest no sampling bias is anticipated. Sampling bias could result from the use of telephone interviews. If either the new or long-term residents did not have a telephone or a publicly listed telephone
number they were missed by this survey technique. There are basically six reasons for not having a telephone or a listed phone number:

1) too poor to afford a telephone,
2) temporary phone disconnection at time phone directory printed,
3) recent movers not yet listed in the phone directory,
4) unlisted number for security reasons,
5) unlisted for job related reasons, and
6) unlisted number for status/privacy reasons.

It is felt that for one or more of the listed reasons a sizeable number of households in Park Forest do not have publicly listed telephone numbers. Therefore, the possibility of bias in the Resident survey could be due to an inability to contact residents whose phone numbers were not listed in the directory.

Are the Samples Representative?

Before analyzing specific survey findings with regard to Integration Maintenance, we will look at the basic characteristics of the respondents to determine if they are representative of the Park Forest population. We cannot make a definitive comparison of sample and actual population because we lack the data. However, given the small sample sizes we will be analyzing it is important to empirically test whether the samples are a "reasonable" representation of Park Forest based on available statistics.

Tables IV-2 and IV-3 present basic household and housing characteristics as found in the two resident samples. We feel the percent black households in the samples underrepresents the black population in Park Forest based on 1980 census counts. Preliminary census findings show 12.1 percent of the Park Forest population as black. Admittedly, percent of households is not the same as percent of population, and as shown in Table IV-2, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Long-Term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent black household</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average income per household</td>
<td>$22,773</td>
<td>$24,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of adult respondent</td>
<td>31.5 years</td>
<td>43.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average education of adult respondent</td>
<td>2.4 years of college</td>
<td>2.2 years of college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average education of spouse if husband/wife household</td>
<td>3.0 years of college</td>
<td>1.9 years of college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed as professional, technical or managerial</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td>2.9 persons</td>
<td>3.2 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black household size</td>
<td>3.5 persons</td>
<td>3.3 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- husband/wife headed</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- single person</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- one parent</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other multiple adult non-husband/wife</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- public schools</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- private schools</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- no children over 18</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV - 3

BASIC HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW AND LONG-TERM RESIDENTS
RESPONDING TO THE PARK FOREST SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where lived before:</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Long-Term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other south suburbs</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other metropolitan suburbs</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>not asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside of metropolitan suburbs</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of housing moving from/to:</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single family</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rental apartment</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condominium</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all other</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing tenure:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rent</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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black households sampled had a larger average household size than the overall sample. However, this difference is not enough to entirely account for the lower number of black respondents in the samples. Our next question was whether the black representation would have been higher had we completed more surveys. We think not. Both the Jaffe study in 1974 and a study conducted by University of Illinois students last year produced similar small numbers of black respondents. In the Jaffe study only 3.7 percent of the respondents were black households at a time (1974) when the black population was estimated at between 6.3 percent and 7.3 percent. This is actually a worse ratio of black household to black population than our survey produced even though it included 300 respondents. Literally all the other data is reasonable when matched with comparable data. The average income of the older resident sample is $24,899. This is what we expected given the I M staff estimate of medium income at $24,350 in 1978. Average age of the adult respondents is just a few years older than the Jaffe figures. Since the Village has aged seven years since the Jaffe study this makes sense.

Jaffe found the average educational level attained by respondents to be 2.4 years of college. Our findings are similar; 2.2 years of college for long-term residents; 2.4 years for new residents. Jaffe found 3.8 persons per household; this was slightly higher than our sample, meaning that the number of one and two person households without children has increased, a reasonable trend given the fact that the Village has aged. The percent of school age children in the two studies is also comparable given the seven year difference in samples. Housing type and tenure are reasonable but do not match Village figures exactly. Representation of cooperatives is just about right, however single family and ownership tenure are overrepresented while rental apartments and rental tenure are
underrepresented. This bias happens frequently in residential surveys and a larger sample would probably not have made a difference. Single family homeowners may be more willing to participate in surveys which they feel can effect their investment, or they may have an adult member home more often, or renters (who move more often) are more likely not to have their current phone number listed and therefore more renters are missed in a telephone survey. We are not sure what causes this particular bias toward more owner respondents. Overall we are pleased with the sample and feel it is representative of Park Forest despite the small sample size. As was stated earlier, we are confident that the completed surveys were randomly selected so that they should be as representative of the population as statistically possible given the sample size.

Characteristics of the New Resident Sample

The first question to be addressed by the New Resident survey was the characteristics of these residents. To do this, return to Tables IV-2 and IV-3. A concern voiced by various people throughout the Village is that the newest in-migrants are poorer, less educated, more often renters, and have larger households. Except for the rental status, the survey does not bare out the image some older residents have of new residents. Surprisingly few of the new residents are coming from Chicago. Most are moving to Park Forest from other suburbs and the majority are moving within the South Suburbs. They are, understandably, over a decade younger in age on average than the long-term residents and thus have a lower average income; but, given the youth of the new residents their average income is comparable or better than the long-term residents. The new residents maintain the Park Forest tradition of the average adult being college
educated, in fact, they have completed more schooling on average than the long-term residents. A higher proportion of the new residents hold professional, technical or managerial jobs. Overall they have smaller households, although not appreciably fewer school age children than the long-term residents. Most of the new residents appear to be upgrading their housing by moving from a rental apartment, from living with parents and/or from somewhere else in the south suburbs, to their first single family house in Park Forest. While more of the new residents are renters than long-term residents, two-thirds are buying homes. Given the high education level, job skills and youth of the new residents we might expect many more to purchase a home within a few years.

The Size and Character of the Housing Market Being Considered by New Residents

The new residents were asked which communities other than Park Forest they considered when they began their housing search, and in which they actually looked at housing. Table IV-4 presents the findings. Nearly one-fifth only considered Park Forest and over one-fourth only looked at housing in Park Forest. This suggests that Park Forest remains an attractive community to many buyers. Still, the majority considered and actually looked at housing in other communities. The new residents concentrated on larger south suburban communities within the middle and far southern suburbs with the exception of Park Forest South. Based on this sample of recent movers, the comparable market area from which Park Forest buyers are coming from and moving to seems to be the south suburbs, south of Homewood and east of I-57 surrounding Park Forest.
TABLE IV - 4

OTHER HOUSING MARKETS CONSIDERED AND ACTUALLY LOOKED AT BY NEW RESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Percent considered</th>
<th>Percent looked at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Park Forest</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richton Park</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Heights</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matteson</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flossmore</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stegar</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenwood</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia Fields</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other south suburbs</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other metropolitan suburbs</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chicago</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Manner in Which New Residents Found Their Homes

Table IV-5 shows that real estate agents continue to be the major source for locating a new home. None of the respondents to the survey used the South Suburban Housing Center. This finding substantiates the SSHC staff statements; that despite a widely held belief, the Center does not serve as a surrogate broker -- it helps very few households in their search for a new residence.

Why New Residents Choose Park Forest

The new resident respondents were presented two questions dealing with their preference for Park Forest. The first was a series of closed questions asking them to consider the importance of ten different reasons for choosing Park Forest. The second question, presented after these closed questions was "which one consideration was the most important in your decision to move to Park Forest?" Table IV-6 presents the findings.

Whether asked directly or voluntarily chosen, housing affordability and quality were the most important reasons for choosing Park Forest as a place to live. The price quality and design of the housing stock has apparently always been a drawing card of the community and continues to be. The next most important asset of the community remains its schools. This was probably the most popular voluntary response by many respondents with school age children. Because new residents without children would not consider better schools that important a choice factor, fewer respondents overall said it was an important reason for choosing Park Forest when directly asked about better schools. Park Forest is not considered by many people for its location to jobs. The remaining five factors, all
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Finding Home</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Agent</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Ad</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend or Relative</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Party/Personal search (i.e. driving around)</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent who felt this reason was important when asked</th>
<th>Percent who voluntarily chose this as the most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better housing</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated community</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Crime</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community with more ways to have fun--with more shops, restaurants, cultural facilities</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town atmosphere</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less pollution/traffic congestion</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better schools</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearer better job</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better job in Park Forest</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dealing with community, were considered important but few respondents felt that any of these was the single most important factor in choosing Park Forest; among these factors is racial integration.

Comparison With the Jaffe Findings

Several questions in the Resident survey were designed to be comparable to the 1974 Jaffe study of Park Forest residents. This section presents the more interesting findings in this comparison. While some change over time can be inferred by comparing these tables, the reader is reminded that these cannot be considered longitudinal trends. Longitudinal trends require interviewing the same respondents over time. Our survey sample does not duplicate the Jaffe sample. The Jaffe sample was based on a quota system where a certain number of residents in a certain category were sought. Residents to be interviewed were selected randomly but, once a quota was filled interviews with all other residents with characteristics that placed them in that category were terminated. The Jaffe survey was also a personal interview. Our survey was a strictly random sample limited by the interview mode which required a publicly listed telephone number and a willingness and ability to be interviewed over the phone.

Table IV-7 presents an overall evaluation of Park Forest now and for five years in the future, as viewed from the 1974 and 1981 samples. Clearly more of the 1981 respondents feel Park Forest is a good place to live. This is a positive sign especially given the fact that seven years ago almost one-third of the respondents felt Park Forest would not be as good a place to live by 1979. When comparing the respondent's estimates of the future, the two studies found virtually an identical proportion of respondents felt Park Forest would be the same or a better place to live in five years. Fewer respondents to the recent survey felt Park Forest would become a
TABLE IV - 7

OVERALL EVALUATION OF PARK FOREST TODAY AND IN FIVE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents feel Park Forest is:</th>
<th>Jaffe (1974)</th>
<th>HR&amp;D (1981)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very good place to live</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good place to live</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A poor place to live</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In five years resident feel Park Forest will:</th>
<th>Jaffe (1974)</th>
<th>HR&amp;D (1981)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be a better place to live</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay the same</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not be as good a place to live</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not answered</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
worse place to live over the coming one-half decade.

More residents in the most recent sample feel Park Forest is a good place to live and feel it will remain so, nevertheless, these residents express many specific concerns for the Village which are often far stronger than the specific concerns of 1974 respondents to the Jaffe study. Table IV-8 compares resident satisfaction with safety and public services and housing in Park Forest. On police and safety issues, more of the 1981 respondents are satisfied with the relations between the police and the people of Park Forest. However, there is slightly less satisfaction with police protection in 1981 than in 1974 and a marked increase in the concern for safety walking after 10:00 P.M. in 1981.

More of the 1981 respondents are satisfied with the administration of local government and the upkeep of physical services in the Village. This is not only reflected in the fourth and fifth statistic shown in Table IV-8, but, in various specific categories not shown in the table such as upkeep of streets, garbage collection, and parks and playgrounds.

The most striking decline in satisfaction between 1974 and 1981 is with the public schools. More than half of the 1981 respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the schools. To a lesser degree, there is also a decline in the number of residents who feel they can personally influence local government decisions. This, coupled with the low turnout of registered voters for recent Village elections, suggest that new efforts to involve residents in Village government would be appropriate. Finally, while there is still a healthy majority of residents who feel Park Forest real estate values are keeping up with adjacent communities, the proportion who believe this has also declined between 1974 and 1981.

The respondents in both surveys were provided the opportunity to express what they liked and disliked most about Park Forest and what they
### TABLE IV - 8

**COMPARISON OF RESIDENT SATISFACTION WITH SAFETY AND PUBLIC SERVICES AND HOUSING IN PARK FOREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feel its safe to walk after 10:00 P.M.</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with police protection</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with police relations</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with local government</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel the Village is well kept up</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with public schools</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel have moderate-to-great deal of influence on local government</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel real estate values are keeping up with adjacent communities</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thought were the major problems facing the Village. The similarities in responses to these open-ended questions was noteworthy. The Village feature the respondents of both surveys liked the most was the convenience of living in Park Forest. The community's "people orientation", its quiet, friendly, small town atmosphere, and the community aesthetics, the cleanliness, spaciousness and beauty of the Village were also mentioned as positive features. The only "like" expressed in 1974 which declined in 1981 was the services and amenities for children.

There are some noted similarities and one major difference among the major "dislikes" between the two surveys. In 1974 the "dislikes" centered on transportation to, from and within the Village, school quality, the non-housing physical quality of the Village (i.e. streets upkeep, etc.) and the "class of people" expressed in social rather than racial terms. In 1981 quality of schools and physical upkeep remain strong "dislikes", however transportation and "class of people" become less mentioned. The negative features most mentioned in 1981 were the general economic decline of the Village and the changing resident population.

The economic decline was more specifically defined when the residents were asked what the most serious problem was that the Village faces. Table IV-9 presents the 1974 and 1981 respondent views of the three most important problems based on frequency of mention by all the long-term respondents. First, almost twice as many respondents could think of a problem in 1981 than in 1974. Second, youth problems (delinquency, crime, lack of discipline by parents and things for teenagers to do, etc.) were the most noted problems in 1974 but were only the third most noted problems in 1981. School quality was the second most mentioned problem in both surveys with about the same percentage mentioning it. Integration related problems
were the third most important problems mentioned in 1974. In 1981, integration related problems amounted to only 2.8 percent of the total problems mentioned. By far the most important problem on the minds of residents was not related in any way to race or social issues but to economic decline and specifically the decline of the Village shopping plaza.

Even though racial and interracial problems were not considered a major issue by current residents of Park Forest, for purposes of this study we wanted a clearer picture of resident attitudes toward interracial living. Table IV-10 compares the respondents' attitudes in the 1974 Jaffe study with both the long-term and new residents surveyed in 1981. The first statistic attempts to isolate those persons who are clearly overestimating the percent black in the Park Forest population. An estimate of greater than 20 percent black residents was used to represent an overestimate for all three samples. If we combine the two 1981 samples the percent estimating more than 20 percent black is 21.0 percent. While this is comparable to the Jaffe study, it is in reality a far more accurate impression of the real racial mix in the community because the actual percent black in 1981 is over 12 percent, it was only about 7 percent in 1974. The second statistic displays the percent of respondents disapproving of racial desegregation. The 1981 statistics reflect a more tolerant population, with the newest residents the most tolerant of all. The third statistic reflects resident expectations about increases in the black population over the next five years. Once again current resident expectations are lower than 1974, with the newest residents showing the lowest percentage who feel the black population will continue to increase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most important problem</td>
<td>Youth Problems 25.0%</td>
<td>Shopping Plaza Decline 13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most important problem</td>
<td>School Quality 20.0%</td>
<td>School Quality 18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most important problem</td>
<td>Integration 17.0%</td>
<td>Youth Problems 10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not think of any</td>
<td>Int. 17.0%</td>
<td>Shopping Plaza Decline 34.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Problems as percentage of total problems identified.
## TABLE IV - 10
ATTITUDES TOWARD INTERRACIAL LIVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent who feel the Park Forest population is &gt;20 percent black</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who disapprove of racial desegregation in Park Forest</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who feel number of black residents will increase in the next five years</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who feel future racial change in surrounding communities will be:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same as in Park Forest</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slower</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faster</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would oppose or feel uncomfortable if black moved onto my block</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents with children who would object to sending children to a school which has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 percent black students</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥50 percent black students</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Jaffe study used 25 percent not 30 percent so 21.5 percent opposition is an understatement of the attitude change reflected in this row of figures.
The fourth statistic shows respondents' feelings about racial change in surrounding communities. In 1974 the strongest belief was that racial change was slower in surrounding communities than in Park Forest. Today the strongest belief is that racial change is similar in Park Forest and contiguous communities. The fifth statistic also reflects a growing tolerance among residents. Fewer respondents in 1981 oppose or feel uncomfortable with black neighbors than in 1974. The final set of figures display opposition to school integration. These figures seem to reflect a more tolerant population in 1981 since fewer respondents oppose sending their children to schools with 30 percent or more black. However, we must remember that in 1981 the average black population in the elementary schools serving Park Forest was 32 percent, it was far lower in 1974.

Since more of the current Park Forest residents have chosen to send their children to public schools with 30 percent or more black students we would expect fewer objections. It would appear that the same amount of parents are still reluctant in 1981 to send their children to schools which are 50 percent black. While there is no improvement in the proportion willing to send their children to a 50/50 interracial school between 1974 and 1981, the fact that almost 70 percent of the respondents with school age children in both studies would not object to sending their children to such a school is a strong indication that Park Forest is a very tolerant community.

Resident Knowledge and Approval of Integration Maintenance

One of the goals set forth for both the New Resident and Resident surveys was an evaluation of the residents' knowledge and approval of the IM Program. Table IV-11 presents tabulations of survey questions dealing
TABLE IV-11
RESPONDENT KNOWLEDGE AND APPROVAL OF
THE INTEGRATION MAINTENANCE PROGRAM AND
THE SOUTH SUBURBAN HOUSING CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of the IM Program’s existence</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understand why the Program is administered</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Believe a program to maintain stable racial integration is a valid Village function</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would like more information about IM</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of South Suburban Housing Center and Village support</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of SSHC activities</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Want more information about SSHC</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approve of Village support of SSHC</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do not know if approve of Village support</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissapprove</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you feel a Regional Housing Center is necessary to achieve and maintain stable racial integration in Park Forest?</th>
<th>New Residents</th>
<th>Longer-term Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with knowledge and approval of the IM Program. The overall impression is that most residents are woefully ignorant of the Program's existence, purpose, and relation to the South Suburban Housing Center (SSHC). However, once told about the Program, a sizable number approve of it and want to receive more information about it.

The first four statistics in Table IV-11 compare new and long-term resident knowledge of, and interest in, the IM Program. While more of the long-term residents than new residents have heard of the program and understand why it is administered, more than two-thirds do not know why the Program is administered. Once the Program was explained to them, more than four-fifths of the new residents and almost three-fourths of the long-term residents said they believe the Program is a valid Village function and well over half would like more information about the Program.

The fifth through ninth items in Table IV-11 deal with the South Suburban Housing Center. Even fewer respondents had knowledge of the SSHC and its activities. Only one of the 42 new residents and 11 of the 91 long-term residents surveyed had knowledge of SSHC activities; but well over half wanted more information about SSHC. Most impressive is that once explained only 17.5 percent of the long-term residents and none of the new residents disapproved of Village supported SSHC activities.

The final question in Table IV-11 asked the respondents if they felt a regional housing center was necessary to achieve and maintain stable racial integration in Park Forest. The most common response among new residents was that they just do not know enough about the Center and integration maintenance at this time to comment. However, the most common answer among the long-term residents was "yes", they do believe it is necessary. Only 14.3 percent of the new residents and 25.3 percent of the long-term residents...
### TABLE IV - 12

**VARIATION IN SATISFACTION AMONG LONG-TERM RESIDENTS BASED ON LENGTH OF RESIDENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2-6 Years</th>
<th>7-14 Years</th>
<th>15 Years or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feel in the last five years (or length of residency if less) Park Forest has become not as good a place to live</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that in the past five years the number of blacks has increased</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would affect decision to remain in Park Forest if the Village were to have 15 percent or 25 percent black families</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with public school quality</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Park Forest contribution to SSHC</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more information on SSHC</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want more information on IM</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Significant to .001; 2 significant to .01; 3 significant to .05.
felt that a regional housing center was not important to achieving and maintaining stable racial integration within the Village.

Length of Residency and Views of the Community

A number of crosstabulations of the new and long-term resident surveys were completed. Comparisons were made between racial groups, income groups, housing tenure (renters and owners) and, for the long-term residents, length of residency. Only the length of residency crosstabulations produced any statistically significant differences.

The 91 long-term residents include persons who have lived in Park Forest for only two or three years and persons who have lived in Park Forest for 30 years or more. In order to test for any differences in satisfaction with the community, interracial living, and the IM Program, the long-term residents were divided into three equal groups: those who have resided in Park Forest for two to six years (n=30); for seven to 14 years (n=30); and 15 or more years (n=31). Table IV-12 presents the questions for which a significant difference appears between length of residency groups using a chi square test of significance. These statistics are not only individually significant, they amount to an overall picture showing that more senior residents are less satisfied with recent changes in the community, especially related to racial proportions and school quality. A similar pattern appears for other questions in the survey; however, the differences between the length of residence groups was not statistically significant.

The first item in Table IV-12 shows that significantly more respondents residing in Park Forest for 15 years or more feel Park Forest has declined in overall quality over the last five years. A higher proportion of these respondents also feel the number of black families has been on the increase over the last five years. The third item shows that significantly more
Residents of 15 years or more will reassess their decision to remain in Park Forest if the black population reaches 15 percent or 25 percent. Finally, more of the resident respondents of 15 years and over are dissatisfied with public school quality. On the other hand, a larger proportion of the 15 year and over residents claim to know about Park Forest's contracts with the South Suburban Housing Center regarding integration maintenance, and a smaller proportion of them want additional information about the SSHC or the Park Forest IM Program.

While these differences between groups by length of residence are significant, they should not be misinterpreted. This pattern does not indicate that all the senior residents are unhappy and on the verge of moving. The critical third question in Table IV-12 on the percent black population that would affect residents' decision to remain, does show more of the senior residents will move at a low percent black population, but only one-fourth of this group is so inclined. A more important statistic from that same question is that 40 percent of the two to six year residents, 46.7 percent of the seven to 14 year resident, and 41.9 percent of the residents living in Park Forest for 15 years or longer, said that it did not matter how high the percent black went, it would not affect their decision about remaining in Park Forest. Thus, the most important finding in this section, as with all other findings in this evaluation, is the broad base of tolerance for racial integration among residents, no matter how long they have resided in Park Forest.
This survey is part of an evaluation of the Integration Maintenance Program in Park Forest, Illinois. One part of this evaluation is to compare Park Forest's activities with the activities of fifteen other municipalities with integration programs located in similar suburban settings and with similar housing characteristics. Your municipality was chosen as one of the fifteen.

The questions are fairly detailed to facilitate explicit comparisons with Park Forest; therefore, it is important that you give us an answer to all questions. However, we do NOT expect you to research specific answers. Your BEST GUESS as administrator of the program will be sufficient. The answers will be held in strictest confidence; only group statistics will be generated for reporting purposes, and those statistics will be forwarded to you upon completion of the study.

Two blank copies of the questionnaire are attached. Please fill in one to the best of your ability during this conference and return it to us. Mark those questions that will require further thought or reference to documents at home on the second questionnaire. When you return the questionnaire with completed responses, we will make a date when we may call and complete the remaining questions.

Should you have any questions we will be available throughout the conference. In addition, we will have a table at the Thursday night "Open Market Exchange" specifically to help you fill out this questionnaire. Please try to return the completed questionnaire during that time. After the conference, we will be available at the following address:

Leonard F. Heumann
James L. Rose
Hildy L. Kingma
Housing Research and Development
1204 West Nevada
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217) 333-7330

Thank you for your cooperation.
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Recently the Housing Research and Development Program staff attended the 4th Annual Exchange Congress in Oak Park, Illinois. Our major goal at the Congress was to distribute a survey questionnaire to those persons who were involved with integration programs for their municipality. We were able to contact representatives from twelve communities who are now in the process of completing the questionnaire.

We are also very interested in having your community included in our sample. The cover letter and questionnaire distributed at the Congress are enclosed. Would you please take the time to fill out the questionnaire and return one copy to us in the self-addressed envelope. Results of this survey will be sent to you upon completion of our research project.

Also, someone from our staff will be contacting you by phone in the next few weeks to answer any questions you may have regarding the survey and to determine the progress you are making toward completing the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for participating in our study!

Leonard F. Heumann, Associate Professor
Housing Research and Development Program
and in Urban and Regional Planning

enc.
The attached questionnaire deals with local government participation in programs which seek to create stable racially diversified communities. The four divisions of the questionnaire each deal with related aspects of your municipality's involvement in integration programs. We are interested in the demographics of your community, the administration of your integration program, the operation of housing center(s) and the characteristics of your housing market.

The questionnaire uses the term "integration program" quite extensively. Please understand that by this term we mean any of the following:

Integration Maintenance - the use of educational, service, legal, counseling, advertising, and auditing programs to encourage the continuance of integration in the community.

Integration Management - the use of programs intended to assure the continuance of integration, including efforts to manage racial composition of a community.

Affirmative Marketing - a special effort to attract to a development or a community members of racial and ethnic groups which would not ordinarily be expected to be attracted through the normal mechanisms of the commercial market.

Programs to Avoid Resegregation - actions which prevent an integrated (or desegregated) area from changing to a segregated area.

Stabilization Programs - action to achieve a racially diverse community without exploitation by the real estate industry, business interest, financial institutions, or local government. Any other programs designed to create a unitary housing market in which members of all races and groups receive the same services and actually compete on equal terms.

Please complete the questionnaire as fully as possible before you leave the conference. Remember, it is not necessary to do any extensive research - your BEST GUESS is sufficient. We will be at the "Open Market Exchange" on Thursday night to answer any questions and to receive completed questionnaires.

Leonard F. Heumann
James L. Rose
Hildy L. Kingma
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS (municipal statistics unless otherwise indicated)

1. Population estimate: __________ as of 19 ______.

2. Racial composition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>% Other Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Within your metropolitan sub-regional housing market, list the municipalities that are predominantly white, predominantly black/other minority, or interracial.

Predominantly White (less than 1% black/other minority)
Next to each municipality you listed as either interracial or predominantly black, could you indicate with a 0 those communities going through rapid transition from white to black and with an X, those communities with integration maintenance programs.
4. Median household income: $______ as of 19______.

5. Range of single-family housing prices. $______ to $______
   Range of apartment rents. $______ to $______
   Range of condominium prices. $______ to $______
   Range of cooperative housing
   monthly assessments. $______ to $______

6. What is the total number of housing units in your municipality? _______ units

7. What is the distribution of owner and renter occupied housing in your community?
   Owner occupied? _______% Renter occupied _______%

8. What is the distribution of housing type by tenure in your community?

   Owner
   Single-family _______%
   Condominium _______%
   Cooperative _______%
   Mobile Home _______%
   Other _______%

   Renter
   Single-family (Includes Condominiums, mobile homes) _______%
   Multi-family apartments _______%

9. What percent of the total rental units in your municipality are subsidized or have subsidized families or elderly living in them?
   _______% subsidized rental units

10. What percentage of your residents are employed?

    Within your municipality _______%
    Within your housing market sub-region but outside your municipality _______%
    Outside your housing market sub-region _______%

11. What are the predominant types of employment (e.g., industrial, commercial, government, university, farming, etc.) for those residents who work in your municipality?

    (rank by labor force size)
    _________________________________________ 1st
    _________________________________________ 2nd
    _________________________________________ 3rd
    _________________________________________ 4th
12. How many separate school districts exist within your municipality?
   - Elementary/Junior High: 
   - High School: 

13. What is the percentage of pupils attending these school districts who reside in your municipality?
   - Elementary/Junior High: 
   - High School: 

14. What is the distribution of pupils in your school district(s) who attend the following:
   - Public School: %
   - Private/Parochial School: %

15. What is the racial composition of the school age children in your municipality and the total school district racial composition, if different?

   **Municipality**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>% Other Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **School District**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>% Other Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

In this section we would like to know about the various integration activities in your community that may be under municipal control and/or financially supported by your municipality. Some of these activities will be totally conducted by municipal staff, others will be carried out by voluntary groups or committees and some activities may be contracted or subcontracted out to non-profit or for-profit agencies in your area.

Which of the following program activities are implemented in your municipality/region; what organization is responsible for carrying out the activity; and what is the funding source for the activities? First, we would like you to fill out a table which matches program activities with the organization which implements/carries out the activities. Please use the following symbols when filling in the line for each activity.

1 = Organization has minor role in implementing activity.
2 = Organization has major role in implementing activity.
3 = Organization implements entire activity.

Leave blank if organization has no role in activity.

Second, we would like you to fill out another table (#17) which is similar to the first, but matches program activities to the funding sources which are used to finance the various activities. Again, please use the following symbols when filling out the line for each activity:

1 = Minor funding source for activity.
2 = Major funding source for activity.
3 = Funding source finances entire activity.

Leave blank if funding source finances no part of the activity.
Implementing Organization

### A. Public Relations:
1. Education - real estate and lending institutions
2. Education - in surrounding communities
3. Education - local residents
4. Education - municipal agencies/departments
5. Education - students/school officials
6. Education - other activities (specify)
7. Advertising - media presentations
8. Advertising - brochures
9. Advertising - special events
10. Guest presentations
11. Advertising - other activities (specify)

### B. Legal:
1. Developing fair housing ordinance
2. Litigation - real estate brokers/financial institutions/federal government
3. Other activities (specify)

### C. Housing Counseling:
1. Home purchase
2. Rental
3. Tenants/landlord relations
4. Home seller
5. Home maintenance
6. Rehabilitation
7. Home financing/mortgage default
8. Section 8/subsidized housing
9. Other counseling activities (specify)

### D. Evaluation/Monitoring:
1. Real estate broker audit
2. Rental agent audit
3. Lender audit
4. Builder/contractor audit
5. Monitoring the real estate market
6. Other activities (specify)

### E. Planning:
1. Sign regulation
2. Reoccupancy inspection
3. Developing programs/strategies
4. Property value upkeep
5. Other activities (specify)

### F. Commercial Development/Revitalization

### G. School Desegregation:
1. Realigning school boundaries
2. Developing school/community relations
17. **Program/Activities**

**A. Public Relations:**
1. Education - real estate and lending institutions
2. Education - in surrounding communities
3. Education - local residents
4. Education - municipal agencies/departments
5. Education - students/school officials
6. Education - other activities (specify)
7. Advertising - media presentations
8. Advertising - brochures
9. Advertising - special events
10. Guest presentations
11. Advertising - other activities (specify)

**B. Legal:**
1. Developing fair housing ordinance
2. Litigation - real estate brokers/financial institutions/federal government
3. Other activities (specify)

**C. Housing Counseling:**
1. Home purchase
2. Rental
3. Tenants/landlord relations
4. Home seller
5. Home maintenance
6. Rehabilitation
7. Home financing/mortgage default
8. Section 8/subsidized housing
9. Other counseling activities (specify)

**D. Evaluation/Monitoring:**
1. Real estate broker audit
2. Rental agent audit
3. Lender audit
4. Builder/contractor audit
5. Monitoring the real estate market
6. Other activities (specify)

**E. Planning:**
1. Sign regulation
2. Reoccupancy inspection
3. Developing programs/strategies
4. Property value upkeep
5. Other activities (specify)

**F. Commercial Development/Revitalization**

**G. School Desegregation:**
1. Realigning school boundaries
2. Developing school/community relations
18. What is the title of the person in charge of the integration program in your municipality?

____________________________________

19. Is the person in charge of the program responsible for housing integration only or all aspects of community integration: (housing, fair employment, community relations, etc.)

Housing only ______ Housing and other integration activities ______

20. What is the line of responsibility or chain of command from the administrator in charge of the integration program to the elected municipal officials?

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

21. List all the municipal professional staff who are responsible for program implementation in your community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Role in Integration Program</th>
<th>% of time assigned to integration program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Approximately how many non-professional full time equivalent (FTE) staff are needed to support your programs.

____________________________________

23. Does your municipal program use volunteer groups or committees to support or implement integration activities.

Yes _______ No _______

24. If yes, please complete the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee or Group Name</th>
<th>Activity/Roles</th>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


24. continued

25. What are the budget amounts allocated to administer your integration program/activities by your municipality over the past six years and the total municipal budget for those years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program Budget</th>
<th>Total Municipal Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$______________</td>
<td>$______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$______________</td>
<td>$______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$______________</td>
<td>$______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$______________</td>
<td>$______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>$______________</td>
<td>$______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>$______________</td>
<td>$______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. In a typical year, what funding sources contributed to the integration program budget in your municipality (check appropriate boxes).

Locally generated revenue
State funds
County contributions
General revenue sharing
County CDBG/Municipal CDBG
Other federal funds
Grants, donations, etc.

27. How many years has your integration program been a municipal budget line item?

__________ years

28. Has your municipality or some outside agency ever audited or evaluated the performance of your integration program activities?

Yes _______ No _______

29. If yes, what year(s)? __________________________
30. Where is the staff for your integration program located or housed in your municipality?

In ______ or outside ______ the Village Hall, City Hall, Municipal Building

Is the location of your integration program staff the most advantageous for administering your program?

Yes ______ No ______

HOUSING CENTERS

Some municipalities contract out part or all of their integration program activities to non-profit organizations such as sub-regional housing centers or metropolitan-wide fair housing councils. We now would like to ask you a few questions which deal with your knowledge about the housing centers(s) or council(s) which may operate in your area.

31. Does your municipality financially support the operation of any fair housing center(s)?

Yes ______ No ______

32. Does your municipality have its own housing center at this time?

Yes ______ No ______

33. How much of your municipal integration program budget for each of the past five years was allocated for contracting the services of a housing center(s) and what activities were funded?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Market Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. List the fair housing centers or housing councils or similar non-profit groups/agencies which serve your community. Also indicate the population served by the agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Population of Service Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOUSING MARKET

35. What is the approximate total population of the communities which share the housing market in which your municipality is located?

____________________ Total Population

36. Does the region in which your municipality is located have a fair share housing allocation plan?

Yes ______  No ______

37. If a fair share plan exists, has it had any substantial impact on (1) the distribution of new low and moderate income housing in your area Yes _____ or No _____ or (2) the dispersal of minority households in your area Yes _____  No _____

38. While an interracial community shares a sub-regional housing market with other municipalities based on location, housing type and values schools etc., the very existence of an integration program may make the community a unique housing submarket.

Do you feel that your municipality attracts new buyers and renters solely on the basis of your integration program?

Yes _____  No _____

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

39. Check appropriate response.

It is an essential part of any municipal integration stabilization program to encourage surrounding municipalities, which share the housing market, develop and implement complimentary programs.

strongly agree ______

agree ______

disagree ______

strongly disagree ______
Would you please comment on your response.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

40. Is your municipality involved in any litigation where a party is challenging the legality or constitutionality of some aspect of your integration program?

Yes ______  No ______

If yes, could you briefly describe that litigation.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

41. How has the adoption of an integration program in your municipality affected the variety and delivery of social services in your community?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Any comments you feel are important concerning issues raised in this survey are most welcome. Also if you have any suggestions concerning the questionnaire feel free to let us know about them. Finally we would like some brief personal information from you so that we can contact you to obtain the information necessary to complete the questionnaire. Thank you again for your cooperation and interest in our project.

Name
Title
Address
Phone No. (___)
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
Housing Research and Development Program
Integration Maintenance Program Evaluation
NEW RESIDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How long have you lived in Park Forest? _______________ months 4-5
   
   If more than 12 months, terminate interview.

2. Where did you live before moving to Park Forest? _______________ 6-7
3. What type of housing did you live in before moving to Park Forest...

   a. a single family home, .................................................. 1
   b. a rental apartment, .................................................. 2
   c. a condominium, ..................................................... 3
   d. a cooperative, or ..................................................... 4
   e. something else? (Specify) ......................................... 5

4a. What communities other than Park Forest did you consider when you began your housing search? (If none skip to Q. 5)

   a. ___________________________ ___________________________ 9_10
   b. ___________________________ ___________________________ 11-12
   c. ___________________________ ___________________________ 13-14
   d. ___________________________ ___________________________ 15-16

b. In which of these communities did you actually look at houses or apartments before settling on your present housing in Park Forest?

   a. ___________________________ ___________________________ 25-26
   b. ___________________________ ___________________________ 27-28
   c. ___________________________ ___________________________ 29-30
   d. ___________________________ ___________________________ 31-32

5. Did you locate the housing unit you now occupy in Park Forest through .... (circle all responses)

   a. a real estate broker/salesperson, ......................... 1
   b. a friend or relative, ................................. 2
   c. a private party, ........................................... 3
   d. a newspaper or other advertisement, ........ 4
   e. the help of a Housing Center/Housing Council, ........... 5
   f. a personal search, or (driving through the Village) ....... 6
   g. some other way? (Specify) .................................. 7
6a. How important were the following considerations in choosing Park Forest as a place to live? ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) better job opportunities in Park Forest?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) better jobs near Park Forest?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) a community with better schools?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) a community with more ways to have fun—with more shops, restaurants, and cultural facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) a community with less crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) a community with more friendly small-town atmosphere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) a community with less pollution and traffic congestion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) better housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) housing that is affordable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) a community that is integrated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Which one consideration was the most important in your decision to move to Park Forest? #

7. Do you currently live in ....
   a single family house, ............ 1
   a condominium, ................. 2
   a rental apartment, *(Skip to Q. 9)*. .... 3
   a cooperative, or *(Skip to Q. 9)* .... 4
   something else? *(Specify, Skip to Q. 9)* .. 5

8. Do you ...
   own *(Skip to Q. 10)* ........... 1
   rent? ........................... 2
9. Do you have any plans to buy a house or condominium in Park Forest in the future?
   yes ........................................ 1
   no ........................................... 2
   don't know ............................... 8

10a. Besides yourself, how many other persons live in this household?
     #______________________________________

   (If appropriate)

b. What is their relationship to you? (i.e., spouse, housemate, children, other relative)
   _______________________________________
   _______________________________________
   _______________________________________

   (If appropriate)

c. (If appropriate) Are any of the children under 18 years of age?
   yes ........................................ 1
   no (Skip to Q. 11) ........................ 2

d. Do(es) the child(ren) attend public, private, or parochial schools? (Circle all that apply)
   public ..................................... 1
   private .................................... 2
   parochial ................................ 3

11a. In what year were you born? ____________________________

   b. What is the highest grade or year in elementary school, high school, or college you completed?
      None ...................................... 0
      Elementary .01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08
      High School ......................... .09 10 11 12
      College .................................. 13 14 15 16
      Some graduate school ................ 17
      Graduate or professional degree .... 18
c. Are you currently...

employed full time, .................. 1
employed part time, .................. 2
temporarily out of work, .............. 3
retired, .................................. 4
not usually employed, or (Skip to Q. 12) 5
keeping house/homemaker? (Skip to Q. 12) 6
other (Specify) (Skip to Q. 12) ........ 7

12a. (If appropriate) In what year was your spouse born?

b. What is the highest grade or year in elementary school, high school, or college your spouse completed?

None ..................................... 0
Elementary .01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08
High School ............................ .09 10 11 12
College ................................. .13 14 15 16
Some graduate school ................... 17
Graduate or professional degree ......... 18

c. Is your spouse currently...

employed full time, ..................... 1
employed part time, .................... 2
temporarily out of work, ............... 3
retired, .................................. 4
not usually employed, or (Skip to Q. 13) 5
keeping house/homemaker? (Skip to Q. 13) 6
other (Specify) (Skip to Q. 13) ........ 7
0. What is your spouse's main occupation or job title?

13. In 1979, was the approximate annual income from employment and from all other sources for all members of your household before taxes... (Repeat until yes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than $8,000?</td>
<td>YES 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $10,000?</td>
<td>YES 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $15,000?</td>
<td>YES 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $20,000?</td>
<td>YES 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $25,000?</td>
<td>YES 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $30,000?</td>
<td>YES 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $40,000</td>
<td>YES 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $50,000</td>
<td>YES 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $50,000?</td>
<td>YES 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refused</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How much influence do you think people like you have over the local government in Park Forest? Would you say...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Level</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a great deal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a moderate amount</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little, or</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none at all?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Park Forest is a mixed Community, including blacks and other minorities. Approximately what percent of the population do you think is black? Do you think it is...

(Repeat until No)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Level</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more than 10%</td>
<td>NO 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20%</td>
<td>NO 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 30%</td>
<td>NO 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Do you approve or disapprove of the racial desegregation that has occurred in Park Forest schools?
   - approve .................................... 1
   - disapprove .................................. 2
   - aren't desegregated .......................... 3
   - don't know ................................... 8

17. Do you think, in the next 5 years, the number of blacks in Park Forest will...
   - increase ........................................ 1
   - decrease, (Skip to Q.18) ..................... 2
   - or remain the same? (Skip to Q.18) ......... 3
   - don't know (Skip to Q.18) .................... 8

b. Do you think the number of blacks will increase by...
   - a lot ........................................... 1
   - some ............................................ 2
   - a few? ........................................... 3

18. Do you think that the surrounding communities near Park Forest will...
   - change in racial composition at the same rate as Park Forest ..................... 1
   - change more slowly ............................. 2
   - change more rapidly ............................. 3
   - don't know .................................... 8

19. What is your racial background? Are you...
   - White .......................................... 1
   - Black .......................................... 2
   - Asian .......................................... 3
   - Hispanic, or .................................. 4
   - something else? _________________________ 5

20. Would you favor or oppose (a/another) black family purchasing a home on your block?
   - favor .......................................... 1
   - oppose .......................................... 2
   - don't know .................................... 8
21a. Do your children attend a school where (other) black children also attend?
   yes ........................................ 1
   no (Skip to Q. 22) .......................... 2
   no school age children (Skip to Q. 22) .. 3

   b. About what percent of the school population would you say are black? Would it be . . . (Repeat until No)
      more than 10% NO .......................... 1
      more than 20% NO .......................... 2
      more than 30% NO .......................... 3
      YES (Skip to Q. 22) .................... 4
      don't know ................................ 8

   c. Would you have any objections to sending your children to a school where . . .
      YES NO DONT KNOW
      (1) 30% of the children are black? ........ 1 (Skip to 2 Q. 22) 8 23
      (2) more than half of the children are black ........ 1 2 8 24

22a. Are there any (other) black families living close to your home?
   yes ........................................ 1
   no (Skip to Q. 23) .......................... 2

   b. How many blocks or courts away?
      on this block or court ..................... 1
      1-3 blocks or courts away ............... 2
      more than 3 blocks or courts away ...... 3

23. Would it affect your decision to remain in Park Forest if the Village were to have . . . (Repeat until Yes)
   15% black families? YES ..................... 1
   25% black families? YES ..................... 2
   35% black families YES ..................... 3
   50% black families YES ..................... 4
   NO ......................................... 5
Statement

The Village of Park Forest administers an Integration Maintenance Program designed to maintain stable racial integration in the community.

24. Did you know that such a program exists?
   yes ........................................ 1
   no (Skip to Q.26) ........................... 2

25. Do you understand how and why the program is administered by the Village of Park Forest?
   yes ........................................ 1
   no ........................................ 2

26. Do you believe that a program designed to maintain stable racial integration is a valid function for local government to pursue?
   yes ........................................ 1
   no ........................................ 2

27. Would you like to have more information about the Integration Maintenance Program in Park Forest?
   yes (Read statement below) .............. 1
   no ........................................ 2

(This information about the Integration Maintenance Program cannot be sent to you because of the confidentiality of the survey, but it can be obtained at the Village Hall Office of the Assistant City Manager for Community Relations.)

28a. Are you aware that the Village of Park Forest contributes funds to a regional fair housing center which is working to achieve open housing and stable racial integration throughout the south suburban area of Chicago?
   yes ........................................ 1
   no ........................................ 2

b. Did you know what the activities of this housing center are?
   yes ........................................ 1
   no ........................................ 2

c. Do you want more information on the activities of the South Suburban Housing Center?
   yes (Read statement below) .............. 1
   no ........................................ 2

(This information about the South Suburban Housing Center cannot be sent to you because of the confidentiality of the survey, but it can be obtained at the Village Hall Office of the Assistant City Manager for Community Relations.)
29. Do you approve or disapprove of Park Forest contributing funds to such a regional housing center?

- Approve: 1
- Disapprove: 2
- Don't know: 8

30. Do you feel a regional housing center is necessary to achieve and maintain stable racial integration in Park Forest?

- Approve: 1
- Disapprove: 2
- Don't know: 8
1. How long have you lived in Park Forest? _________ years

   (If less than 1 year, terminate interview.)
2. Do you think in the past 5 years (or length of residency if less), Park Forest has become...

   a better place to live, ....................... 1
.
   not as good a place to live, or .............. 2
   stayed the same? ............................... 3

3. Do you think in the next 5 years, Park Forest will become...

   a better place to live, ....................... 1
.
   not as good a place to live, or .............. 2
   will stay the same? ............................... 3

4. Thinking about all the characteristics of Park Forest, do you think it is...

   a very good place to live, ..................... 1
   a good place to live, ............................. 2
   a poor place to live, or ....................... 3
   a very poor place to live? ..................... 4

5a. What 3 things do you like most about living in Park Forest? Please list them in order of preference.

   (1) ___________________________________________ 9-10
   (2) ___________________________________________ 11-12
   (3) ___________________________________________ 13-14

b. What 3 things do you like least about living in Park Forest? Again, please list them in order of preference.

   (1) ___________________________________________ 15-16
   (2) ___________________________________________ 17-18
   (3) ___________________________________________ 19-20
6. Would you say this is a community...
   where everyone is basically alike, or . . . . . 1
   where there are many different types of people? 2

7. Which do you feel is the best type of community to live in...
   where everyone is basically alike, or . . . . . 1
   where there are many different types of people? 2

8. Would you say that the people who live in Park Forest are...
   good neighbors, . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1
   neither good nor bad neighbors, or . . . . . 2
   bad neighbors? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3
   don't know . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8

9a. What do you think are the most important problems in Park Forest today? Please list them in order of importance.

(1) ___________________________________________ 24–25

(2) ___________________________________________ 26–27

(3) ___________________________________________ 28–29

b. How much does (problem #1) bother you personally? Would you say . . .
   very much, . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1
   somewhat, . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2
   not very much, or. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3
   not at all? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4

10. Would you say it is safe or unsafe to walk in Park Forest at night, after
    10 pm?
    safe . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1
    unsafe . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2
11. Please tell me whether you are very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with each of the following public services in Park Forest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. the upkeep of streets and roads? (Are you)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the quality of the public schools? (Are you)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. garbage collection?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. the parks and playgrounds?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. local government?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. police protection?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. the relations between the police and the people of Park Forest?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. shopping for groceries and household needs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. public transportation to and from Park Forest?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How much influence do you think people like you have over the local government in Park Forest? Would you say...

- a great deal, ........... 1
- a moderate amount, ........ 2
- a little, or ........... 3
- none at all? ........... 4
- don't know ........... 8

13. Overall, would you say the housing in Park Forest is kept up...

- very well, ........... 1
- fairly well, ........... 2
- not very well, or ........... 3
- not well at all? ........... 4
14. Do you feel that the real estate values on homes and apartments in Park Forest have been keeping up with adjacent South Suburban communities?

   yes ................. 1
   no ................... 2
   don't know ............. 8

15. How important were the following considerations in choosing Park Forest as a place to live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) better job opportunities in Park Forest?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) better jobs near Park Forest?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) a community with better schools?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) a community with more ways to have fun---with more shops, restaurants, and cultural facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) a community with less crime.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) a community with more friendly small-town atmosphere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) a community with less pollution and traffic congestion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) better housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) housing that is affordable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) a community that is integrated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Which one consideration was the most important for choosing Park Forest as a place to live? #

16. Do you currently live in . . .

   a single family house, .................. 1
   a condominium, .......................... 2
   a rental apartment *(Skip to Q. 18)* . . 3
   a cooperative, or *(Skip to Q. 18)* . . 4
   something else? *(Specify) (Skip to Q. 18)* 5
17. Do you...
own (skip to Q. 19) ............... 1
rent? .................................. 2

18. Do you have any plans to buy a house or condominium in Park Forest in the future?
yes .................................... 1
no ....................................... 2
don't know ............................ 8

19. Did you find your house or apartment through ... (Circle all that apply)
a real estate broker, ............... 1
private party, ......................... 2
employer referral, .................... 3
a housing center/fair housing
council, or ............................ 4
some other way? (Specify) ........ 5

IF CURRENTLY RENTING, SKIP TO Q. 21.

20a. In the past year, have any real estate brokers or salesmen contacted you to
find out if you wanted to sell your home?

yes .................................... 1
no (Skip to Q. 21) .................... 2

b. Was this contact by ...
telephone, ............................ 1
mail, or ............................... 2
a personal visit? ..................... 3

c. Did the salesperson/broker identify himself or herself and their company?

yes .................................... 1
no ....................................... 2

d. Did the salesperson or broker indicate, in any way, that there might be an
significant racial change in Park Forest in the near future?

yes .................................... 1
no ....................................... 2
21. Park Forest is a mixed community including blacks and other minorities. Approximately, what percent of the population do you think is black? Do you think it is ... *(Repeat until No)*

- more than 10% NO ....... 1
- more than 20% NO ....... 2
- more than 30% NO ....... 3
- YES ............ 4
- don't know ....... 8

22. Do you approve or disapprove of the racial desegregation that has occurred in Park Forest's schools?

- approve ....... 1
- disapprove ....... 2
- aren't desegregated ....... 3
- don't know ....... 8

23a. In the past 5 years, do you feel the number of blacks in Park Forest has ...

- increased, *(Skip to Q. 24)* ....... 1
- decreased, or ....... 2
- stayed the same? *(Skip to Q. 24)* ....... 3
- don't know *(Skip to Q. 24)* ....... 8

b. Do you think the number of blacks has decreased by ...

- a lot, ....... 1
- some, or ....... 2
- a few? ....... 3

24a. Do you think in the next 5 years, the number of blacks in Park Forest will ...

- increase, ....... 1
- decrease, *(Skip to Q. 25)* ....... 2
- or remain the same? *(Skip to Q. 25)* ....... 3
- don't know *(Skip to Q. 25)* ....... 8
b. Do you think the number of blacks will increase by . . .
   a lot, .................................. 1
   some, or ................................ 2
   a few? .................................. 3

25. Do you think that the surrounding communities near Park Forest will . . .
   change in racial composition at the same rate as Park Forest .................. 1
   change more slowly, or ..................... 2
   change more rapidly? ....................... 3
   don't know ................................ 8

26. What is your racial background? Are you . . .
   White, .................................... 1
   Black, ..................................... 2
   Asian, ..................................... 3
   Hispanic, or ................................ 4
   something else? ______________________ 5

27. Would you favor or oppose (a/another) black family purchasing a home on your block?
   favor .................................... 1
   oppose ................................... 2
   don't know ................................. 8

28a. Are there any (other) black families living close to your home?
   yes ..................................... 1
   no (skip to q. 30) .......................... 2

b. How many blocks or courts away?
   on this block or court .................... 1
   1-3 blocks or courts away ................ 2
   more than 3 blocks or courts ............ 3
29. Would it affect your decision to remain in Park Forest if the Village were to have. (Repeat until YES)

15% black families? YES 1
25% black families? YES 2
35% black families? YES 3
50% black families? YES 4

NO 5

30a. Besides yourself, how many other persons currently live in this household? # __________

b. (If appropriate) What is their relationship to you? (i.e., spouse, housemate, children, other relative)

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

c. (If appropriate) Are any of the children under 18 years of age?

yes 1
no (Skip to Q. 32) 2

31a. Do your children attend a school where (other) black children also attend?

yes 1
no 2
no school age children 3

b. About what percent of the school population would you say are black. Would it be... (Repeat until No)

more than 10% NO 1
more than 20% NO 2
more than 30% NO 3
YES 4
don't know 5
c. Would you have any objections to sending your children to a school where . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) 30% of the children are black?</td>
<td>1 (Skip to Q. 38)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) more than half of the children are black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32a. In what year were you born?__________________________

b. What is the highest grade or year in elementary school, high school, or college you completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none</th>
<th>elementary 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08</th>
<th>high school 09 10 11 12</th>
<th>college 13 14 15 16</th>
<th>some graduate school 17</th>
<th>graduate or professional degree 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>elementary 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08</td>
<td>high school 09 10 11 12</td>
<td>college 13 14 15 16</td>
<td>some graduate school 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>employed full time</td>
<td>employed part time</td>
<td>temporarily out of work</td>
<td>retired</td>
<td>not usually employed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33a. (If appropriate) In what year was your spouse born?__________________________

b. What is the highest grade or year in elementary school, high school, or college your spouse completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none</th>
<th>elementary 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08</th>
<th>high school 09 10 11 12</th>
<th>college 13 14 15 16</th>
<th>some graduate school 17</th>
<th>graduate or professional degree 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>elementary 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08</td>
<td>high school 09 10 11 12</td>
<td>college 13 14 15 16</td>
<td>some graduate school 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Is your spouse currently ....

employed full time, .................. 1
employed part time, .................... 2
temporarily out of work, ............... 3
retired, ................................. 4
not usually employed, or (Skip to Q. 34) ... 5
keeping house/homemaker? (Skip to Q. 34) ... 6
other (Specify) (Skip to Q. 34) ............ 7

d. What is your spouse's main occupation or job title?

34. In 1979, was the approximate annual income from employment and from all other sources for all members of your household before taxes .... (Repeat until yes)

less than $8,000? YES ............... .01
less than $10,000? YES ............... .02
less than $15,000? YES ............... .03
less than $20,000? YES ............... .04
less than $25,000? YES ............... .05
less than $30,000? YES ............... .06
less than $40,000? YES ............... .07
less than $50,000? YES ............... .08
over $50,000 YES ............... 09

don't know ......................... 98
refused. ............................ 99

Statement

The Village of Park Forest administers an Integration Maintenance program designed to maintain stable racial integration in the community.

35. Did you know that such a program exists?

yes .................................. 1
no (Skip to Q. 32) .................... 2
36. Do you understand how and why the program is administered by the Village of Park Forest?
   yes ........................................ 1
   no ........................................... 2

37. Do you believe that a program designed to maintain stable racial integration is a valid function for local government to pursue?
   yes ........................................... 1
   no ........................................... 2

38. Would you like to have more information about the Integration Maintenance Program in Park Forest?
   yes (Read statement below) ........ 1
   no ........................................... 2

(This information about the Integration Maintenance Program cannot be sent to you because of the confidentiality of the survey, but it can be obtained at the Village Hall Office of the Assistant City Manager for Community Relations.)

39a. Are you aware that the Village of Park Forest contributes funds to a regional fair housing center which is working to achieve open housing and stable racial integration throughout the south suburban area of Chicago?
   yes ........................................... 1
   no ........................................... 2

b. Did you know what the activities of this housing center are?
   yes ........................................... 1
   no ........................................... 2

c. Do you want more information on the activities of the South Suburban Housing Center?
   yes (Read statement below) .... 1
   no ........................................... 2

(This information about the South Suburban Housing Center cannot be sent to you because of the confidentiality of the survey, but it can be obtained at the Village Hall Office of the Assistant City Manager for Community Relations.)

40. Do you approve or disapprove of Park Forest contributing funds to such a regional housing center?
   approve .................................... 1
   disapprove .................................. 2
   don't know .................................. 8
41. Do you feel a regional housing center is necessary to achieve and maintain
stable racial integration in Park Forest?

yes .................. 1

no ..................... 2

don't know ............ 8