

VIRGINIA'S RELOCATION EXPERIENCE: A LOOK AT THE DISTRICTS

by

Michael A. Perfater
Research Analyst

and

Gary R. Allen
Research Economist

(The opinions, findings and conclusions expressed in this report
are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the sponsoring agencies)

Virginia Highway and Transportation Research Council
(A Cooperative Organization Sponsored Jointly by the Virginia
Department of Highways and Transportation and the University of Virginia)

Charlottesville, Virginia

April 1976
VHTRC 76-R52

VDOT Research Library

VIRGINIA'S RELOCATION EXPERIENCE: A LOOK AT THE DISTRICTS

by

Michael A. Perfater
Research Analyst

and

Gary R. Allen
Research Economist

RELOCATION SUMMARY FOR BRISTOL DISTRICT

Socioeconomic Profile

Data were received from 59 households in the Bristol District. These data represented a response rate of 60%, which was slightly above the statewide rate of 56%. The respondents in the Bristol District constituted 11.9% of the total statewide respondents. Ninety-seven percent of the respondents were rural residents and 95% were Caucasian. The mean incomes for respondents were \$6,970 prior to relocation (the lowest for any district) and \$8,220 at the time the questionnaire was completed. At the latter time, 44% of the respondents were living on fixed incomes and 46% were unemployed. This displaced unemployment figure is the highest for any district. The mean age of the respondents was 52 years, with the greatest number being between 51 and 60 years of age. The mean number of years of formal education was 8 years, with the greatest number reporting no more than a 6th grade education. The figures for education are the lowest for any district. Prior to their relocation, 61% of the respondents were owners and 39% were tenants; after relocation, 85% were owners and only 10% were tenants. Thus there was an increase of 24% in the owner category and a decrease of 29% in the tenant category. In fact, the Bristol District had the highest percentage of post-relocation home ownership of any district. The mean length of occupancy in original dwellings was 10.6 years, while the mean length of occupancy in replacement dwellings was 2 years. In other words, Bristol District people who gave interviews or who returned questionnaires had lived in their current housing about 2 years.

Attitudinal Profile

Several questions were asked as indicators of each respondent's feelings toward the entire relocation experience. The significant questions and responses are presented below with limited commentaries.

Initial Feeling About Impending Move

Respondents were asked the following question: How did you feel when you first realized the highway would affect your property? Fifty-six percent of the respondents were upset at the thought of relocation, 31% had mixed emotions, 12% were pleased, and the remaining 2% did not respond to the question.

Attitude Toward the Program, Department, and Department Personnel

To determine if any of the initial anxiety was removed during the course of the relocation experience, respondents were asked certain additional questions relating to the entire "Relocation Program." Three such questions were:

- 1) Indicate your feeling toward the Department's overall relocation program.
- 2) Overall, do you think you were treated fairly by the Department?
- 3) What is your opinion of the way Department people acted in their dealings with you?

In 49% of the cases, respondents ranked the program as "Good" or "Very Good"; 20% gave the program a "So-So" rating; and 27% rated it as "Bad" or "Very Bad." Responses to the fairness question were even more positive. Fifty-eight percent felt they had been fairly treated, 36% felt they had been unfairly treated, and the remaining 7% did not respond. Fifty-eight percent had a "Positive" or "Very Positive" opinion of Department personnel, 15% had a "So-So" opinion, and 19% expressed a "Negative" opinion. In consideration of the fact that 56% of the respondents were upset at the outset of the relocation experience while only 27%, 36%, and 19% responded negatively concerning the program, the Department, and the personnel respectively, it appears that the relocation experience did alleviate some of the initial displeasure indicated by the respondents in an earlier question.

Comparability of Housing and Neighborhood

Respondents were asked the following questions concerning their replacement dwelling and neighborhood: 1) Which do you prefer, this house or your old one? 2) Which do you prefer, this neighborhood or your old one? Forty-six percent of the respondents preferred their new dwelling and 31% preferred their old one. In addition, 34% of the respondents preferred their new neighborhood, while 37% preferred their old one. As can be easily seen, respondents are generally more satisfied with their relocation housing than they are with their relocation neighborhood. (This finding is also true for the statewide sample). Displacees are much more concerned with neighborhood comparability than with housing comparability. In fact, a more in-depth analysis revealed that post-relocation neighborhood satisfaction had a direct bearing upon displacee attitudes toward the Department, its personnel, and the overall relocation program. Thus, it is the authors' conclusion that without sacrificing comparability with respect to housing, the Department should devote increased effort toward achieving comparability with respect to neighborhood. This is true not only for the Bristol District but statewide.

Adequacy of Payments

One of the most important concerns of relocatees appears to be the amount of compensation they will receive for being forced to find a replacement dwelling. When asked whether or not the relocation payments were adequate, 12% of the respondents stated they were not sure, 54% felt the monetary compensation was adequate or more than adequate, and 30% expressed the opinion that payments were inadequate in terms of making them as well off financially as they were prior to relocation. A pattern of reasons emerged in support of the respondent's opinions that payments were insufficient. The most frequently mentioned reason was either that the additive was insufficient or that the original offer for their dwelling was too low.

Relative Ease of Move

Respondents were asked the following three questions:

- 1) Were you satisfied with the help the Department gave you in finding a home?
- 2) Were you given enough time to find replacement housing and vacate?
- 3) What concerned you most about your move?

Forty-two percent stated that they were satisfied with the help they received in finding replacement housing, 39% were not satisfied, and 17% did not respond. The most frequently mentioned reason for any dissatisfaction both in the Bristol District and statewide was that help was not offered. While this response may or may not be valid, displacees seem to be of this opinion and every effort should be made to make clear to the displacee that the Department will assist him in every way possible in finding replacement housing. Perhaps one reason for this relatively high rate of dissatisfaction is related to the respondents' answers to the adequacy of vacation notice question. Only 36% felt that vacation notices were adequate, while 45% felt that they were less than adequate. (Twelve percent were not sure and 7% did not respond to the question). Finally, respondents in the Bristol District listed finding replacement housing (19%), uncertainty (15%), and emotional concerns (12%) as that aspect of relocation that concerned them most about their impending move.

Unsolicited Comments and Concluding Remarks

Unsolicited comments were received from over half the respondents in the Bristol District, which fact led the authors to make the following remarks. The task of relocation in the Bristol District is especially difficult due to many features of both the area and the inhabitants. On the whole, the inhabitants are relatively old, low income, uneducated, blue-collar individuals having distinct ties with the land and a basic resentment of a government agency whose job it often is to uproot them from that land. Moreover, with housing in short supply

these individuals may very often be relocated into housing which is not satisfactory to them in the long run. Comments concerning post-relocation repairs to housing and access areas were frequent--thus reasons for dissatisfaction appeared. Individuals in this district also expressed a need for post-relocation services which exceed the boundaries covered by the Uniform Act, but might aid in ameliorating much of the dissatisfaction accompanying relocation.

District Bristol (59)

Socioeconomic Profile

1. Rural 97%	2. Homeowners prior to relocation 61%	Tenants prior to relocation 39%	
Urban 3%	Homeowners after relocation 85%	Tenants after relocation 10%	
3. DSS prior to relocation 70%	4. Pre-relocation income	Mean \$6,970	Mode \$0-\$5000
Non-DSS prior to relocation 30%	Current income	8,220	\$0-\$5000
5. On fixed income prior to relocation 49%	6. Employed 54%		
On fixed income after relocation 44%	Unemployed 46%		
7. Black 5%	8. Age	Mean 51.9 yr.	Mode 51-60 yr.
Caucasian 95%	9. Education Level	8 yr.	1-6 yr.
			10. Average family size 3.15
		Mean 10.6 yrs.	Mode over 20 yrs.
11. Length of occupancy in original dwelling		24 mos.	2-3 yrs.
Length of occupancy in replacement dwelling			

Attitudinal Profile

1. Initial Feeling About Impending Move	Upset 56%	Mixed Emotions 31%	Pleased 12%	No Response 2%
2. Feeling About Overall Relocation Program	Good 49%	So-So 20%	Bad 27%	No Response 3%
3. Neighborhood Preference	Prefer New 34%	About Same 17%	Prefer Old 37%	N/A 5% N/R 7%
4. Housing Preference	Prefer New 46%	About Same 10%	Prefer Old 31%	N/A 5% N/R 9%
5. Adequacy of Relocation Payments	Adequate 54%	Not Adequate 30%	Not Sure 12%	No Response 3%
6. Reason Dissatisfied with Payments	33%	24%	14%	
	(a) Insufficient Additive	(b) Low Offer	(c) Charge Debt	Status
7. Satisfaction with Help Finding Home	Satisfied 42%	Not Satisfied 39%	No Response 17%	
8. Reason Not Satisfied with Help Finding Home	(a) Help not offered (75%) (b) Didn't like it (13%) (c) Found one myself (12%)			
9. Adequacy of Vacation Notice	Adequate 36%	Not Adequate 46%	Not Sure 12%	No Response 7%
10. Attitude Towards Department's Treatment	Fair 58%	Unfair 36%	No Response 7%	
11. Opinion of Department Personnel	Positive 58%	So-So 15%	Negative 19%	No Response 8%
12. Greatest Concern About Moving	(a) Finding Replacement (b) Uncertainty (c) Social, Family Emotional			

Authors Comments

Most mobile homes in state
 Least satisfaction regarding help finding homes
 Least satisfaction regarding vacation notice
 Highest incidence of post relocation repairs made

RELOCATION SUMMARY FOR SALEM DISTRICT

Socioeconomic Profile

Data were received from 144 households in the Salem District. These data represented a response rate of 59%, which was slightly above the statewide rate of 56%. These respondents in the Salem District constituted 29.2% of the total statewide sample of respondents. Sixty percent of the respondents were urban residents, making Salem the most urban district in the state. Ninety percent of the respondents were Caucasian, and the mean incomes for all respondents were \$8,320 prior to relocation and \$8,520 at the time the questionnaire was completed. These figures show that the Salem District respondents had the highest mean income of the respondents from all districts. Twenty-one percent were unemployed and 30% were living on fixed incomes. These displaced unemployment and fixed income figures are the lowest for any district. The mean age of the respondents was 52 years, with the greatest number being between 51 and 60 years of age. The mean number of years of formal education was 10 years, with the greatest number reporting no more than a high school education. Prior to their relocation, 62% of the respondents were owners and 38% were tenants; after relocation, 83% were owners and only 10% were tenants. Thus there was an increase of 21% in the owner category, and a decrease of 11% in the tenant category. The mean length of occupancy in original dwellings was 12 years, while the mean length of occupancy in replacement dwellings was 20 months. Thus, Salem District people who gave interviews or who returned questionnaires had lived in their current housing a little more than a year and a half.

Attitudinal Profile

Several questions were asked as indicators of each respondent's feelings toward the entire relocation experience. The significant questions and responses are presented below with limited commentaries.

Initial Feeling About Impending Move

Respondents were asked the following question: How did you feel when you first realized the highway would affect your property? Fifty-one percent of the respondents were upset at the thought of relocation, 37% had mixed emotions, and 11% were pleased.

Attitude Toward the Program, Department, and Department Personnel

To determine if any of the initial anxiety was removed during the course of the relocation experience, respondents were asked certain additional questions relating to the entire "Relocation Program." Three such questions were:

- 1) Indicate your feeling toward the Department's overall relocation program.
- 2) Overall, do you think you were treated fairly by the Department?
- 3) What is your opinion of the way Department people acted in their dealings with you?

In 57% of the cases, respondents ranked the program as "Good" or "Very Good"; 20% gave the program a "So-So" rating; 20% rated it as "Bad" or "Very Bad"; the remaining 3% did not respond. Responses to the fairness question were even more positive, though a bit below the state average. Sixty-six percent felt they had been fairly treated; 28% felt they had been unfairly treated, and the remaining 6% did not respond. Sixty-three percent had a "Positive" or "Very Positive" opinion of Department personnel, 13% had a "So-So" opinion, and 15% expressed a negative opinion. In consideration of the fact that 51% of the respondents were upset at the outset of the relocation experience while only 20%, 28%, and 15% responded negatively concerning the program, the Department and the personnel respectively, it appears that the relocation experience did alleviate some of the initial displeasure indicated by respondents in an earlier question.

Comparability of Housing and Neighborhood

Respondents were asked the following questions concerning their replacement dwelling and neighborhood: 1) Which do you prefer, this house or your old one? 2) Which do you prefer, this neighborhood or your old one? Fifty-six percent of the respondents preferred their new dwelling and 22% preferred their old one. However, only 32% of the respondents preferred their new neighborhood, while 41% preferred their old one. As can be seen, respondents appear to be generally more satisfied with their relocation housing than they are with their relocation neighborhood. (This finding is also true for the statewide sample.) Displacees are thus more concerned with neighborhood comparability than with housing comparability. In fact, a more in-depth analysis revealed that post-relocation neighborhood satisfaction had a direct bearing upon displacee attitudes toward the Department, its personnel, and the overall relocation program. Thus, it is the authors' conclusion that without sacrificing comparability with respect to housing, the Department should devote increased effort to achieving comparability with respect to neighborhood. The authors wish to stress that this is true not only for the Salem District but statewide.

Adequacy of Payments

One of the most important concerns of relocatees is the amount of compensation they will receive for being forced to find a replacement dwelling. When asked whether or not the relocation payments were adequate, 55% felt the monetary compensation was adequate or more than adequate, 12% were not sure, and 27% expressed the opinion that payments were inadequate in terms of making them as well off financially as they were prior to relocation. A pattern of reasons emerged in support of the respondents' opinions that payments were insufficient. The most frequently mentioned reason was either that the additive was insufficient or that the original offer for their dwelling was too low.

Relative Ease of Move

Respondents were asked the following three questions:

- 1) Were you satisfied with the help the Department gave you in finding a home?
- 2) Were you given enough time to find replacement housing and vacate?
- 3) What concerned you most about your move?

Norty-nine percent stated that they were satisfied with the help they received in finding a replacement housing, 31% were not satisfied, and 20% did not respond.

The most frequently mentioned reason for the dissatisfaction both in the Salem District and statewide was that help was not offered. While this response may or may not be valid, displacees seem to be of this opinion and every effort should be made to make clear to the displacee that the Department will assist him in every way possible in finding replacement housing. Only 19% of the respondents felt that their vacation notice was not adequate, while 63% felt that it was adequate. Finally, respondents listed financial concerns (26%), social and family ties (17%), and finding replacement housing (15%) as that aspect of relocation that concerned them most about their impending move.

Unsolicited Comments and Concluding Remarks

Unsolicited comments were received from one-third of the respondents in the Salem District. As would normally be expected, about two-thirds of these were negative comments. Most of the complaints had to do with either the fact that additional money was needed to "customize" the replacement housing or that respondents were dissatisfied with their replacement neighborhoods. Several of the respondents were disturbed that they were forced into taking a short-term loan (the interest on which is not reimbursable) in order to secure their replacement housing. The authors are currently seeking methods to ameliorate this dissatisfaction. Some of the respondents reported that their dealings with certain agents were "less than pleasant" and that they felt threatened or pressured into vacating and acquiring a replacement which wasn't totally satisfactory. While it is realized that certain deadlines must be met within a project timetable, the authors wish to emphasize that care must be taken to achieve those deadlines with a minimum of abrasion.

District Salem (144)

Socioeconomic Profile

1. Rural 40%	2. Homeowners prior to relocation 62%	Tenants prior to relocation 38%
Urban 60%	Homeowners after relocation 83%	Tenants after relocation 10%
3. DSS prior to relocation 80%	4. Pre-relocation income	Mean \$8,320
Non-DSS prior to relocation 20%	Current income	Mode 0 - 5000
5. On fixed income prior to relocation 24%	6. Employed 79%	Mean 8,520
On fixed income after relocation 30%	Unemployed 21%	Mode 0 - 5000
7. Black 10%	8. Age	Mean 51 yr.
Caucasian 90%	9. Education Level	Mode 51-60 yrs.
		Mean 10 yr.
		Mode 10-12 yrs.
		10. Average family size 2.7
		Mean 12 yrs.
		Mode over 20 yrs.
		Mean 20 mos.
		Mode 12-18 mos.

Attitudinal Profile

1. Initial Feeling About Impending Move	Upset 51%	Mixed Emotions 37%	Pleased 11%	No Response 1%	
2. Feeling About Overall Relocation Program	Good 57%	So-So 20%	Bad 20%	No Response 3%	
3. Neighborhood Preference	Prefer New 32%	About Same 19%	Pref. Old 41%	N/A 3%	N/R 6%
4. Housing Preference	Prefer New 56%	About Same 15%	Pref. Old 22%	N/A 1%	N/R 6%
5. Adequacy of Relocation Payments	Adequate 55%	Not Adequate 27%	Not Sure 12%	No Response 6%	
6. Reason Dissatisfied with Payments	(a) Insuff. Additive (b) Low Offer (c) Other				
7. Satisfaction with Help Finding Home	Satisfied 49%	Not Satisfied 31%	No Response 20%		
8. Reason Not Satisfied with Help Finding Home	(a) Help not offered		(b) Didn't like offer		
	(c) Found myself				
9. Adequacy of Vacation Notice	Adequate 63%	Not Adequate 19%	Not Sure 9%	No Response 9%	
10. Attitude Towards Department's Treatment	Fair 66%	Unfair 28%	No Response 6%		
11. Opinion of Department Personnel	Positive 63%	So-So 13%	Negative 15%	No Response 9%	
12. Greatest Concern About Moving	(a) Financial		(b) Soc-Family Ties (17%)		
	(c) Finding Replacement Housing (15%)				

Authors Comments

Most urban district
1/3 of our respondents from this district
Lowest rate of unemployment

Lowest rate of fixed post income
Highest income level
Lowest utility difference (41.62)

RELOCATION SUMMARY FOR LYNCHBURG DISTRICT

Socioeconomic Profile

Data were received from 48 households in the Lynchburg District. These data represented a response rate of 53%, which was slightly below the statewide rate of 56%. The respondents in the Lynchburg District constituted 9.7% of the total statewide sample of respondents. Eighty-three percent of the respondents were rural residents and 23% were nonwhite. The mean incomes for respondents were \$7,880 prior to relocation and \$8,180 at the time the questionnaire was completed. At the latter time, 31% of the respondents were living on fixed incomes and 27% were unemployed. The mean age of the respondents was 51 years, with the greatest number being between 41 and 50 years of age. The mean number of years of formal education was 9 years, with the greatest number reporting no more than a 9th grade education. Prior to their relocation, 56% were owners and 44% were tenants; after relocation 81% were owners and 15% were tenants. Thus there was an increase of 25% in the owner category and a decrease of 29% in the tenant category. The mean length of occupancy in original dwellings was 11 years while the mean length of occupancy in replacement dwellings was 2.4 years.

Attitudinal Profile

Several questions were asked as indicators of each respondent's feelings toward the entire relocation experience. The significant questions and responses are presented below with limited commentaries.

Initial Feeling About Impending Move

Respondents were asked the following question: How did you feel when you first realized the highway would affect your property? Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were upset at the thought of relocation, 18% had mixed emotions, and 4% were pleased. The Lynchburg District had a higher percentage of displacees upset at the outset of relocation than did any other district.

Attitude Toward the Program, Department, and Department Personnel

To determine if any of the initial anxiety was removed during the course of the relocation experience, respondents were asked certain additional questions relating to the entire "Relocation Program". Three such questions were:

- 1) Indicate your feeling toward the Department's overall relocation program.
- 2) Overall, do you think you were treated fairly by the Department?
- 3) What is your opinion of the way Department people acted in their dealings with you?

In 56% of the cases, respondents ranked the program as "Good" or "Very Good"; 25% gave the program a "So-So" rating; and 17% rated it as "Bad" or "Very Bad." Responses to the fairness question were more positive. Sixty-five percent felt

they had been fairly treated, 31% felt they had been unfairly treated, and 4% did not respond. Even more positive was the Lynchburg displacees' opinion of the Department personnel. Sixty-seven percent had a "Positive" or "Very Positive" opinion of Department personnel, 6% had a "So-So" opinion, and 17% expressed a "Negative" opinion. In consideration of the fact that 77% of the respondents were upset at the outset of the relocation experience while only 17%, 31%, and 17% responded negatively concerning the program, the Department, and the personnel respectively, it appears that the relocation experience alleviated quite a bit of the initial displeasure indicated by the respondents in a earlier question.

Comparability of Housing and Neighborhood

Respondents were asked the following questions concerning their replacement dwelling and neighborhood: 1) Which do you prefer, this house or your old one? 2) Which do you prefer, this neighborhood or your old one? Fifty percent of the respondents preferred their new dwelling and 25% preferred their old one. On the other hand, only 21% of the respondents preferred their new neighborhood while 48% preferred their old one. As can be easily seen, respondents are generally more satisfied with their relocation housing than they are with their relocation neighborhood. (This finding is also true for the statewide sample.) Displacees appear to be much more concerned with neighborhood comparability than with housing comparability. In fact, a more in-depth analysis revealed that post-relocation neighborhood satisfaction had a direct bearing upon displacee attitudes toward the Department, its personnel, and the overall relocation program. Thus, it is the authors' conclusion that without sacrificing comparability with respect to housing, the Department should devote increased effort to achieving comparability with respect to neighborhood. This is true not only for the Lynchburg District but statewide.

Relative Ease of Move

Respondents were asked the following three questions:

- 1) Were you satisfied with the help the Department gave you in finding a home?
- 2) Were you given enough time to find replacement housing and vacate?
- 3) What concerned you most about your move?

Only 36% stated that they were satisfied with the help they received in finding replacement housing, 43% were not satisfied, and 21% did not respond. The figures for satisfaction with assistance in finding replacement housing are the lowest for any district. The most frequently mentioned reason for the dissatisfaction both in the Lynchburg District and statewide was that help was not offered (78%). While this response may or may not be valid, displacees seem to be of this opinion and every effort should be made to make clear to the displacee that the Department will assist him in every way possible in finding replacement housing. Fifty percent of the respondents felt that their vacation notice was adequate, while 25% felt that it was not. Nineteen percent were not sure and 6% did not respond to the question. Finally, respondents in the Lynchburg District listed uncertainty (24%), finding replacement housing (22%), and psycho-emotional concerns (13%) as that aspect of relocation that concerned them most about their impending move.

Unsolicited Comments and Concluding Remarks

Unsolicited comments were received from almost half the respondents in the Lynchburg District. About three-fourth of these comments were negative. The comments were so varied that no attempt was made to categorize them in any way except to say that most of the negative comments dealt with financial concerns.

District Lynchburg (48)

Socioeconomic Profile

1. Rural 83%	2. Homeowners prior to relocation 56%	Tenants prior to relocation 44%
Urban 17%	Homeowners after relocation 81%	Tenants after relocation 15%
3. DSS prior to relocation 78%	4. Pre-relocation income Mean \$ 7,880	Mode 0 - 5000
Non-DSS prior to relocation 22%	Current income 8,180	Mode 0 - 5000
5. On fixed income prior to relocation 25%	6. Employed 73%	
On fixed income after relocation 31%	Unemployed 27%	
7. Black 23%	8. Age Mean 51 yrs. Mode 41-50 yr.	10. Average family size 3
Caucasian 77%	9. Education Level Mean 9 yrs. Mode 7-9 yr.	
11. Length of occupancy in original dwelling Mean 11 yrs. Mode 4-10 yr.		
Length of occupancy in replacement dwelling 27 mos. over 3 yrs.		

Attitudinal Profile

1. Initial Feeling About Impending Move	Upset 77%	Mixed Emotions 18%	Pleased 4%	No Response 0
2. Feeling About Overall Relocation Program	Good 56%	So-So 25%	Bad 17%	No Response 2%
3. Neighborhood Preference	Prefer New 21%	About Same 17%	Pref. Old 45%	N/A 8% N/R 6%
4. Housing Preference	Prefer New 50%	About Same 15%	Pref. Old 25%	N/A 0 N/R 10%
5. Adequacy of Relocation Payments	Adequate 52%	Not Adequate 29%	Not Sure 10%	No Response 8%
6. Reason Dissatisfied with Payments	(a) Low offer (27%) (b) other (c) Insufficient Additive			
7. Satisfaction with Help Finding Home	Satisfied 36%	Not Satisfied 43%	No Response 21%	
8. Reason Not Satisfied with Help Finding Home	(a) Not offered (78%) (b) Didn't like offers (c) Found myself			
9. Adequacy of Vacation Notice	Adequate 50%	Not Adequate 25%	Not Sure 19%	No Response 6%
10. Attitude Towards Department's Treatment	Fair 65%	Unfair 31%	No Response 4%	
11. Opinion of Department Personnel	Positive 67%	So-So 6%	Negative 17%	No Response 10%
12. Greatest Concern About Moving	(a) Uncertainty (b) Finding replacement (c) Psych-Emotional			

Authors Comments

Highest % initial upset
Least satisfied with help given to find home

RELOCATION SUMMARY FOR RICHMOND DISTRICT

Socioeconomic Profile

Data were received from 93 households in the Richmond District. These data represented a response rate of 65%, which was the highest response rate for any district and was above the statewide rate of 56%. The respondents in the Richmond District constituted 18.8% of the total statewide sample of respondents. Sixty-one percent of the respondents were rural residents, and 57% were black. The Richmond District had the second highest percentage of black respondents of all the districts. The mean incomes for respondents were \$7,150 prior to relocation and \$8,090 at the time the questionnaire was completed. At the latter time, 42% of the respondents were living on fixed incomes and 32% were unemployed. The mean age for respondents was 52 years, with the greatest number being between 51 and 60 years of age. The mean number of years of formal education was 10 years, with the greatest number reporting no more than a 12th grade education. Prior to their relocation, 55% of the respondents were owners and 45% were tenants; after relocation, 61% were owners and 31% were tenants. The Richmond District respondents showed the lowest percent increase in post-relocation homeowners of any district. The mean length of occupancy in original dwellings was 13.3 years, while the mean length of occupancy in replacement dwellings was 21 months. In other words, Richmond District people who gave interviews or who returned questionnaires had lived in their current housing almost two years.

Attitudinal Profile

Several questions were asked as indicators of each respondent's feelings toward the entire relocation experience. The significant questions and responses are presented below with limited commentaries.

Initial Feeling About Impending Move

Respondents were asked the following question: How did you feel when you first realized the highway would affect your property? Fifty-six percent of the respondents were upset at the thought of relocation, 31% had mixed emotions, 11% were pleased, and 2% did not respond to the question.

Attitude Toward the Program, Department, and Department Personnel

To determine if any of the initial anxiety was removed during the course of the relocation experience, respondents were asked certain additional questions relating to the entire "Relocation Program." Three such questions were:

- 1) Indicate your feeling toward the Department's overall relocation program.
- 2) Overall, do you think you were treated fairly by the Department?
- 3) What is your opinion of the way Department people acted in their dealings with you?

In 65% of the cases, respondents ranked the program as "Good" or "Very Good"; 15% gave the program a "So-So" rating; and 15% rated it as "Bad" or "Very Bad". Responses to the fairness question were even more positive. Seventy-six percent felt they had been fairly treated, only 15% felt they had been unfairly treated, and

9% did not respond. The figures for this question are the most positive of all those to the districts. In addition, 73% had a "Positive" or "Very Positive" opinion of Department personnel, 4% had a "So-So" opinion, and only 12% expressed a "Negative" opinion. The figures for this question are also the most positive of all those for the districts. In view of the fact that 56% of the respondents were upset at the outset of the relocation experience while only 15%, 15%, and 12% responded negatively concerning the program, the Department, and the personnel respectively, it appears that the relocation experience alleviated a great deal of the initial displeasure displayed by the respondents in an earlier question. The authors wish to commend the personnel in the Richmond District Right-of-Way office and encourage them to continue with similar efforts.

Comparability of Housing and Neighborhood

Respondents were asked the following questions concerning their replacement dwelling and neighborhood: 1) Which do you prefer, this house or your old one? 2) Which do you prefer, this neighborhood or your old one? Seventy percent of the respondents preferred their new dwelling and only 13% preferred their old one. These figures are the most positive concerning the new dwelling of those for any district. In addition, 45% of the respondents preferred their new neighborhood while only 26% preferred their old one. Respondents are also more pleased with their replacement neighborhood in the Richmond District than in any other district. However, respondents are generally more satisfied with their relocation housing than they are their relocation neighborhood. (This finding is also true for the statewide sample.) Displacees are simply more concerned with neighborhood comparability than with housing comparability. In fact, a more in-depth analysis revealed that post-relocation neighborhood satisfaction had a direct bearing upon displacee attitude toward the Department, its personnel, and the overall relocation program. Thus, it is the authors' conclusion that the Department should devote increased effort to achieving comparability with respect to neighborhood. This is true not only for the Richmond District but statewide.

Adequacy of Payments

One of the most important concerns of relocatees appears to be the amount of compensation they will receive for being forced to find a replacement dwelling. When asked whether or not relocation payments were adequate, 62% of the respondents felt the monetary compensation was adequate or more than adequate, 7% were not sure, and 19% expressed the opinion that payments were inadequate in terms of making them as well off financially as they were prior to relocation. A pattern of reasons emerged in support of the respondent's opinions that payments were insufficient. The most frequently mentioned reason was either that the original offer for the dwelling was too low or that the additive was insufficient.

Relative Ease of Move

Respondents were asked the following three questions:

- 1) Were you satisfied with the help the Department gave you in finding a home?
- 2) Were you given enough time to find replacement housing and vacate?
- 3) What concerned you most about your move?

Forty-five percent said that they were satisfied with the help they received in finding replacement housing, 31% were not satisfied, and 24% did not respond. The most frequently mentioned reason for any dissatisfaction both in the Richmond District and statewide was that help was not offered. While this response may or may not be valid, displacees seem to be of this opinion and every effort should be made to make clear to the displacee that the Department will assist him in every way possible in finding replacement housing. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents felt their vacation notice was adequate, while 24% felt that it was less than adequate. Six percent were not sure and 13% did not respond to the question. Finally, respondents in the Richmond District listed uncertainty (27%), finding replacement housing (18%), and financial concerns (16%) as those aspects of relocation that concerned them most about their impending move.

Unsolicited Comments and Concluding Remarks

Unsolicited comments were received from about one-third of the respondents in the Richmond District. Forty percent of these comments were positive, which is the highest percent of positive comments for any district. As might be expected, most of the negative comments were compensation oriented. Several of these were concerned with having to make post-relocation repairs and adjustments to the replacement housing. Overall, however, the displacees in the Richmond District seem to have a very positive opinion of all aspects of the Department relocation efforts.

District Richmond (93)

Socioeconomic Profile

1. Rural 61%	2. Homeowners prior to relocation 55%	Tenants prior to relocation 45%
Urban 39%	Homeowners after relocation 61%	Tenants after relocation 31%
3. DSS prior to relocation 79%	4. Pre-relocation income	Mean \$ 7,150
Non-DSS prior to relocation 21%	Current income	Mode 0 - 5000
5. On fixed income prior to relocation 27%	6. Employed 68%	
On fixed income after relocation 42%	Unemployed 32%	
7. Black 57%	8. Age	Mean 52yr. Mode 51-60yr.
Caucasian 43%	9. Education Level	10yr. 10-12yr.
		10. Average family size 3
		Mean Mode
11. Length of occupancy in original dwelling	13.3 yrs.	over 20 yrs.
Length of occupancy in replacement dwelling	21 mos.	2-3 yrs.

Attitudinal Profile

1. Initial Feeling About Impending Move	Upset 56%	Mixed Emotions 31%	Pleased 11%	No Response 2%
2. Feeling About Overall Relocation Program	Good 65%	So-So 15%	Bad 15%	No Response 4%
3. Neighborhood Preference	Prefer New 45%	About Same 20%	Pref. Old 26%	N/A N/R
4. Housing Preference	Prefer New 70%	About Same 12%	Pref. Old 13%	N/A 4%
5. Adequacy of Relocation Payments	Adequate 62%	Not Adequate 19%	Not Sure 7%	No Response 12%
6. Reason Dissatisfied with Payments	(a) Other (dispersed) (b) Insuff. Additive (c) Low Offer			
7. Satisfaction with Help Finding Home	Satisfied 45%	Not Satisfied 31%	No Response 24%	
8. Reason Not Satisfied with Help Finding Home	(a) Help not offered (b) Didn't like offer (c) Found myself			
9. Adequacy of Vacation Notice	Adequate 57%	Not Adequate 24%	Not Sure 6%	No Response 13%
10. Attitude Towards Department's Treatment	Fair 76%	Unfair 15%	No Response 9%	
11. Opinion of Department Personnel	Positive 73%	So-So 4%	Negative 12%	No Response
12. Greatest Concern About Moving	(a) Uncertainty (b) Funding Replacement (c) Financial			

Authors Comments

Highest % black population
 Lowest % prefer old neighborhood
 Highest % status change

Highest % fair treatment
 Most complimentary district reg. personnel

RELOCATION SUMMARY FOR SUFFOLK DISTRICT

Socioeconomic Profile

The cases interviewed in the Suffolk District represent approximately 10% of all responses to the relocation survey. Of those responding to the survey in the district (49 of 94), 45% were rural residents and 85% lived in DSS housing prior to relocation. While less than half (49%) were owners prior to relocation, 80% owned homes after being relocated. The post-relocation income level of the respondents was consistent with the large increase in home ownership; even though there was a higher incidence of relocatees on fixed income after relocation (31% after, 20% prior to relocation), the mean family income level after relocation was the highest in the state (\$9,130). This income level reflects a sizeable increase over the pre-relocation level of \$7,790. While the district was composed of a rather sizeable black population (45% of the respondents), the percentage of respondents employed (75%) was higher than the state average, a likely reflection of the tourist industry. The typical family contained three members and had lived in their pre-relocation housing for 10.5 years; the typical respondent had a 10th grade education and was 51 years of age. Most relocatees interviewed had been living in their replacement dwelling approximately 2 years at the time of contact.

Attitudinal Profile

Several questions were asked as indicators of each respondent's feelings toward the entire relocation experience. The significant questions and responses are presented below with limited commentaries.

Initial Feeling About Impending Move

Respondents were asked the following question: How did you feel when you first realized the highway might affect your property? In the Suffolk District, 67% responded that they were upset, 4% said they were pleased, and 25% expressed mixed emotions. These findings typify the reaction in all districts.

Attitude Toward the Program, Department, and Department Personnel

To determine the extent to which the aforementioned feelings were removed during the course of the relocation experience, respondents were asked several additional questions relating to the entire "Relocation Program." Three such questions were:

- 1) How do you feel about the Highway Department's overall relocation program?
- 2) Overall, do you think you were treated fairly by the Highway Department?
- 3) What is your opinion of the way the Highway Department people acted in their dealings with you?

Sixty-one percent of the respondents rated the program as "Good" or "Very Good"; 20% rated the program as "Bad" or "Very Bad"; and 14% gave it a "So-So" rating. The ratings for all the districts were almost identical. As for fairness of treatment, 67% felt that they had been fairly treated by the Department, while 29% felt unfairly treated. Respondents in the Suffolk District appeared to have a slightly higher or more positive opinion of the Department personnel than did respondents statewide. Two out of every three (67%) had a very positive opinion of relocation personnel in the Suffolk District; only 10% expressed a negative attitude.

Comparability of Housing and Neighborhood

Respondents were asked the following questions concerning their replacement dwelling and replacement neighborhood: 1) Which do you prefer, this neighborhood or your old one? 2) Which dwelling do you prefer, this one or your old one? The responses to these questions showed that a larger percentage of relocatees in the district preferred their new housing to their old than preferred their new neighborhood to their old. Forty-one percent preferred the new neighborhood, 14% said it was about the same as the old, and 36% preferred the old neighborhood to the new one. On the other hand, 57% preferred the relocation housing, while only 22% preferred their old dwelling.

Adequacy of Payments

When questioned concerning the adequacy of the relocation payment, the respondents in the Suffolk District indicated an even greater concern for the financial aspects of the relocation program than had been expected at the outset. Almost half (47%) expressed dissatisfaction with the relocation payment, citing changes in their debt status as the primary reason for this dissatisfaction. While it certainly can be said that it is a relocatee's own choice that leads him to purchase a dwelling which is valued at an amount greater than the comparable, the results of the survey point to the need for relocation personnel to emphasize to the relocatee the financial consequences of choosing such a replacement dwelling. This need for special emphasis is heightened by the fact that respondents in the Suffolk District indicated the greatest dissatisfaction with the relocation payment when compared to the other districts in the state.

Relative Ease of Move

Respondents were asked the following three questions:

- 1) Were you satisfied with the help the Department gave you in finding a home?
- 2) Were you given enough time to find replacement housing and vacate?
- 3) What concerned you most about your move?

While 52% were satisfied with the help they received in finding a home, 25% were not, and 23% didn't respond to the question. The reason most often cited as the cause of the dissatisfaction was that help was not offered. While the extent to which help wasn't offered is a matter for debate, increased emphasis should be placed on clarifying, for the relocatee, that help will be given if requested. Only 14% stated that for them the vacation notice period was too short, while 65% stated that they had plenty of time to vacate and find new housing. The typical response to the "concern about the move" question was finding a suitable (satisfactory) replacement. Running a close second was some kind of financial concern; the third most frequently mentioned concern was social and family ties.

Unsolicited Comments

Quite frequently the most useful information in a survey comes from unsolicited comments. One can be reasonably sure that responses which are spontaneous represent real concerns. There seemed to be no central theme, however, to the comments given by the respondents in this district; in fact, less than one-third commented in any way.

Concluding Remarks

The answers to the adequacy of payment question possibly should be of some concern, particularly the reason for the answers. Based upon the authors' judgment of the comments, some additional effort should be made to emphasize to relocatees the financial consequences of choosing a replacement dwelling which is valued greater than the comparable. As is true for all districts, greater emphasis should be placed upon neighborhood comparability in the selection of replacement comparables.

Socioeconomic Profile

1. Rural 45%	2. Homeowners prior to relocation 49%	Tenants prior to relocation 51%
Urban 55%	Homeowners after relocation 80%	Tenants after relocation 16%
3. DSS prior to relocation 85%	4. Pre-relocation income	Mean \$7,790
Non-DSS prior to relocation 15%	Current income	Mode \$5,001 - \$8,000
5. On fixed income prior to relocation 20%	6. Employed 75%	
On fixed income after relocation 31%	Unemployed 25%	
7. Black 45%	8. Age	Mean 51
Caucasian 55%	9. Education Level	Mode 51-60
		10. Average family size 3
		Mean 10 yrs.
		Mode 10-12 yr.
11. Length of occupancy in original dwelling		Mean 10.5 yrs.
Length of occupancy in replacement dwelling		Mode 5-10 yrs.
		Mean 24 mos.
		Mode 2-3 yrs.

Attitudinal Profile

1. Initial Feeling About Impending Move	Upset 67%	Mixed Emotions 25%	Pleased 4%	No Response 4%
2. Feeling About Overall Relocation Program	Good 61%	So-So 14%	Bad 20%	No Response 4%
3. Neighborhood Preference	Prefer New 41%	About Same 14%	Pref. Old 36%	N/A 8% N/R
4. Housing Preference	Prefer New 57%	About same 6%	Pref. Old 22%	N/A 10% N/R 4%
5. Adequacy of Relocation Payments	Adequate 43%	Not Adequate 47%	Not Sure 0	No Response 10%
6. Reason Dissatisfied with Payments	29%	19%	(a) Other (dispersed) (b) Low Offer (c) Debt Status Change	
7. Satisfaction with Help Finding Home	Satisfied 52%	Not Satisfied 25%	No Response 23%	
8. Reason Not Satisfied with Help Finding Home	(a) Help not offered (36%) (b) Found myself (36%) (c) Didn't like offers (27%)			
9. Adequacy of Vacation Notice	Adequate 65%	Not Adequate 14%	Not Sure 8%	No Response 12%
10. Attitude Towards Department's Treatment	Fair 67%	Unfair 29%	No Response 4%	
11. Opinion of Department Personnel	Positive 67%	So-So 10%	Negative 10%	No Response 12%
12. Greatest Concern About Moving	(a) Replacement (b) Financial (c) Social & Family Ties			

Authors Comments

Highest % DSS prior to Relocation
 Highest % not adequate to relocation payment question
 Highest post income

RELOCATION SUMMARY FOR FREDERICKSBURG DISTRICT

Socioeconomic Profile

The cases interviewed in the Fredericksburg District represented approximately 3.6% of all responses to the relocation survey. Of those responding to the survey in the district (18 of 45), all were rural residents and 61% lived in DSS housing prior to relocation. While 72% were owners prior to relocation, 83% owned homes after being relocated. Such an increase in home owners status is rather surprising in light of the fact that the mean income level for relocatees fell after their relocation; the mean income level prior to relocation was \$7,030 as compared to post-relocation income of \$5,970. This reduction in mean income level is consistent with the finding that almost 40% of the respondents were on fixed income after their relocation, while only 17% were on fixed income prior to relocation. Although the district has the highest percentage of black respondents (61%), the percentage of respondents employed (72%) was higher than the state average. The typical family contained slightly more than 3 members and had lived in their pre-relocation housing for 14.8 years, the highest of any district. The typical respondent had less than a 9th grade education and was 54 years of age; most relocatees interviewed had been living in their replacement dwelling approximately 33 months at the time of the contact. This period was longer than the period of time in replacement dwelling for any other district.

Attitudinal Profile

Several questions were asked as indicators of each respondent's feelings towards the entire relocation experience. The significant questions and responses are presented below with limited commentaries.

Initial Feeling about Impending Move

Respondents were asked the following questions: How did you feel when you first realized the highway might affect your property? In the Fredericksburg District, 67% responded that they were upset, 11% said they were pleased, and 22% expressed mixed emotions. These findings typify the reaction in all districts.

Attitude Toward the Program, Department, and Department Personnel

To determine the extent to which the aforementioned feelings were removed during the course of the relocation experience, respondents were asked several additional questions relating to the entire "Relocation Program." Three such questions were:

- 1) How do you feel about the Department's overall relocation program?
- 2) Overall, do you think you were treated fairly by the Highway Department?
- 3) What is your opinion of the way the Highway Department people acted in their dealings with you?

Sixty-seven percent of the respondents rated the program as "Good" or "Very Good"; 22% rated the program as "Bad" or "Very Bad"; and 11% gave it a "So-So" rating. The ratings for all the districts were almost identical. As for fairness of treatment, 50% felt that they had been fairly treated by the Department, while 39% felt unfairly treated. Respondents in the Fredericksburg District felt that they were unfairly treated in more instances than were found to be the case statewide. Furthermore, the respondents also appeared to have a slightly lower opinion of the Department personnel than did respondents statewide; while only 56% of the respondents had a positive opinion of the Department in the Fredericksburg District, 66% of the responses statewide gave a positive opinion of the personnel.

Comparability of Housing and Neighborhood

Respondents were asked the following questions concerning their replacement dwelling and replacement neighborhood: 1) Which do you prefer, this neighborhood or your old one? 2) Which dwelling do you prefer, this one or your old one? The responses to these questions showed that respondents in the Fredericksburg District had a higher preference for their pre-relocation housing than did respondents in any other district. Almost 40% preferred their old housing to their new housing while the statewide average was only 23%. Furthermore, the responses showed that a larger percentage of relocatees in the district preferred their new housing to their old than preferred their new neighborhood to their old. Six percent preferred the new neighborhood, 22% said it was about the same as the old, and 33% preferred the old neighborhood to the new one. On the other hand, 33% preferred the relocation housing while 40% preferred their old dwelling.

Adequacy of Payments

When questioned concerning the adequacy of the relocation payment, the respondents in the Fredericksburg District indicated the same concern for the financial aspects of the relocation program as did respondents in other districts. Fifty percent expressed satisfaction with the payment while 39% stated that the payment was not adequate. For those who were dissatisfied with the payment, the reason most often mentioned for this dissatisfaction was that they simply were not paid enough for their trouble. Reasons of this sort were not atypical of responses in other parts of the state.

Relative Ease of Move

Respondents were asked the following three questions:

- 1) Were you satisfied with the help the Department gave you in finding a home?
- 2) Were you given enough time to find replacement housing and vacate?
- 3) What concerned you most about your move?

While 44% were satisfied with the help they received in finding a home, 28% were not, and 28% did not respond to the question. The reason most often cited as the cause of the dissatisfaction was that help was not offered. While the extent to which help wasn't offered is a matter for debate, increased emphasis should be placed on clarifying, for the relocatee, that help will be given if requested. A very high percentage of respondents indicated that for them the vacation notice was not adequate. While 57% of the respondents statewide indicated that the vacation notice was quite adequate, only 28% of the respondents in the Fredericksburg District felt that they had enough time to find new housing prior to the deadline. The typical response to the "Concern About the Move" question was the uncertainty involved in finding a home.

Unsolicited Comments

Quite frequently the most useful information in a survey comes from unsolicited comments. There seemed to be no central theme, however, to the comments given by the respondents in this district; of the total of 6 comments, 4 were positive and 2 were negative. All of the positive comments dealt in some way with the personnel involved in the relocation program. Both negative comments were in reference to the financial portion of the program.

Concluding Remarks

Although it is difficult to make specific suggestions based upon only 18 respondents, two areas appear to warrant comment. The first relates to satisfaction with the comparability of the neighborhood in which the relocation housing was found. While it is certainly true that the relocatee, himself, chooses in the final instance the neighborhood that he lives in, the authors believe that greater emphasis should be placed upon neighborhood comparability. This is not a problem peculiar to the Fredericksburg District; it occurs statewide. The second relates to the attitude toward the Department's personnel. The comments and the results from the questionnaires in the Fredericksburg District offer no evidence as to why relocatees had a negative opinion of the Department personnel. The responses may have stemmed from the fact that the respondents were dissatisfied with the neighborhood in which they lived or from the possibility that there was a particular group socioeconomic bias among the high incidence of black respondents.

District Fredericksburg (18)

Socioeconomic Profile

1. Rural 100%	2. Homeowners prior to relocation 72%	Tenants prior to relocation 28%
Urban 0	Homeowners after relocation 83%	Tenants after relocation 11%
3. DSS prior to relocation 61%	4. Pre-relocation income	Mean \$ 7,030
Non-DSS prior to relocation 39%	Current income	Mode 0 - 5000
5. On fixed income prior to relocation 17%	6. Employed 72%	
On fixed income after relocation 39%	Unemployed 28%	
7. Black 61%	8. Age	Mean 54
Caucasian 39%	9. Education Level	Mode 51 - 60
		10. Average family size 3.2
		Mean 14.8 yrs.
11. Length of occupancy in original dwelling		Mode 20 yrs.
Length of occupancy in replacement dwelling		Mean 33 mos.
		Mode 2-3 yrs.

Attitudinal Profile

1. Initial Feeling About Impending Move	Upset 67%	Mixed Emotions 22%	Pleased 11%	No Response 0
2. Feeling About Overall Relocation Program	Good 67%	So-So 11%	Bad 22%	No Response 0
3. Neighborhood Preference	Prefer New 6%	About Same 22%	Pref. Old 33%	N/A 33% N/R 6%
4. Housing Preference	Prefer New 33%	About Same 22%	Pref. Old 39%	N/A 0% N/R 6%
5. Adequacy of Relocation Payments	Adequate 50%	Not Adequate 39%	Not Sure 6%	No Response 6%
6. Reason Dissatisfied with Payments	(a) Too much trouble		(b) Financial	
7. Satisfaction with Help Finding Home	Satisfied 44%	Not Satisfied 28%	No Response 28%	
8. Reason Not Satisfied with Help Finding Home	(a) Not offered		(b)	
	(c)			
9. Adequacy of Vacation Notice	Adequate 28%	Not Adequate 56%	Not Sure 6%	No Response 11%
10. Attitude Towards Department's Treatment	Fair 50%	Unfair 39%	No Response 11%	
11. Opinion of Department Personnel	Positive 56%	So-So 6%	Negative 22%	No Response 17%
12. Greatest Concern About Moving	(a) Uncertainty		(b)	
	(c)			

Authors Comments

Highest % non-DSS
 Lowest % non-fixed income
 Highest % black
 Highest preference-old housing
 Least new neighborhood friends made
 Least post. relocation repairs made

High % not adequate to vacation notice
 Longest in original dwelling
 Relatively low opinion of personnel
 Highest utility difference (101.94)
 Highest incidence of utility increase (89%)

RELOCATION SUMMARY FOR CULPEPER DISTRICT

Socioeconomic Profile

The cases interviewed in the Culpeper District represented approximately 12.6% of all responses to the relocation survey. Of those responding to the survey in the district (62 of 125), 57% were rural residents and 76% lived in DSS housing prior to relocation. While this district had the highest number of tenants both prior to relocation (73%) and after relocation (45%), 25% of the respondents changed their status to home owners upon being relocated. Such a high incidence of tenants was not unexpected however, considering that relocatees in the Culpeper District were typically younger than any other relocatees in the state. An additional indicator of the mobility and youth of this group of relocatees is that they had lived in their original dwelling fewer years on average than any other group of relocatees (8 years). The post-relocation income level of the respondents, while it increased by only \$600 (\$7,190 to \$7,690) is consistent with an increase in home ownership. On the other hand, there was a slight increase in the percentage of respondents who were on fixed income after relocation (39% prior to relocation, 42% after relocation). The percentage of respondents who were employed (57%) was lower than the state average, and may reflect the higher than average percentage of black respondents (39% compared to 28% statewide). The typical family contained slightly more than 3 members; the typical respondent had a higher mean educational level than the state average (11 years compared to 9.6 years statewide). Most relocatees interviewed had been living in their replacement dwelling approximately 2 years at the time of the contact.

Attitudinal Profile

Several questions were asked as indicators of each respondent's feelings towards the entire relocation experience. The significant questions and responses are presented below with limited commentaries.

Initial Feeling About Impending Move

Respondents were asked the following questions: How did you feel when you first realized the highway might affect your property? In the Culpeper District 53% responded that they were upset; 17%, a rather high figure, said they were pleased; and 24% expressed mixed emotions. The fact that almost one-fifth were pleased when they found out they would have to move is consistent with a high percentage of tenants.

Attitude Toward the Program, Department, and Department Personnel

To determine the extent to which the aforementioned feelings were removed during the course of the relocation experience, respondents were asked several additional questions relating to the entire "Relocation Program." Three such questions were:

- 1) How do you feel about the Highway Department's overall relocation program?
- 2) Overall, do you think you were treated fairly by the Highway Department?
- 3) What is your opinion of the way the Highway Department people acted in their dealings with you?

Respondents in the Culpeper District rated the relocation program higher than any other group of respondents in the state. Seventy-four percent of the respondents rated the program as "Good" or "Very Good"; only 8% rated the program as "Bad" or "Very Bad"; and 18% gave it a "So-So" rating. As for fairness of treatment, the responses were very similar: seventy-four percent felt that they had been fairly treated by the Department, while 24% felt unfairly treated. Respondents in this district appeared to have a slightly higher or more positive opinion of the Department personnel than respondents statewide. Seventy-one percent had a very positive opinion of relocation personnel in the Culpeper District; only 13% expressed a negative attitude.

Comparability of Housing and Neighborhood

Respondents were asked the following questions concerning their replacement dwelling and replacement neighborhood: 1) Which do you prefer, this neighborhood or your old one? 2) Which dwelling do you prefer, this one or your old one? The responses to these questions showed that a larger percentage of relocatees in the district preferred their new housing to their old than preferred their new neighborhood to their old. Forty-five percent preferred the new neighborhood, 11% said it was about the same as the old, and 34% preferred the old neighborhood to the new one. On the other hand, 61% preferred the relocation housing, while only 27% preferred their old dwelling.

Adequacy of Payment

When questioned concerning the adequacy of the relocation payment, the respondents in the Culpeper District expressed feelings which were typical of those exhibited by respondents statewide. Twenty-nine percent expressed dissatisfaction with the relocation payment, citing insufficient additives as the primary reason for

this dissatisfaction. This type of reason seems very interesting because it would appear that a relocatee is interested just as much in getting a fair amount for his prior property as he is in getting a total payment (offer for existing facility plus additive) which allows him to obtain a comparable replacement. It is not suggested that appraisals are low; however, relocatees in this district obviously believe in many instances that fair appraisals are not being made.

Relative Ease of Move

Respondents were asked the following three questions:

- 1) Were you satisfied with the help the Department gave you in finding a home ?
- 2) Were you given enough time to find replacement housing and vacate ?
- 3) What concerned you most about your move ?

While 61% were satisfied with the help they received in finding a home, 19% were not, and 19% did not respond to the question. Respondents in this district were much more satisfied with the help they received in finding a home than were respondents statewide. As was typical of the state, however, those who were not satisfied with the help they received indicated that their dissatisfaction stemmed from the fact that help was not offered. While the extent to which help wasn't offered is a matter for debate, increased emphasis should be placed on clarifying, for the relocatee, that help will be given if requested. Only 16% stated that for them the vacation notice was too short, while 66% stated that they had plenty of time to vacate and find new housing. Financial consideration was mentioned as the most frequent concern in the minds of relocatees about their having to move. Running a close second was the uncertainty associated with the move.

Unsolicited Comments and Concluding Remarks

Quite frequently the most useful information in a survey comes from unsolicited comments. One can be reasonably sure that responses which are spontaneous represent real concern. A total of 26 unsolicited comments were received from respondents in the Culpeper District; 15 of these were negative, and 11 were positive. Most of the positive comments were in reference to the attitude and the fairness of the Department personnel. Renters in particular were very complimentary. The negative comments, on the other hand, were most frequently received from home owners. This is not unexpected considering the fact that home owners usually have much more to lose than do renters. Most of these negative comments related in one way or the other to some kind of financial concern. As was noted above, home owners frequently are very concerned about getting what in their mind is a fair appraisal for their old property. The comments received suggest no easy method of alleviating or minimizing this kind of feeling on the part of relocatees. It can be suggested that the district take on a heightened awareness that this kind of feeling does arise in a great many cases and that possibly more effort should be given to the explanation of appraisals.

District Culpeper (62)

Socioeconomic Profile

1. Rural 57%	2. Homeowners prior to relocation 27%	Tenants prior to relocation 73%
Urban 43%	Homeowners after relocation 52%	Tenants after relocation 45%
3. DSS prior to relocation 76%	4. Pre-relocation income Mean \$ 7,190	Mode 0 - 5000
Non-DSS prior to relocation 58%	Current income Mean 7,690	Mode 0 - 5000
5. On fixed income prior to relocation 39%	6. Employed 57%	
On fixed income after relocation 42%	Unemployed 43%	
7. Black 39%	8. Age Mean 47	Mode 51-60
Caucasian 48%	9. Education Level Mean >11 yr.	Mode 7-9 yrs.
		10. Average family size 3.2
	11. Length of occupancy in original dwelling Mean 8 yrs.	Mode <1 yr.
	Length of occupancy in replacement dwelling 24 mos.	2-3 yrs.

Attitudinal Profile

	Upset	Mixed Emotions	Pleased	No Response
1. Initial Feeling About Impending Move	53%	24%	17%	3%
2. Feeling About Overall Relocation Program	Good 74%	So-So 15%	Bad 8%	No Response 0
3. Neighborhood Preference	Prefer New 45%	About Same 11%	Pref. Old 34%	N/A 3% N/R 6%
4. Housing Preference	Prefer New 61%	About Same 6%	Pref. Old 27%	N/A 2% N/R 3%
5. Adequacy of Relocation Payments	Adequate 55%	Not Adequate 29%	Not Sure 5%	No Response 11%
6. Reason Dissatisfied with Payments	(a) Insuff. Additive (33%) (b) (dispersed) (c) Low Offer			
7. Satisfaction with Help Finding Home	Satisfied 61%	Not Satisfied 19%	No Response 19%	
8. Reason Not Satisfied with Help Finding Home	(a) Help not offered		(b) Not like offer	
	(c) Found it myself			
9. Adequacy of Vacation Notice	Adequate 66%	Not Adequate 16%	Not Sure 10%	No Response 8%
10. Attitude Towards Department's Treatment	Fair 74%	Unfair 24%	No Response 2%	
11. Opinion of Department Personnel	Positive 71%	So-So 8%	Negative 13%	No Response 8%
12. Greatest Concern About Moving	(a) Varied		(b) Financial	
	(c) Uncertainty			

Authors Comments

Highest tenant status (pre, post)
 Highest positive feeling
 Largest family size
 Highest % status change

Highest education level
 Youngest relocatees
 Least time in original dwelling
 Lowest incidence of utility increase (69%)

RELOCATION SUMMARY FOR STAUNTON DISTRICT

Socioeconomic Profile

The cases interviewed in the Staunton District represented approximately 4.3% of all responses to the relocation survey. Of those responding to the survey in the District (18 of 39), 57% were rural residents and 81% lived in DSS housing prior to relocation. While 62% were owners prior to relocation, 82% owned homes after being relocated. Even though the same number of respondents were on fixed incomes both prior to and following relocation, the mean income level of the respondents increased \$1,250 after the move (from \$7,400 to \$8,650). The district had the lowest percentage of black respondents in the state (5%). The typical family contained 2.4 members (possibly a reflection of the fact that the respondents were the oldest in the state) and had lived in their pre-relocation housing for approximately 13 years; the typical respondent had a 10th grade education, and had a one in three chance of being on fixed income. Most relocatees interviewed had been living in their replacement dwelling approximately 18 months, a period of time shorter than that of respondents in any other district.

Attitudinal Profile

Several questions were asked as indicators of each respondent's feelings toward the entire relocation experience. The significant questions and answers are presented below with limited commentaries.

Initial Feeling About Impending Move

Respondents were asked the following question: How did you feel when you first realized the highway might affect your property? In the Staunton District, 57% responded that they were upset, 19% said they were pleased, and 23% expressed mixed emotions. These findings typify the reaction in most districts.

Attitude Toward the Program, Department, and Department Personnel

To determine the extent to which the aforementioned feelings were removed during the course of the relocation experience, respondents were asked several additional questions relating to the entire "Relocation Program." Three such questions were:

- 1) How do you feel about the Highway Department's overall relocation program?
- 2) Overall, do you think you were treated fairly by the Highway Department?
- 3) What is your opinion of the way the Highway Department people acted in their dealings with you?

The results of the survey conducted in the Staunton District were extremely positive. Only 5% of the respondents rated the overall relocation program as "Bad" or "Very Bad". Seventy-one percent of the respondents rated the program as "Good" or "Very Good"; and 19% gave it a "So-So" rating. The positive responses to the fairness of treatment question were the highest in the state. Seventy-six percent of the respondents felt they had been treated fairly by the Department, while only 14% felt they had been unfairly treated. Responses to the opinion of Department personnel question followed a similar pattern; seventy-one percent had a positive or very positive opinion of the Department personnel, while only 5% had a negative opinion.

Comparability of Housing and Neighborhood

Respondents were asked the following questions concerning their replacement dwelling and replacement neighborhood: 1) Which do you prefer, this neighborhood or your old one? 2) Which dwelling do you prefer, this one or your old one? The responses to these questions showed that a larger percentage of relocatees in the District preferred their new housing to their old than preferred their new neighborhood to their old. Thirty-eight percent preferred the new neighborhood, 14% said that it was about the same as the old, and 33% preferred their old neighborhood to the new one. On the other hand, 76% (the highest in the state) preferred the relocation housing, while only 14% preferred their old dwelling.

Adequacy of Payments

While it is true that most relocatees expressed a great deal of interest in the financial aspect of the relocation program, the respondents in the Staunton District indicated that in 71% of the cases the relocation payment was adequate, while in only 10% of the cases was it not adequate. The percentage indicating payment adequacy was much higher than the state average.

Relative Ease of Move

Respondents were asked the following three questions:

- 1) Were you satisfied with the help the Department gave you in finding a home?
- 2) Were you given enough time to find replacement housing and vacate?
- 3) What concerned you most about your move?

While the survey did indicate some concern statewide with the help that relocatees received in finding a home, responses in the Staunton District indicated that 81% were satisfied with the help that they received; on the other hand less than 50% of those responding statewide were satisfied with the help they received in finding a

home. Only 10% stated that for them the vacation notice period was too short, while 76% stated that they had plenty of time to vacate and find new housing. The typical response to the "Concern about the Move" question was some sort of financial concern; running a close second was the uncertainty that is normally associated with having to move.

Unsolicited Comments and Concluding Remarks

Quite frequently the most useful information in a survey comes from the unsolicited comments that are received. One can be reasonably sure that responses which are spontaneous represent real concern. Only 7 unsolicited comments were received from the 18 respondents in the Staunton District and no central theme seemed to appear in these comments. It is felt, however, that several comments are in order concerning the operations in the District. It was found that even though the respondents in the Staunton District were the oldest of those for any district in the state and therefore might have been expected to have had particular problems in adjusting to relocation, they were all very complimentary of the empathy shown by relocation personnel during the entire relocation process. It was apparent to the interviewers that a great many post-relocation contacts are made and that, in fact, this adds a great deal to the overall positive attitude about the relocation program in that district.

District Staunton (21)

Socioeconomic Profile

1. Rural 57%	2. Homeowners prior to relocation 62%	Tenants prior to relocation 38%
Urban 43%	Homeowners after relocation 81%	Tenants after relocation 14%
3. DSS prior to relocation 81%	4. Pre-relocation income	Mean 87,400
Non-DSS prior to relocation 19%	Current income	Mode 0 - \$5000
5. On fixed income prior to relocation 38%	6. Employed 57%	
On fixed income after relocation 38%	Unemployed 43%	
7. Black 5%	8. Age	Mean 55 yrs.
Caucasian 95%	9. Education Level	Mode over 70 yrs.
		10. Average family size 2.4
		Mean 13 yrs.
		Mode over 20 yrs.
		11. Length of occupancy in original dwelling 13 yrs.
		Length of occupancy in replacement dwelling 18 mos.
		Mean 13 yrs.
		Mode over 20 yrs.

Attitudinal Profile

1. Initial Feeling About Impending Move	Upset 57%	Mixed Emotions 23%	Pleased 19%	No Response 0
2. Feeling About Overall Relocation Program	Good 71%	So-So 19%	Bad 5%	No Response 5%
3. Neighborhood Preference	Prefer New 35%	About Same 14%	Pref. Old 33%	N/A 14%
4. Housing Preference	Prefer New 76%	About same 10%	Pref. Old 14%	N/A N/R
5. Adequacy of Relocation Payments	Adequate 71%	Not Adequate 10%	Not Sure 19%	No Response 0
6. Reason Dissatisfied with Payments	Not significant			
7. Satisfaction with Help Finding Home	Satisfied 81%	Not Satisfied 10%	No Response 10%	
8. Reason Not Satisfied with Help Finding Home	(a) Not significant	(b)		
9. Adequacy of Vacation Notice	Adequate 76%	Not Adequate 10%	Not Sure 14%	No Response
10. Attitude Towards Department's Treatment	Fair 76%	Unfair 14%	No Response 10%	
11. Opinion of Department Personnel	Positive 71%	So-So 5%	Negative 5%	No Response
12. Greatest Concern About Moving	(a) Other	(b) Financial		
	(c) Uncertainty			

Authors Comments

Highest pleased
 Lowest incidence of bad attitudes to program
 Highest preference for replacement housing
 Highest incidence of payment adequacy
 Highest percent satisfied with help
 Lowest negative opinion of personnel

Highest % adequacy vacation notice
 Highest % fair treatment
 Smallest families
 Highest % widowed
 Shortest time in replacement
 Oldest

APPENDIX 1

RELOCATION SUMMARY FOR ALL DISTRICTS*
(494 of 879 cases responding or 56%)

Socioeconomic Profile

1. Rural 61%	2. Homeowners prior to relocation 55%	Tenants prior to relocation 45%
Urban 39%	Homeowners after relocation 75%	Tenants after relocation 20%
3. DSS prior to relocation 78%	4. Pre-relocation income	Mean \$7,466
Non-DSS prior to relocation 22%	Current income	Mode \$0 - \$5,000
5. On fixed income prior to relocation 29%	6. Employed 69%	
On fixed income after relocation 36%	Unemployed 31%	
7. Black 28%	8. Age	Mean 52 yrs. Mode 51 - 60 yrs.
Caucasian 70%	9. Education Level	Mean 9.6 yrs. Mode 10 - 12 yrs.
		10. Average family size 2.9
11. Length of occupancy in original dwelling	Mean 11.5 yrs.	Mode over 20 yrs.
Length of occupancy in replacement dwelling	24 mos.	2-3 yrs.

Attitudinal Profile

	Upset	Mixed Emotions	Pleased	No Response
1. Initial Feeling About Impending Move	58%	30%	11%	2%
2. Feeling About Overall Relocation Program	Good 61%	So-So 18%	Bad 17%	No Response 3%
3. Neighborhood Preference	Prefer New 35%	About Same 17%	Pref. Old 36%	N/A 7% N/R 4%
4. Housing Preference	Prefer New 58%	About Same 12%	Pref. Old 23%	N/A 2% N/R 6%
5. Adequacy of Relocation Payments	Adequate 55%	Not Adequate 28%	Not Sure 9%	No Response 8%
6. Reason Dissatisfied with Payments	(a) Insufficient Additive (27%)		(b) Low Offer (19%)	
7. Satisfaction with Help Finding Home	Satisfied 49%	Not Satisfied 30%	No Response 21%	
8. Reason Not Satisfied with Help Finding Home	(a) Help not offered (68%)		(b) Did not like offers (22%)	
	(c) Found one myself (10%)			
9. Adequacy of Vacation Notice	Adequate 57%	Not Adequate 24%	Not Sure 10%	No Response 9%
10. Attitude Towards Department's Treatment	Fair 68%	Unfair 26%	No Response 6%	
11. Opinion of Department Personnel	Positive 66%	So-So 9%	Negative 14%	No Response 11%
12. Greatest Concern About Moving	(a) Financial (18%)		(b) Finding a Replacement (17%)	
	(c) Uncertainty (16%)			

* Percentages are rounded off

APPENDIX II

GENERAL COMMENTS

" I feel underpaid for my property. The price I received would have been equal to the price of 5-10 years ago. Moving put me in a terrible financial condition. "

" I now have to find another place. The landlord has upped my rent from \$85-\$150 because I have children. "

" Residents living in trailer courts outside of the right of way of the highway should have been given assistance in relocating. The trailer court was closed because of the highway."

" It would have cost us at least 1/3 more to buy a house comparable to the one we had. The house payments doubled, which caused us to move into an apartment. People within political pull are the only ones who are paid well for their property. "

" Our feelings toward the man we dealt with were very poor; not because our house was taken away but because we were treated badly."

" We feel that the Highway Department thinks it is more important for them to be content than for those who had to move."

" The state could have sold us the Griffith Jr. house and solved all problems. The state has done nothing with the land our rented house stood on. The state also had Vepeco work against us in moving the Griffith house (a practice of Communism). The state ran us out and yet has done nothing with the property. They also pushed the contractor and ended up doing a lousy job (which I ended up fixing with my own time and money). "

" The Highway Department people were very fair and helpful in the relocation process."

" Everyone involved was very nice. We don't believe the rumors anymore that the Highway Department always trys [sic] to get your land for nothing."

" There was sentimental attachment to our old place but we realized that downtown had gone "downhill" and it was for the best to move. "

" Before relocation we were renting; now we are buying a home."

" We thank God that we got a fair deal from the Highway Department and that in making a better highway more lives will be saved."

" The relocation program was beneficial to us; it helped build a replacement dwelling. "

" Before moving we had a separate dwelling for storage. The price on this property was not given enough consideration and we had to borrow money to finish the house. We feel that if there had been more time, we could have complained more and maybe have gotten a better deal."

" We have no regrets about our move. We realized that the highway was necessary due to too much traffic on Rt. 17."

" Mr. Tom Cooke and J.W. McGhee were 100%. I would like to pass this along to them and to anyone else who wishes to know."

" Time is tight. I am a single woman with no money to pay my bills."

" We were treated fairly except for the purchase price which was \$10,000 under the market and the Highway Department would not go to court and settle."

" Thanks to the Highway Department, they were very decent about the move."

" The relocation came about during my final semester at Georgetown University. The state allowed us to stay in the house after their takeover of it for the next couple of months until we graduated. I was impressed by the Highway Department's willingness and cooperation in allowing us to remain in the house. The sensitivity to individual situations is greatly appreciated."

" We did not want to part with our land. We were not given enough money for this property. They also took almost two acres of tenant housing off the property I am living on, so I am not receiving any income from a rented house now. Also the land value is much higher."

" We are pleased with our new location and with the help the Highway Department people gave."

" Before I lived in a room on Ridge Street, now I live in an apartment on Prospect Avenue. Conditions have been most favorable."

" My trailer was set on a lot on Mill Street owned by H. B. Sedwich. Town of Orange paid first six months rent but nothing has been paid since. I have applied for social security but have received no payment. I was receiving food stamps but was cut off. Water was never connected or electricity because of bad credit. Interested persons have given me oil and cooking gas but I am in desperate need of help."

" The place we left will always be home; the place we live now is just a house."

" Mr. Baker was very nice and helpful when we needed him."

- " We cannot imagine how the state assessors could evaluate the property for one amount and then two years later have the same property minus one acre evaluated for 40% more for tax purposes. We feel the state condemnation procedures were unfair and this weighted against us getting a fair price."
- " The Highway Department's so called workers know how to mistreat people. It's not for the little people anymore, it's for the big man."
- " I think that if I was given more time I could have taken advantage of the dollar for dollar state plan. (You put up an X amount of dollars and the state matches it to buy a dwelling). Overall I am satisfied."
- " The psychological aspects of uprooting are traumatic especially when it feels to everyone that the road wouldn't benefit anyone but the bureaucrats (as was the case Rt. 66). Many people were moved and millions of dollars spent on something unnecessary."
- " Thank you."
- " I don't think it is fair to make old people leave their homes and neighbors and subject them to strange places and surroundings which cost much more."
- " We feel the timing was bad. We were in a position for twelve years of not knowing what to do with our property. Finally it was purchased; but several acres now stand as weeds next to our house and we have to mow it."
- " Everything the state promised us was carried out to the fullest."
- " They ruined the grounds around our house by bulldozing it 3 feet lower than the wood causing water to run under the house. The house smells musty and damp and stays wet underneath all the time."
- " We had trouble finding a place. We found and built on a lot(\$11,000). Our son does chair caneing and lost a lot of work because of move. We told the Highway Department to lock the doors of our old house and put up "No Trespassing" signs. They didn't and vandals destroyed the insides. We were upset to see our old house of 48 years destroyed so."
- " Built a new house. The lot cost twice what we paid for our old house and land."
- " Our new house needed a lot of fixing and we were unable to do it. It is more expensive to live in the new house and we don't like it."
- " We were settled in our old home, pretty location, good neighborhood. Now we are in a flood area, if it rains for more than 15 minutes we have to leave. We are thinking about suing the state because the area we live in has been classified as a flood area for 100 years."

" We are glad the ordeal is over. We are satisfied with the payments but confused about the payment procedure. We had to pay rent until the deal was closed, which put us in the hole for several months."

" We think the Highway Department should have helped dig the well for our property."

" The Highway Department did a good job except in taking care of the back roads off the main roads, which are as important as the hard top ones."

" We felt the Highway Department shouldn't make people vacate their homes just to let them sit for 2 to 3 years before beginning construction. Housing is limited in this area due to the Dam project and the Highway Department should have let us stayed on until they really needed the land. Harold Ball was very nice and considerate in our dealings with him."

" Heard rumors that the Highway Department would take land for nothing but are now happy in new home."

" Moving made things much harder. Utility bills and interest rates were much higher than before."

" I would like to thank Curt Jackson for his help in relocation."

" I had enough land to put a trailer on but there was no road to it. Had to climb a hill until I became too disabled; then I had to move the trailer to level place."

" They made a mistake awarding the contracts and I over spent."

" I am not satisfied because the landlord did not give me the contract that my wife signed when the Highway Department paid for it. I would like to have the original contract."

" Thank you!"

" Before moving I was renting a house, don't know if I deserved any more than moving expenses."

" The Highway Department did all they said they were going to do."

" I would be more satisfied if the Highway Department helped me move the creek that is next to my yard. It keeps washing the yard away."

" I would like a better driveway down to the house."

" I do not believe in people beating the state in their lawsuits by getting double the amount their property was valued at."

- " I did not have enough time. My husband had just died; but they still kept pushing me. I moved in December 1974, the lady across the street is still there. It is not fair to make one move and not the other."
- " I am very pleased with the Highway Department."
- " They were rather slow in their settlement. Had to move six weeks before things were settled. "
- " I have spent thousands of dollars to fix up our new house. I hope I live long enough to enjoy it."
- " I have no complaints, I was treated very fairly. Mr. Lyle was a very nice man to deal with."
- " I moved in a mobile home of fair condition. The stove and refrigerator have both given out and I don't have the money to replace them."
- " I am very resentful that my house was priced according to housing "in a cheap unsatisfactory area of the Martinsville Area" when my house was in a more exclusive area. Mr. Hill and Mr. Huff were both courteous and helpful but bound to state regulations."
- " I felt pushed into buying something I didn't want. Things were taken from my house that were supposed to be left; but I had no one to turn to."
- " We are joint owners of the property. My sister had Parkinson's Disease and has always lived on the property. Thus, this made it very difficult to move. "
- " Our move has caused a financial burden. I am also dissatisfied with where I am living. I blame the appraisers. They were from Bristol; how would they know anything about land values here."
- " We are in our 70's. We are finding it hard to make ends meet on a fixed income. Before the relocation we didn't have any bills, now we do."
- " We see now how the new highway affects us. We are very pleased with it, live near it and think it looks good!"
- " I think it is a shame that the state can take people's property away to build a highway. I don't care for such progress. "
- " I was not allowed to stay in my house until my new one was completed. My old house stayed empty for six months after I left."

- " The Highway Department was very helpful in helping us to find a new location."
- " I think the program is very good. I don't see the need for changes unless it is in assistance after being moved. The program helped me get a much nicer place to live."
- " All in all I am quite pleased."
- " The road was under construction for one year. It started in front of my house and was finished everywhere else except in front of my house. I was dissatisfied with the values placed on my home. I felt I should have gotten the same as my neighbor did. State takes from the poor and gives to the rich."
- " My husband died and I want to thank the Highway Department for helping me move to Michigan."
- " I was offered \$23,000 for my house if I moved into a comparable one, but I am old and crippled by arthritis so I had to move into an apartment at a loss of \$8,000."
- " I would like to thank Mr. Oaks and Mr. Phillipi for all their help."
- " New house had leaks and the driveway was not finished properly. Tried to get the Highway Department behind the contractor. No results. Had to sell the house at a \$4,000 loss. I've been in financial trouble since I started dealing with the Highway Department."
- " I hope to never have dealings with the Highway Department again. I had to borrow money for a downpayment on our new house because the Highway Department was so slow in a settlement. We were also told that unless we bought a house equalling or more than the total value of our house and relocation payment we would only get the value of our house. No relocation money!"
- " We didn't receive fair relocation money. We had been offered more by individuals because of our good location."
- " My granddaughter is in a wheelchair. I found a place near her so I could take care of her."
- " I feel more consideration should be given to people on fixed incomes than to people working!"
- " We were treated fairly but we were satisfied with our cheaper way of living before."
- " If we tried to compare prices of our other house, the Highway Department told us if we didn't like it to take it to court."

" We were never told why we received \$900 and our neighbor received \$4,500 for the same type of home. We are very bitter towards the Highway Department."

" I was told by the Highway Department that the house chosen was alright. I had to replace furnace, and repair unsafe wiring. I am a woman alone, ill and have no funds left to repair. I feel taken."

" Any comment would have no value to you since the subject is closed."

" The only reason we filled out the questionnaire was to say "The Highway Department is a bunch of idiots whose intelligence could not fill a good size thimble." We are disgusted with our dealings with the Highway Department."

" Our new house does not have as many rooms as we need (basement, room for canning fruit). "

" We felt the Highway Department did not pay enough for our old property. "

" I am well satisfied."

" I am dissatisfied with my present location. Gas bill to and from work is much more than at old housing. "

" When we were told of the move we were afraid of the change and we had a feeling of being uprooted. Now we have adjusted and love our new house."

" The Highway Department should not be able to take a person's property unless they are completely satisfied."

" We did not receive any pressure from the Highway Department but the people we rent from pushed us out thinking they would lose their home. We were tricked into buying a non-quality house. We were not given enough time to look for a house and for a loan to be approved. Then we couldn't do anything until we received aid."

" We were very upset about the move and now it seems the Highway Department has forgotten about the new road."

" I hope when you move people you don't expect old people to just jump up and go. I am a 72 year old who had done just that and now have been down sick ever since the move. "

" I am pleased with our new home."

" My wife has suffered from schizophrenia since 1962 and I would not settle with the Highway Department. The court bought us a house and put the remainder of the money in our lawyers hands. Why not our 2 sons (graduates of college) I don't know. I have always taken care of my family and hope to continue without the help of the state or courts."

"I think the Highway Department is rotten and I want my home back. My husband and I bought the house in 1925, he is dead and now they are taking away everything that belonged to us. They did not pay the proper value; they do not give a damn about people."

"I don't like having to go 1/2 mile past my house to get back to it from the opposite side of the road. There should have been a cut-off put closer to my home."

"We are glad it is over."

"Hope they don't take us again."

"We could have made a better choice of relocating our trailer."

"We did not know much about buying a house; therefore the house was not inspected before we bought it. We had to spend \$900 for repairs."

"Thank you."

"After all is done with I am pleased with my new home. I am upset though at how the Highway Department agents tried to give me less than I had. Without the help of one honest agent I would have been lost. I feel that because I am black and unmarried they tried to take advantage of me."

"I feel my contractor gave me a very bad deal. He took sections of my land and sold it and did not give me any of the money."

"I wish this were an official investigation of the Highway Department dealings with me. I would want the Highway Department to finish my home to make it DS&S or give me relocation payments so I could put gutters on, fix heating, paint and put in a driveway before winter."

"I feel that because of political factors I did not receive a fair market value. I think the fair market value was derived according to the value of the property not to the status of owner."

"I think it was an excellent program. All the people we dealt with were very kind."

"I thank all the Highway Department people for all they have done."

"Everyone treated me very nice."

"I like my new dwelling but the neighborhood is getting run down. If I had it to do over again I would look for a better neighborhood."

"I was charged \$267 by Va. Mutual & Loan Assoc. for paying off old mortgage. I was told this would be refunded but it never was."

" Everything was fair and above board!"

" I was pleased with the way the Highway Department handled the situation."

" I am pleased with my house and the settlement. The state people were very helpful. "

" No comment. What's the use--its all over. The state has what they want, I just hope they are satisfied."

" My husband is confined to a wheelchair and without the help of the Highway Department people we would not have been able to get our home. Thanks!"

" We are well satisfied, there is only one complaint -- it is cold in the winter!"

" The Highway Department agent should be located in the community involved for a couple of weeks so that working people can see them after work and not have to make long distance calls to set up appointments and straighten out details."

" We have a bad access to the new road. No crossover in our section of Nottoway!"

" I feel that anytime people are forced to leave a paid-for-home they should not have to build on already owned land and then end up with a \$16,000 mortgage which, with financing, will be \$33,000 and for the exact same amount of room. I feel we received a bad deal. "

" I don't drive. I need an opening in the fence or front of the house to make it easier to get to transportation. My age and health are not good to have to walk far. "

" I feel fortunate to have been relocated."

" The rent, electricity and gas cooking are more costly than in old house."

" I feel I wasn't paid enough for my land."

" I am satisfied with all transactions."

" Not enough time was given to build a new home. No consideration was given for moving personal property other than household items. "

" We were treated fairly and respectfully by Highway Department representative Mr. Owens. "

" I have had many problems with our new house. Also utility bills are higher. "

" With money we received we bought furniture for new home."

" Cost me \$6000 more to relocate than was allocated to me."

- " I feel that if I did not have enough money for a downpayment for a house the state should give the amount in full (what they would allow towards a house payment) instead of a smaller amount at a time. I would have bought a house but the payments would have been \$185.00 per month."
- " We were treated fairly and are satisfied. My state lawyer at the time of settlement was "a very nasty-sharp tongued old man."
- " The road leading into the "Adult Home" was very dangerous. I did not get enough money to put of the four rooms in the basement. After working all my life for a home it is not the same."
- " Too much time lapsed between the initial visit and the time definite plans for relocation were started. I am very satisfied with the dealing. Highest regards to Mr. D. Brandt and Mr. G. Rush. "
- " On making our last load moving my wife fell breaking her hip (requiring \$300 worth of care including surgery). It would not have happened if we did not have to relocate. "
- " The Highway Department promised to replace the driveway with a pipe. They didn't. Water washed across our yard. Had land surveyed and marked with pegs, the Highway Department covered them and did not replace them."
- " We were dissatisfied at first because the initial offer was too low to find comparable property. However, changes were made and more money was offered. We were treated very nicely."
- " The people I dealt with were nice people only doing their job. They were courteous and understanding."
- " We were dissapointed that the state didn't try to help us find a comparable place. We couldn't find one with as much land and room as we could afford!"
- " Everything the Highway Department did was OK. We needed the highway!"
- " I don't like Amherst County or this location because I have to transfer buses to get to work. I can't keep my trailer or windows clean because of dust from the road. "
- " Some questions should be discussed person to person. We never saw the same man twice. We were given the run-around and many things were unfair."
- " We wish to thank the Highway Department for allowing us to own our own house. "

- " We were promised by the Highway Department that there would be no changes; we now have a smaller yard due to a twelve foot embankment with the driveway."
- " We were lied to about the right-of-way!"
- " The Highway Department paid damages and landlocked our remaining property with no outlet. We had to buy the access from a neighbor and pay to have a road built with funds from the Highway Department. We also had to drill another well."
- " This was the second time in 20 years we had to deal with the Highway Department. Now we are landlocked and had to buy the right of way into property. We are now getting settled and are very well satisfied. "
- " When the highway was moved to my side of the road I lost my land and mothers home, land from fathers estate and brothers home. All the changes have made me bitter. "
- " Our initial problem was that of dealing with the right of way agents."
- " We felt we were dealt with very fairly by the Highway Department."
- " We want no more dealings with the Highway Department. We owed \$500 on our original dwelling; now we owe \$7,000. We are glad it's over."
- " We are angry that we have to start all over again for some lousy highway that only goes 55 miles. There was no housing in our area for the amount we received."
- " With modern engineering skills you would think that the builders could have found an alternative route without having to tear down our community."
- " It is hard adjusting to our new home after living in our old one for 20 years. We were almost out of debt. "
- " Thanks for your help. "
- " Thanks to everyone who helped us. "
- " We didn't like the way the Highway Department issued the relocation money and didn't understand. Also there was not enough time for relocation."
- " We were satisfied overall with the move. "
- " I would like to thank the Highway Department for our new home that we would have been unable to afford. My husband died of leukemia in 1974 and a home means a lot to me and my children."

- " I never received an explanation of why I received \$1,000 and others under the same circumstances received \$7,000."
- " I am grateful to the Highway Department for allowing me to purchase my own home. "
- " I have no complaints. I was able to buy a home instead of renting one. Payment was received within 30 days."
- " I feel cheated. I was paid \$5,000 less than a house of the same quality cost on the 1974 market considering the inflated market and high interest rates. "
- " I am happy and enjoying my new home."
- " Anytime you want to relocate me again give me a call. If you need a recommendation refer anyone to me. "
- " Highway folks are very nice people but I think there should be a law that if they take your land they should get you a similar one and put you in it free of debt. I am too old to be in debt and will never get it paid off."
- " We were lucky the Highway Department took the house we were renting; now we own a home."
- " Receiving payments at different times makes settling up finances of our new house difficult."
- " We felt the Highway Department was fair. The only problem was moving from a house we had lived in all our married life. "
- " I didn't like the way the new road took the yards of people when nothing would have to been taken if they had used the other side of the road. "
- " I have retired of disability on a fixed income. It cost me \$3,018 to move my trailer. I received only \$1,572. I didn't mind the move but I feel the Highway Department should have found me a lot and paid my expenses to move."
- " I wasn't paid what the Highway Department promised. "
- " I was not paid enough for my relocation expenses."
- " Because of my husband's illness we moved back to our home in Michigan. We never moved one piece of furniture and by not living in the house 6 months we weren't entitled to all the relocation money. (They came around 10 days before we had been back 6 months wanting us to sign which we didn't). We felt we had been treated dirty."

- " We weren't treated fairly. We were due \$1,000 more than we got from the state."
- " We do not like the way the state promises things with no intention of carrying them out!"
- " We feel the Highway Department treats people fairly and we are very pleased with our house!"
- " We didn't feel we were paid enough. We are afraid the bank will wash down and the house will slide."
- " We had a hard time getting settled. Once settled though we had a slide taking an acre of land and trees. We are forced to go into Court because the Highway Department doesn't want to pay for land damages. "
- " We feel the Highway Department did damage to our property. The construction of the highway created water problems in our basement. We feel it wasn't fair play. "
- " We are not satisfied with our new location. It isn't as convenient, not as good of neighbors, and has a narrow rough road. "
- " We were forced to relocate before any payment for land was made. We had to take a bank loan to relocate. The Highway Department gave no assistance. The property taken was given only 1/2 of its appraised value."
- " We did not have all the pensions when we had to move. We had to relocate with what money was available and moved into too small a house!"
- " State appraisers do not do a good job appraising personal property."
- " We lost a lot of money by moving. Our income is now half of what we had in Virginia but are thankful because we have found the Lord."
- " We had trouble financing and in getting the timing of payments the way we wanted. But we are satisfied now. "
- " We had to pay \$4,000 on our house and had to borrow the money until the state could pay. The state was supposed to pay the interest, but they never did. We think the state should pay more when you are made to give up your home."
- " We thank the Highway Department for our beautiful home we now live in!"

- " We were told we would receive 4 equal payments annually in the amount of \$984.00 then we received a call saying we would only receive \$780.00. The move also had a terrible affect on our parents health. As to date the road still remains the same."
- " The two relocation men were very nice to us."
- " It is difficult to adjust to a new location especially after living in a location for so long. Move has caused us many worries."
- " I have adjusted and made many more friends. All transactions with the state were courteous and considerate."
- " Compensation costs were 50% below that required for a convenient move. "
- " I feel the Highway Department should put in writing all they will pay before you move. We were promised full coverage of relocation but when we asked the state to pay for a \$300 entry fee into a trailer court they refused to pay."
- " The Highway Department relocation personnel should explore all possibilities in highway construction before condemnation of property and eviction of families."
- " I don't like having to go so far to make a turn into our mobile home. There should have been an opening left in the highway to get to the trailer court."
- " I have bought a home and am living much better now. "
- " I wasn't given a fair price for a lot as compared to another landowner in the same area. I believe it was due to race. The other landowner is white, I am black."
- " Thanks to the Highway Department for being so nice to us. "