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A study of the relocation of 189 households from or within the greater Salt Lake City and Ogden area of northern Utah was conducted by the Utah State Department of Highways. Of this total, 15 concerned a commercial project and 174, public roads. Aware of possible effects of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968, the latter data were divided with 101 cases falling within the range from 1963 to 1968 and 73 from 1969 to 1973.

Of the 189 total, 125 (66%) were found to be current and 78 (41%) provided data adequate for this study.

Methodology centered upon personal, telephone and mail contact providing maximum opportunity for both objective and subjective expressions about the move; financial settlement; housing, neighborhood, social life, and personal interests.

Reactions to the interviews showed 84% favorable, 9% indifferent, and 7% negative.

Reactions to the move showed that 68% were favorable, 4% indifferent, and 27% unfavorable.

Responses to financial settlement were more favorable for those having been relocated after 1968 than before.

Evaluations of current housing, following relocation, showed 67% favorable, 16% indifferent, and 16% unfavorable. As to change in housing 64% were favorable, 22% indifferent and 14% unfavorable.

Neighborhood evaluations were 69% favorable, 13% indifferent and 21% unfavorable. Change in neighborhood was rated as favorable by 58%, inconsequential by 25%; and unfavorable by 17% of both segments.

Social life was rated as currently favorable for 62% of the former and 66% of the latter; as adequate by 27% of the former and 18% of the latter; and as unfavorable by 11% of the former and 13% of the latter segments. Change in social life was rated as favorable by 26%, of no real consequence by 53% and as unfavorable by 21% of those constituting the total population for the study.

Personal interests in the current location were rated favorably by 71% of the former and 90% of the latter; adequate by 14% of the former and 4% of the latter; and as unfavorable by 14% of the former and 8% of the latter of the two segments. Change in personal interests was rated as improved by 12%; as about the same by 84% and for the worse by 4% of the totals for the study.

Methodologically, it was concluded that the time required for more involvement with both subjective and objective responses provided much higher validity to the findings of this study than had this been an "objective" inquiry only.

Data acquired clearly affirmed the conclusion leading to the title formulated after the compilation of findings that, at least in the area of this study, relocation can be good for you.
PREFACE

Invitation to conduct the study came in May 1974 from Lowell Elmer, Study Coordinator of the Utah State Department of Highways who, along with Les Abbey, Dale Petersen, Max Williams, Don Goodfellow and other members of the Department, provided clarification of intent and scope, additional information and valuable viewpoints and suggestions.

Initial field interviewing was assisted by Jim Thuet who also helped prepare tentative questionnaires and schedules adapting existing methodologies to this study.

Map studies, directory research, route-chart formulations and address locations were accomplished by Diane Draper and Julieta Porres who also did most of the interviewing. Assisted by other members of the Department, Diane provided the photography included in this report.
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INTRODUCTION

The relocation of residences and businesses has become an important part of modern, urban living in the United States, with a total of 168,000 being reported for 1970. (Highway Research Board Special Report No. 110, 15 Jan. 1973). Of these, 80,000 were through private industry, 55,000 by the Federal Highway Administration, 30,000 by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 3,000 through the construction of parks, mass transit and related projects on a state or local level.

Growing concern for standards of living and financial settlements in recent years has led to increasing inquiries about attitudes and social values among those affected. Such human elements are more significant than materialistic ones alone and federal, state and local governments have been appropriating increasing funds to build their files of useful information on these subjects.

A commercial project in Ogden relocating fifteen residences in 1972 and 1973 provided focus for a preliminary or "pilot" study later to be augmented by another 174 cases from the files of the Utah State Highway Department between 1963 and 1973. Data from all of these were later combined yielding a total of 189 cases for this study.

Subsequent review of the nearly-completed report with members of the Department led to some question about the possible influence of the 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act upon relocatee responses and division of data at that point. A total of 101 cases appeared in the first group ranging from 1963 to 1968 with 73 cases in the second from 1969 to 1973. When analysis for each group shows enough difference, two separate profiles are combined in the same graph.
...just as happy here as where I was before."

"...grateful for the chance to move."

METHODOLOGY

Locating and Contacting

Identification and location of addresses with attempts to contact residents were limited geographically to the greater Salt Lake and Ogden areas from Draper on the south to Willard on the north and from the lake on the west to the foothills on the east including Huntsville several miles east of Ogden.

Each address was located by colored pin on the map and route-charts were composed to save time and costs of travel. Residences not located by this means were investigated in telephone and city directories for possible changes. Residents not currently listed were sent letters-of-inquiry seeking verification or revision of the original file addresses along with expression of willingness to participate in interview.

Of the 189 addresses on the composite list, 125 or 66% were found to be current in the area, and 78 or 41% of the 189 provided data adequate for this study.

Of those found to be no longer current, 3 were known to be deceased; 8 were known to have moved from the defined area (to Lehi, Provo, Fillmore and La Verkin, Utah; Phoenix, Arizona; Riverton, Wyoming; Pocatello, Idaho; and Snohomish, Washington); 24 follow-up letters were returned by the Post Office marked "no such address" or "moved; no forwarding address"; and 29 could not be found in city or telephone directories. Of those located but not providing adequate data, 12 refused; 2 were tenants unaware of being relocated; 1 spoke only Japanese; one was too ill; and 31 could not be found at home for interview either by visit or telephone.
METHODOLOGY

Observing and Interviewing

The general character and quality of neighborhood and housing were not included in the writing of the case histories due to the lack of comparative data regarding former locations. The intent of this work was to clarify values and attitudes in order to better understand reactions to the relocation experience. Illustrations on these pages show varieties of environmental conditions in the new locations. A wide variety of quality is apparent and, contrary to certain stereotypes of public opinion, not all find themselves within the realm of lower-class or poverty-level housing. In fact, very few relocating could be so classified; the very large majority could be termed "entirely adequate" and many were very well situated in terms of both housing and general neighborhood character. A few, such as the one illustrated here, would qualify as elite or clearly high standard in all respects.

"...some gains and some losses."

...elite or clearly high standard in all respects.
Personal contacting was made through use of private cars as well as those marked as property of the State Highway Department.
Respondents were advised that many agencies are interested in problems associated with relocation - including universities, highway departments and other branches of state and local government along with many of an industrial and commercial variety.

The mode of inquiry was one of sympathetic interest in how they were getting along in their new location. Plain and straightforward questions as to how they felt about the move, financial settlements or aids, housing old and new, changes in neighborhood, social life in the new locality and in personal hobbies led to direct answers in nearly all cases. Willingness to discuss matters of a personal nature promoted spontaneity of expression on matters relevant to the study itself.
Information and opinions volunteered were taken as stated without questioning or debate and no attempts were made to convey the opinions or views of the interviewers. Many were pleased that someone cared enough about their welfare and feelings to converse with them.

This somewhat subjective approach to how they felt led to a humanistic relating of views and information of considerable scientific value. Had they only been asked what they thought, they might have felt obligated to provide “good” or “right” answers in attempts to anticipate what the interviews wanted to hear. These data, therefore, carry more of the quality of what people wanted to say rather than what they logically or intellectually thought they ought to say.

Caution was exercised to avoid implications of good or best kinds of responses and often topics not relevant to the study consumed some of the time. This was allowed as a means of insuring spontaneity and good will and eventually the line of thinking was brought back to topics used as references for discussion. As a result, most were willing and even anxious to take the time to talk through the areas of greatest concern. Had even slight pressure been exerted to limit time, less honest and reflective responses might have been gained. At all times, focus was maintained on a sense of concern for their welfare and sincere feelings of understanding how they felt. References to science or the importance of accurate and complete data were never made lest the study itself were to be assumed to be of greater importance than the people themselves.

A common limitation of daytime surveys is a preponderance of housewives at home with an absence of evidence about how husbands, children or others feel. Where possible and appropriate, appointments by telephone were made when both husband and wife could be interviewed simultaneously. In addition, interviews at one time with a member of the household were followed by subsequent ones with others. In some cases useful information was provided by children.

Many were pleased that someone cared enough...to converse with them.

Recording and Verifying

Only rarely were notations made in the presence of relocatees directly but in cars or otherwise away from those being studied.

Of the 78 providing adequate data for this study, one was contacted by interview, telephone and mail; 3 by direct visit and telephone; 2 by visit and mail; 39 by visit alone; 3 by telephone and mail; 28 by telephone only; and 2 by mail only.

A summary of each interview was mailed to each household providing data. This had the advantage of not only providing those interviewed but also others with opportunity to affirm or adjust its accuracy.

Even though postage-free, self-addressed envelopes were provided, only three of these were returned. Of these, two were unchanged and the other edited so slightly as not to modify earlier tabulations.
Results of this study are presented here by two modes: (1) mathematical; and (2) narrative.

Mathematical profiles depict horizontal ranges from positive to negative responses to given questions and vertical ones show frequencies.

Narrative treatments present literal statements by interviewees without imposing meanings assumed by the interviewers.

The Interview

While not part of the original motive of this study, responses to those contacting and interviewing become relevant in attempts to understand the problem. Far beyond the most idealistic expectations, this was a very favorable experience for the interviewers who received only occasional rebuff or overt expressions of ill will. With nearly all of the field work having been completed by the same two interviewers, a high degree of consistency was expected in the manner of approaching and questioning each of the respondents lending validity to mathematical presentations such as the one at the right.

Of the total households contacted, 84% were very receptive or interested -- combing the categories "A" and "B" with 40% and 44% respectively. Even the passive class "C" assisted in providing useful data even though not showing forth any degree of enthusiasm for the study. It is significant to note this constituted only 9% of those interviewed. The 6% in class "D" were at least accommodative, while the 1% in class "E" contributed difficulty to the study.

DATA

The Move

Ready responses were elicited by the general inquiry, how do you feel about the move?

Within the most positive or "A" group, such comments as we are glad it happened and we are much better off than we were before were typical. Observed in the "B" group were comments, we came out ahead and we gained by it or it was a good thing for us. Type "C" commented, we don't see much difference; about the same; no better and no worse; or it doesn't matter where we live. Group "D" said, we lost on it; it was unfortunate that we had to leave and we were better off where we were before. Type "E" simply expressed their great loss.
Combining the 39% of type “A” with the 29% of type “B” yielded a total of 68% or two-thirds who were strongly or mildly favorable to the move. Only 4% expressed no sense or loss or gain. The 10% in type “D” and the 17% in type “E” totaled 27% or slightly over one-fourth of the total number responding.

Financial Settlement

A marked difference was observed between data from the former and latter ranges. In the former, for whom only homes were appraised, a smaller proportion of the respondents were favorable than afterward when other factors such as neighborhood quality and personal factors were taken into account.

Typical “A” responses were, the highway department was more than generous and we made a great gain on it. “B” responses were, it was a good deal; we are better off financially and we gained in more ways than we lost. Type “C” responses were, losses about balanced gains; we feel it came out to about the same as we had before and we don’t really see any difference in it for us financially. The “D” comments were, losses outweighed our gains and we lost on it. “E” responses, we feel cheated or it was a great loss.

Financial Settlement

In the 1963-1968 group, only 23% were favorable compared with 55% in the 1969-1973 group. The percentages of those who were indifferent were about the same (30% and 33% respectively). In the former, 45% were unfavorable as contrasted with only 11% in the latter group.
HOUSING

Differences before and after 1968 were slight so are not differentiated in the accompanying profile.

Comments by those contacted were as follows, Type "A" said it was very favorable; entirely satisfactory; highly desirable in nearly every way or we couldn't have asked for anything more. Type "B" said our housing is favorable but we find some limitations or it is certainly above average. Type "C" said it is entirely adequate. Type "D" expressed, not the best or unfavorable in some respects. Type "E" did not appear for this variable.

Housing for most was changed although some had moved the house itself to new foundations in the current neighborhood.

Whereas the preceding graph expresses evaluations of housing, at the time of the interview, attention here expresses evaluations of change relative to the former location. In this instance no difference occurred in the mean value of 6.38 for the two segments so data appear in a single profile.

Respondents of the "A" type made such statements as, we are grateful we could make such a change and for the better and it is better here than we ever had it before. Of the "B" type we find, our condition is improved; we are in a better house than before and we gained more than we lost in quality housing. The "C" types said, we are about as well off as we were before, and there seems to be little difference one way or the other. Mildly negative, "D" comments were, our housing is not as good and we are not as well off as we were before. Type "E" respondents, though almost non-existent, spoke of the tragedy the change brought into their lives.
Neighborhood

Responses to the present neighborhood are presented in terms of current evolutions without comparison with the former one. The emphasis is upon physical rather than social considerations treated later in this report.

Because of similarities in the two sets of data, a composite profile is again employed. For these, typical were the following: “A”, this is a very fine location or we are completely at home here. “B” we like it here although we find certain limitations. “C”, we are getting along as good as can be expected or we are not especially happy here but it’s not too bad either. “D”, this is not a very good place to live; we don’t like the area too well. Type “E” complained very unfavorable or very inadequate.

Comparing old and new neighborhoods, type “A” responses were, we are grateful for the change for the better; we like this better than the old in all ways and we feel at home here; like we never did before. “B” comments were, this is a real improvement even though we miss some things about the former neighborhood and we are quite at home here - - - more than before. With Type “C” observed reactions were, we like the old one and we like this one too or we feel no different here than we did where we lived before.

Type “D” responses were, we like some things here but not as well as where we were before; we miss the old neighborhood and would like to be there but see some gains here or all things considered, we liked the other one better. In Type “E” people said, this is a change for the worse in every way, we moved from something very good to something of little or no value to us except maybe a house and a place to put our belongings or we gained nothing but lost almost everything.
Social Life

Though usually related to neighborhood, social life is treated separately in order to accommodate contacts and activities with others not necessarily living nearby.

Many of those interviewed indicated continued contact with former as well as with current neighbors.

Differences between the two segments of the highway relocatees justify the dual presentation in the accompanying profile.

Narratively, responses were as follows: “A”, we like all our new neighbors and we keep in touch with those where we lived before. “B”, there are some good people here but we don’t like the landlord or we are happy with our social life here and are making a good adjustment. “C”, we really aren’t sociable; we are busy doing other things or simply, it’s all right. “D”, if we go out of our way we can make friends but people aren’t too friendly here. There were no “E” responses among those consenting to interviews; however, those refusing would possibly have fallen into this category.

When a separate analysis was made of changes in social life, the following were observed: Type “A” said, we were glad to have been able to make the move. Type “B” said, although not ideal we feel improvements outweigh our losses. Type “C” comments represent a collection of synonyms about adequacy or little or no change. “D” types said, we have some advantages here but regret the move and felt socially more a part of the place we lived before. A single “E” response expressed a loss in every way due to neighborhood discrimination.

DATA

Of the 1963-1968 segment, 62% were favorable while 66% of the 1969-1973 group thus responded to this value. Indifference was expressed by 27% of the former and only 18% by the latter. Unfavorable responses were indicated by 11% of the former and 13% of the latter.

Change in social life was rated as favorable by 26%, of no consequence either way by 53% and unfavorable by 21%.
The importance of personal interests in the new location was rated as favorable by 71% of the former and 90% of the latter segments. "Satisfactory" was the rating by 14% of the former and 4% of the latter. Unfavorable ratings appeared for 14% of the former and 8% of the latter.

Responses to inquiries about hobbies and other personal interests produced the most extreme variations of the total study. Differences observed for the segments justify a dual profile.

Typical "A" responses were, I have my garden and my sewing which is what I really enjoy or we have many personal interests which keep us busy and happy. Type "B" commented, we are free to do what we like here but find a few limitations or I like to hunt and fish and have opportunity enough to do that while living here. Type "C" indicated a sense of adequacy and contentment saying it's not too bad for my hobbies here but not ideal either. "D" types expressed frustration and disappointment with limitations of the present location feeling their interests could not be developed or adequately expressed. No "E" responses appeared.

When personal interests were examined with reference to the move, relocation appeared to have been a negligible factor. Sports activities hobby pursuits or other interests of a non-social or personal nature continued as before.

Nearly all or 83% indicated the "C" response, 8% the "A" and 4% the "B" types. Only 4% said they were not as free and none suggested a great change for the worse in these pursuits.
CONCLUSIONS

Methodology

Subjective expressions of concern for the interests and welfare of relocatees appears to have been a major gain for this study by promoting spontaneous responses. Studies requiring respondents to react with more rigid objectivity in answering specific questions in the order of their occurrence on interview schedules have often led to more apparent attempts to give appropriate answers meeting assumed expectations of interviewers.

Most positive responses came from those having gained in every way by escaping undesirable conditions and moving into those found to be fully satisfying. Most negative ones came from those having been relocated more than once by governmental projects, particularly prior to 1968, and feeling that financial adjustments had not adequately compensated for sentimental or other personal losses. A few were offended with the attitudes of construction workers who moved in on them with equipment designed to destroy the efforts of years. Some expressed resentment for vandalism of their property before construction crews arrived to complete the removal of the buildings.

Several expressed their intent to have made a change of location anyway and were only reinforced, with an economic benefit, by the moving agency. A few felt they needed more time to consider alternatives in choices of new housing.

The high incidence of repeated and voluntary relocation suggests that for many, mobility is a way of life with or without highway or other projects being involved. Many indicated they would not object to moving again if needed and a few said they were glad to participate in projects designed to better the community. Others said they would not want to move again and, generally, these were above 60 years of age.

A number having reacted negatively toward the move initially acquired a more favorable view after a few years at the new location.

The great difficulty encountered in finding many families at home suggests that non-home interests are more important and that location makes little difference in life style.

Scales tested in pilot surveys and proven effective in subsequent interviews reaffirmed mathematical frames-of-reference as highly useful. They substantiate rather than weaken narrative, non-mathematical expressions. It is valuable not only to know how one responds to a given inquiry but also how much or how far along a scale he does so. As developed in this report, these scales provide focus for a type of logic felt to be essential in dealing with variables like satisfaction with financial settlement; evaluation of old and new neighborhoods; adequacy of housing; and change itself. It is difficult to imagine more descriptive terms and techniques on strictly narrative grounds.

Finally, the high level of reinforcement obtained by means of the follow-up correspondence with those interviewed provided considerable defense against the housewife bias with a lack of information from husbands and others in the household. While apathy might have accounted for some of the failures to return edited summaries of interviews, this is not likely the most important reason.
Conclusions regarding data gathered and presented in this study center upon categories established through the preliminary survey.

Positive reactions to the study were observed in expressions of appreciation for concern and genuine interest shown for the welfare of those involved. Negative ones for a minority of relocatees were associated with problems of real or imagined coercion associated with moving. Substantially, larger numbers were favorable to moving than those subjected to the historical stereotype of bureaucratic exploitation.

Conclusions regarding financial settlements centered upon two main points: (1) influence upon the standard of living and general life-style; and (2) comparisons socially with others known to have also relocated.

When relocatees expressed feelings of having gained in space and quality of housing because of financial aids, fairness and good will prevailed unless other kinds of losses, such as sentimentiality and friendship associations became apparent.

In a number of cases, comparisons invoked jealousies for those actually receiving substantial compensations themselves. Having moved from crowded, noisy and in other respects undesirable neighborhoods into something highly favorable, they were still negative because they had heard that someone else had received more. They were disturbed by ideas of what they could have gotten if they had held out for even greater payments.

Some felt that even though settlements for housing itself had often been adequate, insufficient allowances had been made for higher costs for utilities and taxes.

Some said they were pleased with the financial liberality yet felt irreplaceable emotional and social losses.

Most negative responses to housing related to losses of personal investments in labor, time and taste apart from monetary considerations. Those having devoted the most time to doing their own remodeling felt most offended by relocation. This was accentuated in cases where children had been raised and identified with the property.

Many simply moved trailer homes from one court to another with little concern for the court itself. Some found the new court better simply by having escaped difficulties with management or neighbors in a former one.
In the minds of nearly all of those interviewed, neighborhood was esteemed as more social than geographic.

Exceptions were noted in cases of concern for access to main roads due to traffic congestion, loss of shade trees, flower gardens or space around the house. Gains, however, outweighed losses for these factors. References to changes in proximity to work, school and church were rare although a number indicated their children felt a loss due to changes in school districts and that more time would be required to feel accepted among the young people in the new areas.

Neighborhood changes were found make little difference for those maintaining former friendship alliances through telephone and personal visits. Many not only retained their former friends but, through outgoing attitudes on their part, made many new ones as well.

Those having anti-social or non-social inclinations absorbed themselves in hobby or other personal interests and largely ignored neighbors in new locations just as they had done in former ones.

Some elderly respondents compared their former locations with the way they used to be rather than the way they actually are today. When asked would you go back now if you could? they responded either no or else I don’t know.

It is highly significant that so many elected to obtain housing very near their former locations -- ostensibly to retain neighborhood associations already established at the previous addresses.

Regarding non-social personal interest -- overwhelming evidence indicated that change of residence made virtually no difference; stamp collecting, fly tying, sewing, art work, craft projects and the like went on and with as much enthusiasm as before. Exceptions to this were observed where land or shop facilities were less adequate than earlier. Conversely, many gained -- having more land and better provisions for shops and other types of hobby facilities in new residences.

For those preoccupied with television, stereo equipment, hunting, fishing, club activities, tourism, community and church involvement outside the home, changes of residence within the same general locality made no real difference. Many renters esteemed home simply as an address, telephone number and a place of storage while devoting most of their time to travel and other activities elsewhere.

Ivory tower (originally ivy tower) interpretations of disadvantages of forced relocations clearly did not prove to be valid for more than the smaller portion of respondents in this study.

In this we may conclude that while some were indeed inconvenienced by forced relocation they were greatly outnumbered by those adequately compensated if not also rewarded and that obvious and expressed gains far outweighed financial, social and even psychological losses.

CONCLUSIONS
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and the City of Ogden, Utah, Monroe Boulevard Extension, EIS. 1973.


New York State Department of Transportation, Canajoharie - 1970; A Study in Relocation. 1972.

The following interview schedule is designed as a guide for interviewers. It is a kind of "check list" for the thinking of those contacting people having been moved by projects such as urban renewal, highway clearance and preparation, industrial or commercial developments or institutional domains. It is not intended that it be followed mechanically or entirely but rather that it be adapted to the expressed and also the implied interests of those being contacted.

Interviewers should adjust to each family while making contact. With some it will be advisable to use a census-taking approach by textly going through this schedule in sequence; with others, a more flexible technique will be in order -- often with no writing during the entire interview. Experience and perceptiveness on the part of the interviewers will suggest the most appropriate mode.

PHASE 1

This is to test the initial reaction of the respondent to the general idea of the move without specific direction from the interviewer. Only tentative, leading questions are employed.

1. How do you feel now about the move?
2. How does this replacement property compare with the former place of your residence?
3. What effect did the move have on your family?
4. Did your "life style" change because of your relocation?
5. Have you come to feel as much a part of this neighborhood as the one in which you lived previously?
6. Do you like it as well?
7. Are your children (if any) as well accepted here?
8. Have you ever had a feeling of being "displaced"?
9. Would you have remained at the former residence if you had been given a choice -- knowing the project was underway?
10. Did you feel "forced" to move? Or simply "advised" or "invited" to do so?
11. Did you favor the attitude or approach of those contacting you about the project?
12. Was there a public hearing where persons concerned could express their views?
13. Do you think the project was justified? Did it seem to serve the public interest?
14. Do you think court action was (or would have been) in order to assure fairness to all concerned?
15. How negotiations for your property handled fairly? Do you feel you gained a fair or adequate settlement?
16. Was adequate effort made by others to help you locate a new place of residence?
17. Do you feel you had adequate choice of relocation housing? Were there a number of alternatives from which you could choose?
18. Did it take you very long to find this present housing?
19. Why did you choose this particular one?
20 Are you satisfied with it now?  
21 Do you like it better than at first?  
22 Are there expenses here you did not anticipate?  
23 What would you say are your greatest gains from the move?  
24 What were your greatest losses?  
25 Do you plan to remain here or would you like to move again?  

PHASE 2  
This is to inquire somewhat into the character of the family itself -- a few facts, as matters of census, and also, a few of the family values.  

26 Check name with case report; is it correct?  
27 What is the composition of the family unit? Sexes and ages? Marital status? Is more than one family unit living here? (Indicate that adult ages are optional and may be withheld if preferred.)  
28 [Estimate, do not ask, race and nationality.]  
29 Optional: Where did you live before moving into your previous residence? Have you always lived in this region? This country?  
30 Do you still maintain contact with friends and former neighbors of your immediately previous location?  
31 Do you feel socially involved here? As much as you would like to? As much as you did before?  
32 Have you developed new interests here?  
33 Do you enjoy watching television? As much as before?  
34 Have you maintained hobbies or other personal interests here which you had at your earlier residence?  
35 Are you away from home a lot? Do you like to spend a lot of time at church, lodge, club, business or other meetings or associations? Do you enjoy travel? Do you enjoy being out-of-doors as in fishing, hiking or camping?  

PHASE 3  
This is to examine contrasts between the former and the replacement housing itself. It is direct and somewhat analytical.  

36 Did you own your previous home? Do you own this one?  
37 How long did you live there?  
38 Did you build or help build it? Or this one?  
39 Was there a kind of family tradition about that property?  
40 Was it larger than this house?  
41 Was there more land there or here?  
42 Is this place easier or more difficult to maintain?  
43 How do the costs of maintenance compare?  
44 How about storage space? Basement? Garage? Tool shed?  
45 What about stairs, here and there? Convenience? Safety?  
46 Does this house have a fireplace? Did the other one?  
47 How is this house heated: coal? gas? oil? Is it central?  
48 Does this one have air conditioning? Did the other one?  
49 Is there any difference in appliances: washer, drier, etc.?  

50 What about carpeting? Old or former house? This one?  
51 What was the water supply: city, Pine View, well, or other?  
52 Was the soil quality good there? Here? For gardening?  
53 Did you have horses, cattle or other animals there?  
54 Are provisions for health as good here?  
55 What about police and fire protection here and there?  
56 Have you have garbage collection services here? Did you there?  
57 How is the general area safe for children or elderly persons?  
58 Do you have more privacy here? Visually? Audibly?  
59 General travel requirements different? The view?  
60 Do the places of your usual activities or conveniences for you?  
61 How do garage or other car-shelter facilities compare?  
62 Is there a difference in accessibility to public roads?  
63 Have these travel differences, if any, influenced your budget?  
64 Have they modified your time requirements and freedom?  
65 Have these changes influenced your extent of community activity?  

PHASE 4  
This concluding section is designed to be completed by the interviewer as an observer. With possible exceptions, these will NOT be discussed with the respondents or residents.  

71 General attitude toward the interview.  
72 General standard of living within the home.  
73 General character of neighborhood. View, sounds, odors,  
74 Proximity to parks, schools, railways, highways, factories, etc.  
75 Existence of sidewalks, curbing, street lighting,  
76 Fee paid for moving (from records).  
77 Date of move (records).  
78 A photograph of the replacement property.  
79 A photograph of the previous property (usually on file).  

Interviewer:  
Date:
**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT ADDRESS</th>
<th>FORMER ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF MOVE</th>
<th>PROJECT CODE AND SITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTANCE OF MOVE</th>
<th>MILES</th>
<th>TIME REQUIRED TO COMPLETE MOVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPENSATION FOR MOVE</th>
<th>PROPERTY VALUE DIFFERENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS**

---

**PERSONAL & FAMILY REACTIONS TO RELOCATION:**

**ECONOMIC FACTORS:**

---

**SOCIAL FACTORS (RELATIVES, FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS):**

---

**PERSONAL & ESTHETIC FACTORS (PRIVACY, FREEDOM, HOBBIES & RECREATION):**

---

**MISC OBSERVATIONS:**

---

STANFORD/FORM 73

---

**INTERVIEW SCHEDULES**

---

**VERIFICATION LETTER**

I am enclosing for your review a copy of the information and expressions of opinion you have given me during my survey of families and individuals who have been relocated due to industrial, commercial, highway or other projects. Would you kindly return to me any comments or revisions you may care to make on this summary. If you feel it is adequate and correct you need not reply or return this to me unless you wish to do so.

Each case study has been assigned a code number to protect the privacy of all participating. In no writing and teaching I make no reference whatever to the names, addresses, telephone numbers or other possible identifying data. Conclusions are drawn from the group without drawing individual interpretations.

I am grateful for your willingness to assist me in this work. There are many benefits derived from some knowledge as to how people feel who have undergone a move made necessary by projects beyond the control of residents affected. Their views are important; how they feel makes a difference. As such knowledge becomes more prevalent, including myself, hope that necessary adjustments will become increasingly acceptable to all concerned and that benefits will outweigh possible losses.

Sincerely,

Stephen S. Stanford, PhD
Professor of sociology

WEBER STATE COLLEGE
370 HARRISON BLVD. OGDEN, UTAH 84408

Office of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work

JOSEPH L. BISHOP, Ph.D.

[Signature]
Case #23

- had just remodeled home when told it would be necessary for them to relocate.
- purchased new home that had originally wanted to buy.
- after marriage
- enjoy neighborhood and have many friends
- only lived at former address 10 months so did not know many of the people of that neighborhood
- the state was fair but they lost financially because of materials and man hours used in remodeling former home
- would consider moving again depending on the situation
- husband is 44 years old, wife, 42 years old
- 12 children, 7 currently living
- enjoy collecting antique dolls, furniture, and canoes
- husband is a home remodeler

Case #74

Those interviewed presently live with their in-laws and feel that they have been treated unfairly. First of all, the Highway Department did not allow them enough time for moving. Secondly, after the first move, the Highway Department found itself in need of their newly-bought property as well. Being required to move twice because of highway needs is, in their opinion, unjust.
Case #100

- Satisfied financially, received $1000 to relocate. About a block.
- However, did lose access to laundry facilities and on ramp to freeway.
- Rent has been raised three times since being relocated plus extra costs of owning a mobile home caused the decision to move into an apartment closer to the University.
- Good friends live in town but still associate with many of the people in trailer court.
- No children, husband PhD. in Mathematics.
- June 1974, wife teaches 5th grade.
- Plan to move to Idaho after finish schooling.
- Construction causes noise and dust problems.

Case #101

- Unhappy with new home.
- Lived 20 years at former residence.
- Misses the amount of land they had before being relocated.
- Does not like new neighborhood.
- Keeps contact with former neighborhood.
- Family of 3 sons.
- Youngest son not happy about changing school districts.
- Wife enjoys gardening.
- Although expressed dislike for new location, still felt they were treated fairly as far as financial settlement from the highway department.

Case #2

- Grateful to highway department for generosity.
- Children are in the same school district.
- Very happy with present residence.
- Has no neighbors at former address.
- Enjoy neighbors at present location.
- Personal interests are golf, tennis & skiing.
- Would not want to move again.

SAMPLE PROOFS
Case #8

Both occupants were in their early twenties and were pleased that they had purchased a lot within the new trailer court, and even though their friendships were limited in the former court, they are now enjoying many acquaintances at their current address. Accordingly, they are not, at the present time, interested in moving. Hobbies enjoyed by the wife were gardening and ceramics.

Case #9

- Satisfied financially but did hope to receive a better price
- Very satisfied with relocation
- Keeps in touch with former neighbors and likes new neighborhood also
- Husband's occupation - brick mason
- Enjoys gardening & sewing
- Raised a family of 9 children, 3 of whom are living at home
- Children did like change of schools
- Lived at former address for 20 years
- Lived at new address for about 10 years
- Husband 56 years old - wife 55 years old
- Own more land at this residence, are able to raise nice garden

Case #10

Husband presently working on road construction in Panola Canyon.

Live in trailer court and was relocated one lot east of present location.

Here lived in trailer court 5 years, financially gained from relocating.

Now practically all people in court enjoy traveling.

Husband is enthusiastic camper and fisherman.

- Wife spends spare moments sewing
- Sympathetic to highway relocation process.
The author assumes full responsibility for possible misconceptions or other errors which may have entered into this study while expressing appreciation and gratitude to parents, teachers, writers and others whose influence has contributed to its merits.