

13.W89/2: 13/TR-12

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION
Division of Social Research

~~CALIFORNIA
LIBRARY
DOCUMENTS DEPT.~~

A SURVEY OF THE TRANSIENT AND
HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

September 1935 and September 1936

DOCUMENTS COLLECTION
THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA



TR-12

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator
Corrington Gill, Assistant Administrator

Howard B. Myers, Director
Division of Social Research

RESEARCH BULLETIN

A SURVEY OF THE TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION
IN 12 CITIES

September 1935 and September 1936

Prepared by
M. Starr Northrop
Malcolm J. Brown
Katherine Gordon

under the supervision of
John N. Webb
Coordinator of Urban Research

Washington

1937

This report is one of a series covering aspects of the migratory labor problem, as requested of various governmental agencies by the Secretary of Labor to assist her in responding to Senate Resolution 298, 74th Congress, Second Session.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	vii
Summary.....	xi
Chapter I. Liquidation of the FERA Transient Program..	1
Summary of the September 1935 survey of conditions following the closing of transient bureau intake.....	1
The decline of the transient bureau case load.....	3
Reasons for closing cases after the stop- page of intake.....	5
Voluntary separations.....	6
Transfer to WPA or other Federal project	7
Secured employment.....	8
Return of transients to care of relatives or friends.....	8
Transfer of unemployable cases to res- ident relief rolls.....	8
II. Changes in the size of the transient and homeless population.....	9
Changes in the size of the needy transient and homeless population in relief agencies.....	11
Changes at FERA transient bureaus.....	11
Changes at State and local agencies....	11
Changes at private agencies.....	13
Changes in the size of the needy tran- sient and homeless group outside relief agencies.....	15
Illegal train riders.....	15
The shelterless population.....	17
Unmet needs of the transient and homeless group.....	19
Arrests for vagrancy.....	19
Panhandling and begging.....	20
Testimony of local observers.....	20
Testimony of transients.....	21
III. Changes in the composition of the transient and homeless population.....	25
Proportion of unattached and family cases	25

	Page
Proportion of transient and homeless cases	26
Age.....	27
Proportion of men and women.....	28
IV. Agencies extending relief to the transient and homeless population.....	31
The intake policies of the relief agencies	31
Intake policies at public agencies.....	31
Intake policies at private agencies....	32
Missions.....	32
Other agencies.....	33
Agency care.....	34
Nature of care.....	34
Quality of care.....	35
Equipment.....	35
Funds.....	35
City-wide coordination of transient and homeless relief activities.....	36
Central application bureaus.....	36
Interagency agreements.....	36
Plans for the care of the transient and homeless population.....	37
Planned changes in intake policy.....	37
Planned changes in equipment and facilities.....	37
Requests for additional money.....	37
V. Conditions affecting the stabilization of the transient and homeless in September 1936.....	39
Community attitudes.....	39
Eligibility for resident relief.....	40
Eligibility for Works Program employment.	41
Eligibility for Social Security benefits.	42
Private employment.....	43
Appendix A. Supplementary tables.....	47
B. Schedules.....	51

TEXT TABLES

Table 1. Midmonthly census of cases under care in transient bureaus, total United States, May 1935 through December 1936.....	4
2. Disposition of Transient Division cases, total United States, October 1935 through September 1936.....	6
3. Summary of 24-hour census of transient and homeless cases under care at principal agencies in 12 cities, September 1935 and September 1936.....	9

CONTENTS

v

TEXT TABLES—Continued

	Page
4. 24-hour census of transient and homeless cases under care at FERA transient bureaus, at other public agencies, and at private agencies in 12 cities, September 1935 and September 1936.....	10
5. Summary of 24-hour census of transient and homeless cases at FERA transient bureaus in 12 cities, September 1935 and September 1936	11
6. 24-hour census of transient and homeless cases (excluding service only cases) under care at public agencies, other than FERA transient bureaus, in 12 cities, according to city, September 1935 and September 1936....	12
7. 24-hour census of transient and homeless cases (excluding service only cases) under care at private agencies in 12 cities, according to city, September 1935 and September 1936.	14
8. Illegal train riders, or trespassers removed from trains, prevented from getting on trains, or ejected from railroad premises during August and September, 1935 and 1936.....	15
9. Unattached and family cases under care in 12 cities, September 1935 and September 1936..	25
10. Residence status of transient and homeless cases under care in 11 States, September 1935, and 12 cities, September 1936.....	27
11. Age of unattached transient and homeless persons and heads of family groups, September 1935 and September 1936.....	28
12. Sex of unattached transient and homeless persons and heads of family groups, September 1935 and September 1936.....	29
13. 24-hour census of transient and homeless cases at private agencies in 12 cities, by type of agency, September 1936.....	33
14. Agency care available to transient and homeless cases in 12 cities, September 1936.....	35

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

(Appendix)

Table 1. New and reopened cases accepted for care at transient bureaus, total United States, May 1935 through October 1936.....	47
---	----

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES—Continued

	Page
2. Cases closed at transient bureaus, total United States, May 1935 through October 1936.....	47
3. 24-hour census of transient and homeless cases (excluding service only cases) under care at the principal agencies in 12 cities, according to city, September 1935 and September 1936.....	48
4. 24-hour census of transient and homeless cases under care at FERA transient bureaus in 12 cities, according to city, September 1935 and September 1936.....	48

INTRODUCTION

As part of the survey of the needs of laborers migrating across State lines, in accordance with Senate Resolution 298,¹ the Secretary of Labor requested the Works Progress Administration to repeat in September 1936 a survey of the transient and homeless population that was made in a number of cities during the latter part of September 1935. The report which follows presents and compares the findings of the two surveys. Although the emphasis throughout is on the findings of the September 1936 survey, the report is primarily a comparison of conditions that existed at the time transient bureaus stopped intake with conditions 1 year later.

It may be helpful to review briefly the situation at the time of the original survey in September 1935. On September 20, 1935, intake at transient bureaus was closed as a part of the general shift from direct and work relief under the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to a works program in accordance with the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935.² For about 25 months, August 1933 to September 1935, transient relief had been an integral part of the general program of emergency relief administered under the provisions of the Federal Emergency Relief Act of May 1933. During most of this period, State Transient Relief Programs were operated in 47 States and the District of Columbia. As administered under these State programs, transient relief was essentially direct relief, and therefore was included among those activities from which employable cases were to be transferred to the Works Program.

In planning this survey, it was recognized that the problem of the inter-State transient, particularly with respect to local relief conditions, could not be separated from that of the entire relief group technically known as the transient relief population. Directly or indirectly, the entire needy homeless population—inter-State and intra-State transients

¹Senate Resolution 298, 74th Congress, 2d session, agreed to June 15, 1936. "Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to study, survey, and investigate the social and economic needs of laborers migrating across State lines, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress and the States in enacting remedial legislation. The Secretary of Labor shall report to the Senate, with recommendations for legislation."

²Public Resolution - No. 11, 74th Congress, approved April 8, 1935.

and local homeless persons—was involved.³ Therefore, the survey of September 1935 included all public and private agencies that had facilities for the care of transient and homeless persons in the cities selected for study.

As shown by the summary of the September 1935 findings (see chapter I) there was no immediate indication that the closing of transient bureau intake would create a serious situation in any of the survey-cities, although it was the opinion of observers in some of the cities that local facilities might prove insufficient to care for all applicants.

The second survey, made 1 year later, provided a basis for comparison between the numbers and conditions of transient and homeless persons in September 1935 and September 1936. In addition, the second survey had a particular bearing on the investigation conducted by the Department of Labor in accordance with Senate Resolution 298. Specifically, the objectives of the September 1936 survey were (1) to determine the size and composition of the transient and homeless population in selected cities, (2) to survey existing facilities for their care, (3) to compare conditions in September 1936 with those immediately following the closing of transient bureau intake in September 1935, and (4) to report on community attitudes towards the transient and homeless problem and on future plans for the care of this group.

The procedures followed in making the two surveys were practically identical, except that in September 1935 there were 18 cities included while in September 1936 the survey included only 12 cities.⁴ In both years the WPA Division of Social Research appointed local supervisors in each city to assemble and report the following types of information: (1) descriptive material for each public or private agency extending care to transient and homeless persons, provided the agency had facilities

³During the operation of the Transient Program the three types of cases were defined as follows:

Inter-State transients—persons who had not been in the State for 12 continuous months at time of application for relief.

Intra-State transients—persons who had been in the State for 12 months or longer but who were not residents of the community.

Local homeless—persons who were residents of the community but were without a home.

⁴The 18 cities in the 1935 survey were Atlanta, Bakersfield, Calif., Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Fort Worth, Jacksonville, Fla., Kansas City, Mo., Los Angeles, Memphis, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Portland, Oreg., San Francisco, and Washington, D. C.

The 12 cities in the 1936 survey were Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Jacksonville, Fla., Kansas City, Mo., Los Angeles, Memphis, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Portland, Oreg., and Washington, D. C.

In selecting these cities, use was made of information that had been derived from previous studies on the size and nature of the transient population in different parts of the country. As a result, it is believed that the observations in these cities represent a fair cross section of conditions in the country as a whole.

for 10 or more persons; (2) statistical data on amount of care given by each agency, including a 24-hour census of persons under care; (3) digests of interviews with officials of various public and private organizations and with transient and homeless persons who had received relief at FERA transient bureaus; and (4) a summary report on the local transient and homeless relief situation. Copies of the schedules used in the 1936 survey appear in appendix B of this report. The study represents, for the most part, a digest of the information contained in these schedules and field reports.

Two limitations of the statistical data in this report should be noted. The first arises from the unavoidable confusion between transient and local homeless cases. The distinctions maintained by the Federal transient bureaus between inter-State (Federal) transients, intra-State (State) transients, and local homeless have not been observed by local agencies since the termination of the FERA Transient Program; and hence it is impossible to segregate the inter-State transient group, or to consider the facilities and conditions governing their welfare apart from the general problem of relief to homeless persons. This circumstance precludes direct comparisons with most of the data collected during the operation of the Transient Program, and prevents complete differentiation of the strictly inter-State aspects of the problem.

A second limitation arises from the inadequacy of the records kept by private agencies of the mission type. Many of the shelters operated by missions keep only a rough count of meals and lodgings given to transient and homeless persons, and make no record of individual applications. Data for the two 24-hour censuses were derived from actual counts of cases in every agency, but much of the other statistical information involves estimates from some of the reporting agencies.

SUMMARY

Two surveys of the transient and homeless population in selected cities—the first made immediately after the closing of intake at FERA transient bureaus in September 1935 and the second made 1 year later—show that there has been a marked decline in the size of this group. This decline began prior to the closing of transient bureau intake and continued throughout the year following.

The stoppage of intake did not mean the abrupt closing of the transient bureaus throughout the country. The majority of the States were given final grants during October 1935 for the purpose of liquidating the program and for continuing relief as long as possible to cases under care, pending their absorption into the Works Program or private employment, their return to place of legal settlement, or their closings for other reasons.

Reductions in case loads were accomplished gradually, with abandonment of individual State programs staggered over a period of about 18 months. During that time a substantial number of new and reopened cases were accepted for care. In fact, the aggregate case load involved in the final liquidation of the Transient Program was almost twice the number of cases under care in the country as a whole on the day intake was suspended.

Reasons for closing cases under care at transient bureaus during the 12 months following the closing of intake were reported monthly to the FERA Division of Transient Activities. These reports show that in the country as a whole 43 percent of the cases were closed because of voluntary withdrawal; 21 percent, because of transfer to WPA or other Federal project; 14 percent, because of employment secured; 12 percent, because of transfer to general relief; 2 percent, because of the assumption of responsibility by relatives or friends; and 8 percent, for miscellaneous reasons.

In the 12 cities surveyed a striking decrease in the number of transient and homeless cases under care was found in the results of two 24-hour censuses taken in September 1935 and September 1936. The returns from these two censuses show that the number of transient and homeless cases under care in all public and private agencies dropped from about 37,000 in September 1935 to slightly less than 15,000 in September 1936.

About half of this decline was the result of the closing of cases under care at transient bureaus; the remainder resulted

from a decrease of more than half in the case loads at public agencies other than transient bureaus. In contrast, transient and homeless cases at private agencies in the 12 cities increased from 6,809 in September 1935 to 7,224 in September 1936, an increase of 6 percent.

This increase at private agencies serves as a warning against drawing the conclusion that the transient and homeless problem has diminished directly in proportion to the number of cases receiving care at *all* agencies. The growth of the private agency case load indicates that the decreases at public agencies had not resulted entirely from decreasing need, but have resulted in part, at least, from the restrictions public agencies place upon the intake of needy cases.

Because of these restrictions and the increase in the private agency case load, additional facts were needed to show whether the number of persons on the road or homeless in the cities, but outside the agencies, had increased or decreased during the year following the closing of transient bureau intake. The facts which are summarized below concern the volume of illegal train riding, the change in the size of the shelterless population in jungles, parks, etc., the prevalence of begging and panhandling, the number of arrests for vagrancy, and the observations of agency and city officials on the number of transient and homeless persons outside of public and private agencies.

a. Between August 1935 and August 1936 the number of illegal train riders, trespassers, etc., decreased 36 percent on all railroads in the United States, and 32 percent on selected railroads in the 10 of the 12 survey-cities for which data could be obtained.

b. Evidence from the 12 cities indicates that the shelterless population increased only slightly during the year following the close of transient bureau intake. Jungles were found in only 5 of the 12 cities, and in only 2 of the cities was there a reported increase in the number of persons sleeping in parks and vacant buildings.

c. In the majority of the 12 survey-cities, arrests for vagrancy either increased slightly or remained the same during the year after the closing of intake at transient bureaus.

d. There was little agreement between the number of arrests for vagrancy and the prevalence of panhandling and begging. To a large extent this was the result of an absence of uniform policy on the part of police, who were strict or lenient according to local conditions and attitudes. In a majority of the cities panhandling and begging were of fairly common occurrence, and only four cities reported that there had been a decrease between September 1935 and September 1936.

e. According to the opinion of local observers the transient and homeless problem was not serious in two cities—Kansas City,

Mo., and Memphis; in three cities—Atlanta, Philadelphia, and Portland, Oreg.—local observers felt that the problem was only moderately acute; the opinions in six cities—Chicago, Denver, Jacksonville, Fla., Minneapolis, New Orleans, and Washington, D. C.—reflected unsatisfactory transient and homeless programs; and in one city—Los Angeles—local opinion was not sufficiently definite to permit classification.

The decline in the size of the needy transient and homeless population during the year following the closing of transient bureau intake was accompanied by changes in the personal characteristics of this group. In brief, these changes were (1) a decrease in the proportion of family cases as compared to the unattached; (2) a decrease in the proportion of inter-State transients as compared to the resident homeless; (3) an increase in the proportion of older persons; and (4) an increase in the proportion of women.

Changes in the composition of the transient and homeless population receiving care in the 12 cities during September 1936 were the result, in part, of the intake policies of public and private agencies. Local homeless persons, transient families, and lone women were given care by public agencies in most of the cities, but transient men, particularly employables, were either refused care or accepted on an overnight basis only. In view of the fact that employable men made up the bulk of the transient population during the operation of transient bureaus, their exclusion had a marked effect on the composition of public agency case loads.

Unlike the public agencies, the private agencies in the 12 cities were accepting all types of needy transient and homeless cases to the limit of their resources. Although some private agencies requested applicants to pay a small amount whenever possible, and others accepted only special cases (e.g., juveniles, families, etc.), there was much less restriction as to type of case and length of stay than was found at public agencies.

Both public and private agencies in the 12 cities reported that their funds were insufficient to meet the transient and homeless problem adequately. This was the basic difficulty in September 1936, and was responsible for restricted intake policy, unused equipment, and inadequate care.

Extensive interviews were conducted with social agencies and city officials in the 12 cities for the purpose of disclosing local attitudes. About half of the persons interviewed had a definitely antagonistic attitude towards the transient and homeless population. This attitude appears to have limited the factors favorable to the stabilization of the transient and homeless population in September 1936, whether these factors were eligibility for resident relief, employment on the Works Program, or employment in private industry.

A SURVEY OF THE TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION
IN 12 CITIES
SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936

Chapter I

LIQUIDATION OF THE FERA TRANSIENT PROGRAM

The September 1936 survey of the transient and homeless population confirmed the indication found in the 1935 survey that the transient relief population would continue to decline in number. This decline had, in fact, already begun prior to the close of transient bureau intake. It may be well to summarize the findings of the first survey in order to make this point clear.

SUMMARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 1935 SURVEY OF CONDITIONS FOLLOWING THE CLOSING OF TRANSIENT BUREAU INTAKE

The number of transients under care in transient bureaus and the number of applications for relief in the 18 study-cities declined before, as well as during, the 10 days immediately following the closing of transient bureau intake on September 20, 1935. There was also a slight decline in the number of homeless cases (principally resident homeless) under care in public relief agencies other than transient bureaus. These declines were partially offset by an increase in the number of transient and homeless cases cared for by private relief agencies. This increase would probably have been greater had private agencies not been limited both as to facilities and finances.

Not only did the number of transients under care decline after the closing of transient bureau intake, but there was also the following subsidiary evidence of a decrease in the total number of persons on the road: (1) No general increase in the shelterless population was noted. (2) There was no immediate evidence of a return of the "jungle." (3) Mobility, as reflected by the volume of illegal train riding, showed no tendency to increase.

The decline in the transient and homeless population, however, was in part due to the difficulty in providing care in localities where the facilities available for transient relief after the closing of intake were inadequate to care for all applicants,

2 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

even though the number of transients was declining. Furthermore, public relief agencies other than transient bureaus were often limited by law to the care of resident homeless persons, because of provisions that local funds should not be spent on the relief of nonresidents. Consequently, the problem of caring for new applicants was left, in many communities, primarily to private agencies whose facilities were often too limited to provide for all transients who applied.

Largely for this reason, most of the cities studied were concerned as to how the problem of transient relief would be met during the winter. Actually an immediate shortage of facilities occurred in but few of them during the 10 days following the closing of transient bureau intake. Certain communities were affected adversely by the seasonal movement of transients. For example, the problem in Atlanta and Jacksonville, Fla., was influenced by southward migrations into Florida and the Gulf Region, which created a demand for shelter that exceeded the capacities of private agencies.

A shortage of facilities also existed in Chicago and Philadelphia practically from the day the transient bureau stopped intake. The situation in these large metropolitan areas seemed to be attributable less to any increase in the number of transients than to a scarcity of facilities for the care of such cases in private agencies. On the other hand, several cities, particularly Boston, Detroit, Kansas City, Mo., and Minneapolis, had public or private agency facilities available to meet the increased demand and, therefore, anticipated no great difficulty in caring for needy nonresidents.

The effect that seasonal employment has on the problem of transient relief was particularly marked in the reports from Bakersfield, Calif., Buffalo, Fort Worth, Minneapolis, Portland, Oreg., and San Francisco. This effect alternately increases and decreases the intensity of the problem, depending upon weather conditions and the demands for seasonal labor by such industries as agriculture, fishing, and lake shipping.

It seemed apparent from this study that the importance of establishing an adequate service for needy nonresidents had been rather widely recognized as a result of the FERA Transient Program. Although it was doubtful that many communities would

be able to maintain the standards of the transient bureaus, there was evidence that a majority were giving careful consideration to enlargement of their transient relief service.

THE DECLINE OF THE TRANSIENT BUREAU CASE LOAD

The conditions reviewed above existed at the beginning of a transition period during which responsibility for the provision of direct relief to needy nonresidents was gradually shifted back to local public and private agencies. This shift involved, over a period of months, the closing of transient cases under care at the time intake was suspended; and it also involved adjustments to a changed situation on the part of local agencies and the nonresident needy.

Regular reports received by the FERA Division of Transient Activities afford nation-wide data on a part of the transition process—the gradual liquidation of the FERA Transient Program. Since this process was perhaps the most important factor of change in the administration of transient relief since September 1935, it is described here in some detail. The effects of the discontinuance of the FERA Transient Program on local agencies and on the needy homeless population are discussed in chapters II and III.

The stoppage of intake did not, of course, mean the abrupt closing of the transient bureaus. The majority of the States were given final grants during October 1935 for the purpose of liquidating and for continuing relief to cases already under care, pending their absorption into the Works Program or private employment, their return to place of legal settlement, or their closings for other reasons. These final grants were sufficient in a few States to permit the continuance of transient relief on a reduced scale for more than 18 months after the discontinuance of Federal support. At the close of 1936, 9 States were still extending relief from these final grants to a combined case load of 4,308 unattached persons and 1,847 family groups.¹ However, comparison of these figures with the total of 125,843 unattached persons and 28,691 family groups reported under care in transient bureaus the day after the close of intake on September 20, 1935, indicates that liquidation was substantially complete by the end of 1936.

Reductions in case load were accomplished gradually, with abandonment of individual State programs staggered over the

¹As indicated by reports to the Division of Transient Activities, FERA Form 302. These States were Arizona, Arkansas, California, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Washington, and Wisconsin.

4 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

entire 13-month period.² Net declines in the national case load from May 15, 1935, to December 16, 1936, are clearly shown by the midmonthly census figures of cases receiving care in transient bureaus from special earmarked funds³ (see table 1). These data alone, however, fail to give an accurate picture of the final liquidation process, because they do not disclose the substantial number of cases accepted after the formal close of intake. This continued acceptance of reopened cases into the

Table 1—MIDMONTHLY CENSUS OF CASES UNDER CARE IN TRANSIENT BUREAUS, TOTAL UNITED STATES, MAY 1935 THROUGH DECEMBER 1936

Year and Month	Total Cases ^a	Unattached Persons ^b	Family Groups
1935			
May	191,114	153,843	37,271
June	181,077	144,246	36,831
July	173,706	138,439	35,267
August	166,947	132,463	34,484
September 16	158,529	128,020	30,509
September 21 ^c	154,534	125,843	28,691
October	117,837	96,066	21,771
November	93,231	79,889	13,342
December	54,978	47,300	7,678
1936			
January	21,488	16,054	5,434
February	16,274	12,193	4,081
March	12,103	9,360	2,723
April	9,542	7,574	1,968
May	7,842	6,304	1,538
June	6,018	4,859	1,159
July	4,489	3,517	972
August	4,475	3,496	979
September	4,038	3,018	1,020
October	3,994	2,978	1,016
November	4,645	3,320	1,325
December	6,155	4,308	1,847

^aIncludes cases transferred between other transient centers or camps.

^bIncludes local homeless.

^cA special census was taken on September 21, 1935, the day immediately following the closing of intake.

Source: Reports to the FERA Division of Transient Activities.

transient case load and registration of new cases in some localities modified to a marked degree the effects of the closing of transient bureau intake. A few States facing emergency situations were granted permission to continue intake of new cases on a restricted basis until their final grants of transient funds were exhausted. Continued acceptance of health cases at specially equipped camps, such as those at Hot Springs, Ark., and Nogales, Ariz., was also authorized.

Data on monthly intake at transient bureaus, as reported to the Division of Transient Activities, show that the aggregate

²Final monthly reports to the Division of Transient Activities indicate that State programs were terminated as follows: three in November 1935; three in December 1935; five in January 1936; four in February; three in March; four in April; four in May; one in June; four in July; two in August; three in September; one in October; and two in November. In nine States, transient bureaus were still operating in December 1936.

³Transient cases cared for from general relief funds are not included.

case load involved in the final liquidation of the Transient Program has been not far from twice the number of cases reported under care on the day after intake was suspended. Continued intake brought new and reopened cases totalling approximately 145,000⁴ under care during the 12 months beginning October 1, 1935 (see appendix table 1). The reduction of the load in transient bureaus to 4,038 cases by September 1936 thus involved the closing of approximately 260,000 cases,⁵ inclusive of transfers, during the year (see appendix table 2).

REASONS FOR CLOSING CASES AFTER THE STOPPAGE OF INTAKE

The data on closings of transient cases indicate that liquidation proceeded at an accelerated rate after September 20, 1935, with voluntary separations as the largest single factor in the decline of case loads.

Closings were reported to the Division of Transient Activities under seven main headings (see table 2): (1) responsibility assumed by relatives or friends; (2) secured employment; (3) left of own accord; (4) died; (5) transferred to general relief; (6) miscellaneous; and (7) transferred to other transient center or camp.⁶ Although the States were not required to report separately on closings caused by the assignment of transients to Works Program employment, a number of States did so voluntarily and the data, though incomplete, are included in table 2. Return to legal settlement was not included as a cause of closing, but a report was made each month of the number of closings involving transportation to place of legal settlement.

This classification of reasons for closing cases is not wholly satisfactory because the categories used are somewhat indefinite and not mutually exclusive. Thus, a case reported by one transient bureau as closed because of transfer to another bureau, still remains in the case load for final disposition. Nevertheless, the data (table 2) afford a rough picture of what happened to the transient cases under care on September 20, 1935, and those admitted subsequently, and indicate the relative importance of the different reasons for closing cases in liquidating the program. Of cases leaving transient bureaus during the year ending September 30, 1936, exclusive of transfers to other transient centers, 43 percent left of their own accord without

⁴Includes possible duplications from cases registered more than once or transferred from one bureau to another, but does not include cases accepted between September 20 and October 1, 1935.

⁵Includes possible duplications from cases closed more than once or transferred from one bureau to another, but does not include cases closed between September 20 and October 1, 1935.

⁶The transfer of cases to other centers or camps is excluded from the following discussion and tabulations, since such cases remained in the national case load for final disposition.

6 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

announcing their plans; 14 percent secured employment; 21 percent were transferred to WPA or other Federal project;⁷ 12 percent were transferred to general relief; 2 percent were placed

Table 2—DISPOSITION OF TRANSIENT DIVISION CASES, TOTAL UNITED STATES,
OCTOBER 1935 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 1936

Month and Year	Total Number of Closings ^a		Reasons for Closing						
			Responsibility Assumed by Relatives or Friends	Secured Employment	Left of Own Accord	Died	WPA or Other Federal Project ^b	Transferred to General Relief	Miscellaneous
	Number	Percent							
Total, 12 months	236,280	100.0	2.5	13.8	42.9	0.2	20.9	12.1	7.6
1935									
October	50,655	100.0	3.9	11.4	52.2	0.2	1.7	8.8	8.1
November	45,993	100.0	2.6	11.0	30.0	0.2	21.7	12.9	6.4
December	54,530	100.0	0.9	17.2	23.6	0.2	43.1	6.3	2.7
1936									
January	26,401	100.0	1.5	8.3	20.9	0.1	29.5	28.0	4.6
February	10,574	100.0	1.9	15.7	40.5	0.4	13.6	8.0	9.7
March	10,979	100.0	2.4	14.2	52.3	0.3	3.8	8.6	13.5
April	10,370	100.0	1.5	9.0	66.0	0.4	2.3	6.2	12.7
May	9,651	100.0	1.9	10.4	69.3	0.2	2.5	2.9	8.2
June	5,741	100.0	1.7	13.0	56.9	0.2	2.3	1.5	8.9
July	4,579	100.0	2.3	10.9	43.6	0.3	4.2	26.5	10.3
August	3,951	100.0	2.0	9.6	55.2	0.2	3.3	15.0	10.2
September	2,856	100.0	1.4	12.8	60.9	0.1	4.6	2.4	13.2

^aExcludes closings involving the transfer of cases between other transient centers or camps since these cases remained in the national case load for final disposition.

^bThe data on cases closed to WPA or other Federal project are incomplete because some States did not report such closings separately.

Source: Report to the FERA Division of Transient Activities.

in the care of relatives or friends; and 0.2 percent died. The remaining 8 percent of the cases were closed for miscellaneous reasons. A brief discussion of the more significant of these classifications follows.

Voluntary Separations.

About two-fifths of the cases closed during the liquidation process left the transient bureaus of their own accord without indicating their plans. The proportion of voluntary separations was lowest in the months of December 1935 and January 1936, when transfers to Works Program employment were at a peak. Presumably, some of the cases not reporting their reasons for departure had found jobs in private industry, or had returned to the care of relatives or friends or to their place of legal settlement. Others had apparently returned to the road despite warnings that they could expect to be neither admitted to other transient

⁷Inasmuch as WPA closings were not reported separately by all States, it is probable that many such cases were classified as having secured employment, so that the figure 21 percent represents an understatement of this liquidation factor.

bureaus nor assigned to Works Program employment anywhere other than at the place of original certification.

Transfer to WPA or Other Federal Project.

The total number of transient cases absorbed by the Works Program cannot be accurately determined, since most localities do not distinguish the employment records of certified transients from those of resident eligibles after assignments have been made to work projects. The partial⁸ data on closings to Works Program employment (table 2) suggest that assignments to work projects were small in number during the month immediately following the close of transient bureau intake, but picked up in November and December 1935.

Eligibility of transient cases for assignment to work projects had been assured by a WPA administrative order issued June 28, 1935. This order stated that, "In general, the same principles governing the removal from the relief rolls and transfer to the Works Program of persons eligible for employment shall apply to nonresidents receiving transient relief as obtained for persons on the local relief rolls." The requirement of May relief status for Works Program eligibility was specifically modified in this order to permit certification of transient cases registering not later than July 15, 1935.

A review of transient bureau cases in 17 cities immediately after the close of intake showed that less than three-fifths of those originally certified as eligible for Works Program employment were still under care in the bureaus where they were certified.⁹ The continued migration of transients after certification can be attributed in part to the inherent restlessness which was always characteristic of the more mobile individuals in the transient relief population; but it was probably due also to impatience at the delay in assignments to work projects.

A subsequent order, dated September 28, 1935, authorized certification of all employable transients under care at the close of intake on September 20, provided they remained under care during the 2 weeks immediately following. Certified transients who remained in the place where certification had been made were assigned to locally sponsored projects, to projects of other Federal agencies (especially in locations where local relief labor was not available), and to WPA camp projects. Approximately 190 of the camps, located in 41 States, were active in

⁸WPA closings were not reported separately by all States, and it is probable that many such cases were classified as having secured employment.

⁹The maximum period of time elapsing between the date of the memorandum regarding certification (June 28) and the date of closing intake was 12 weeks; but, because of the time required to establish the certification procedure, it is probable that the time between certification and closing did not average more than 8 weeks.

8 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

March 1936, employing 40,000 men, most of whom were formerly unattached transient and homeless relief cases.¹⁰

Secured Employment.

Among the cases who left the transient bureaus of their own accord, doubtless many subsequently secured jobs. In addition to them, approximately one case in each seven at the transient bureaus was closed from the case load directly because of having secured employment. This reason for closing cases was third in importance.

Return of Transients to Care of Relatives or Friends.

The transfer of responsibility to relatives and friends did not play a large part in the final liquidation of the Transient Program. Less than 3 percent of the total closings resulted from relatives and friends assuming responsibility for transient cases.

Transfer of Unemployable Cases to Resident Relief Rolls.

Unemployables in the transient case load were relatively few in number,¹¹ but they constituted a problem out of proportion to their number during the liquidation of the program. Federal policy, as announced at the advent of the Works Program, called for the ultimate transfer of such cases to local relief rolls either in the community of legal settlement or of last registration for transient bureau care. Negotiations for the return of unemployables with verifiable legal residences were pushed during the summer of 1935, so that most of those remaining in the case load after the close of intake had no legal settlement status. With the exhaustion of final grants and the closing of transient bureaus, many of the States provided for the transfer of unemployable cases to the general relief rolls, and granted them legal residence for relief purposes.

¹⁰ For information concerning WPA work camps, see Report on Progress of the Works Program, Division of Research, Statistics, and Records, Works Progress Administration, August 15, 1936, pp. 28 ff.

¹¹ Sample studies conducted by the Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, indicated that about 10 percent of the heads of family groups and about 8 percent of the unattached transients were totally unemployable. See Webb, John N., *The Transient Unemployed*, Research Monograph III, Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D.C., March 1936, pp. 43 ff.; and Webb, John N. and Bryan, Jack Y., *Migrant Families*, Research Bulletin TR-10, Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D.C., January 1936, pp. 6 ff.

Chapter II

CHANGES IN THE SIZE OF THE TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION

The preceding account of the liquidation of the case load of the transient bureaus, and of the disposition that was made of the cases under care after the close of intake, suggests that the needy transient and homeless population must have shrunk considerably during that time. Among the transient cases under care throughout the country, more than one-third were closed because they had secured employment in private industry or in the Works Program (see table 2). In addition, many of the cases who left the transient bureaus of their own accord, amounting to two-fifths of all closings, probably obtained similar employment.

A striking net decrease in the number of transient and homeless cases under care at all relief agencies, both public and private, further suggests a rapid decline in the urgency of the needy transient and homeless problem during the year following the close of intake at transient bureaus. On the basis of two 24-hour censuses in 12 selected cities—the first census made 1 week after intake closed in September 1935, and the second made 1 year later—the transient and homeless cases under care at all agencies declined 61 percent; the number of cases under care dropped from about 37,000 to slightly less than 15,000. Table 3 summarizes the result of the two censuses.

Table 3—SUMMARY OF 24-HOUR CENSUS OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES
UNDER CARE AT PRINCIPAL AGENCIES IN 12 CITIES,^a
SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936

Month and Year	All Cases	Unattached Persons	Family Groups
September 1935	37,424	28,520	8,904
September 1936	14,911	13,424	1,487
Percent change	-61	-53	-83

^aSee appendix table 3 for detailed city figures.

Some of the 12 survey-cities experienced only relatively slight decreases in the number of needy transient and homeless persons under care during the year following the close of intake, while others were practically enabled to eliminate transient and homeless relief. Cases under care at Memphis and Jacksonville, Fla., decreased 95 and 91 percent respectively; but in Kansas City, Mo.,

10 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

and Atlanta, at the other extreme, the decrease was only 26 and 37 percent (see appendix table 3). The explanation of the marked variations among the cities requires an examination of individual city differences not relevant to the general decline in cases under care. More significant at this point is the fact that, despite the variations, all cities without exception reported net decreases.

It must be borne in mind that these decreases directly apply only to the transient and homeless cases *receiving* care. Obviously, such data provide an imperfect index to changes in transiency and homelessness. A considerable decrease in the number of persons receiving care does not necessarily indicate a proportionate decrease in the number of those in need. The decrease noted may, in fact, be the result of any one of three factors: (1) a shrinkage of facilities for caring for transient and homeless persons; (2) changed intake policies at the agencies giving care, restricting the number of persons to whom care is offered; or (3) an actual decrease in the number of

Table 4—24-HOUR CENSUS OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES UNDER CARE AT FERA TRANSIENT BUREAUS, AT OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES, AND AT PRIVATE AGENCIES IN 12 CITIES, SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936

Type of Agency	24-Hour Census of Cases Under Care					
	September 1935			September 1936		
	Total	Unattached	Family	Total	Unattached	Family
All agencies	37,424	28,520	8,904	14,911	13,424	1,487
FERA transient bureaus	12,242	8,559	3,683	88	55	33
Other public agencies	18,373	13,712	4,661	7,599	6,586	1,013
Private agencies	6,809	6,249	560	7,224	6,783	441
Percent Distribution						
All agencies	100	100	100	100	100	100
FERA transient bureaus	33	30	42	1	*	2
Other public agencies	49	48	52	51	49	68
Private agencies	18	22	6	48	51	30

* Less than 0.5 percent.

needy cases. In order to isolate the effects of each of these factors, it is necessary to consider in detail the circumstances attendant upon the decrease shown in the 24-hour censuses.

In 1935, the transient and homeless cases enumerated in the 12-city census were under care at one of the three following types of agencies:

(1) The FERA transient bureaus, after the close of intake.

(2) Other public agencies, usually connected with city or county departments of public welfare.

(3) Private agencies, such as the Salvation Army, missions, or Travelers Aid. These agencies were sometimes partially supported by public funds, but were privately managed.

Between September 1935 and September 1936, the distribution of the total transient and homeless case load among these three types of agencies shifted decidedly. The nature of the changes is summarized in table 4.

In September 1935 the transient bureaus in the 12 cities were caring for one-third (33 percent) of the transient and homeless group, principally inter-State transients; local public agencies had a little less than one-half (49 percent) of the load, principally local homeless; while private agencies were caring for less than one-fifth (18 percent). In contrast, the greatly decreased case load in September 1936 was divided approximately equally between the local public agencies and the private agencies.

CHANGES IN THE SIZE OF THE NEEDY TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN RELIEF AGENCIES

Changes at FERA Transient Bureaus.

The data of table 4 show that the most important contribution to the decrease was the liquidation of the case load at the transient bureaus. This liquidation was virtually completed by September 1936 (see table 5).

Table 5—SUMMARY OF 24-HOUR CENSUS OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES
AT FERA TRANSIENT BUREAUS IN 12 CITIES,^a
SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936

Month and Year	All Cases	Unattached Persons	Family Groups
September 1935	12,242	8,559	3,683
September 1936	88	55	33

^aSee appendix table A for detailed city figures.

In September 1935 over 12,000 cases were under care at these bureaus; whereas, at the time of the census of 1936, only the Denver bureau, with 88 cases, was still operating. Subsequent reports show that this bureau closed October 31, 1936, so that at the time of the writing of this report the liquidation of the transient bureaus in the 12 cities studied was complete.¹

It seems logical to suppose that the reasons for closing transient bureau cases in the 12 survey-cities correspond roughly to those operative in the country as a whole (see pp. 5-8).

Changes at State and Local Agencies.

In the 12 cities surveyed, the number of transient and homeless cases under care in all agencies declined about 23,000

¹As indicated in chapter I, the closing of the transient bureaus did not necessarily involve the closing of all cases under care since many of them were transferred to local relief or to Works Program employment. See pp. 3-6.

12 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

between the time of the 2 censuses. The liquidation of the FERA Transient Program accounts for only slightly more than half of this decrease. The remainder resulted from a decrease of more than half in the case loads of public agencies other than transient bureaus. The changes in the case loads of these agencies between September 1935 and September 1936 are shown in table 6.

Table 6—24-HOUR CENSUS OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES (EXCLUDING SERVICE ONLY CASES) UNDER CARE AT PUBLIC AGENCIES, OTHER THAN FERA TRANSIENT BUREAUS, IN 12 CITIES, ACCORDING TO CITY, SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936

Cities	24-Hour Census of Cases Under Care								
	September 1935			September 1936			Percent Change		
	Total	Unattached	Family	Total	Unattached	Family	Total	Unattached	Family
All cities	18,373	13,712	4,661	7,599	6,586	1,013	-59	-52	-88
Atlanta	1,798	1,627	171	1,569	1,569	-	-13	-4	-100
Chicago	3,379	2,530	849	711	508	203	-79	-80	-76
Denver	254	67	187	79	70	9	-69	+4	-95
Jacksonville, Fla.	289	53	236	-	-	-	-100	-100	-100
Kansas City, Mo.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	4,033	895	3,138	771	250	521	-81	-72	-83
Memphis	619	543	76	-	-	-	-100	-100	-100
Minneapolis	5,621	5,621	-	2,810	2,629	181	-50	-53	-
New Orleans	11	11	-	-	-	-	-100	-100	-
Philadelphia	1,901	1,897	4	1,114	1,110	4	-41	-41	-
Portland, Oreg.	303	303	-	462	379	83	+52	+25	-
Washington, D. C.	165	165	-	83	71	12	-50	-57	-

Insofar as these agencies dealt with the transient and homeless needy, their primary function was to administer direct relief to resident homeless persons. The most important exception was Los Angeles, where the case load in September 1935 was made up chiefly of inter-State migrant families taken over from the transient bureaus and subsequently assigned to WPA jobs. In a few cities, local public agencies established very restricted transient programs after the closing of the FERA transient bureaus (see pp. 31-32); in the main, however, their transient and homeless case loads in both 1935 and 1936 were made up of homeless persons. Thus, the decrease noted in table 6 reflects chiefly a decrease in the size of the homeless group under care.

In some cities this decrease in cases under care doubtless represents a shortage of facilities and money, rather than a decrease in need. This was especially true of Chicago, which showed a decline from 3,379 cases in 1935 to 711 in 1936; and on a somewhat smaller scale, of Memphis, which liquidated its homeless population during the year; and of Jacksonville, Fla., and Philadelphia.

However, in other cities where cases under care at local public agencies decreased, there was a real decline in the need of the transient and homeless group. The local public agencies in Minneapolis, for example, showed a decline from 5,621 cases in the 24-hour census of September 1935 to 2,810 cases in

September 1936, and this decline appeared to be attributable mainly to the fact that large numbers of the homeless cases in Minneapolis secured private employment or were certified for the Works Program at some time during the year after the transient bureaus closed.

The family cases under care at the State and local public agencies showed a much larger proportionate decline than the unattached (see table 6). Most of the decline in family cases is attributable to Los Angeles, where certification for the Works Program accounted for a decrease of about 2,600 family cases. It is true that public agencies in three cities (Minneapolis, Portland, Oreg., and Washington, D. C.) reported family cases under care in September 1936 and none in September 1935, but family cases declined in most of the cities.

Changes at Private Agencies.

The general policy of State and local relief agencies is to accept resident homeless cases for care, and to reject applicants who have no legal residence in the community where they apply. But private organizations, such as Travelers Aid, the Salvation Army, Volunteers of America, and missions do not ordinarily insist that applicants for relief be residents of the community. For this reason, private agencies were the principal source of what little assistance transients received prior to the establishment of the FERA Transient Program in 1933.

For the same reason, the case loads of private agencies began to increase immediately after transient bureaus closed intake on September 20, 1935. Because of lack of funds, most of the private agencies were unable to expand their facilities or, in some instances, to operate existing facilities to capacity; yet at the same time that the number of transient and homeless relief cases in transient bureaus and other public agencies was decreasing, the case load of private agencies was increasing.

During the year following the September 1935 survey, the case loads of the private agencies increased further. In the 12 survey-cities, the private agencies had 6,809 transient and homeless cases on their rolls in September 1935, and 7,224 cases a year later. The total number of cases increased 6 percent; and unattached cases increased 9 percent. Family groups, however, decreased 21 percent (see table 7).

The increase in September 1936, shown in table 7, serves as a warning against drawing the conclusion that the transient and homeless problem has diminished directly in proportion to the number of cases receiving care at *all* agencies. The growth of the case load at private agencies indicates that the decreases at the public agencies were not a result of declining needs alone; partly, at least, they resulted from the restrictions that

14 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

public agencies placed upon intake of needy cases for care. Private agencies, which had few restrictions as to type of cases accepted, were naturally the recipients of cases unacceptable to the public agencies; and such cases, as table 7 reveals, were numerous enough to have increased the private agency case loads of the 12 cities between the 2 survey-dates.

Table 7—24-HOUR CENSUS OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES (EXCLUDING SERVICE ONLY CASES) UNDER CARE AT PRIVATE AGENCIES IN 12 CITIES, ACCORDING TO CITY, SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936

Cities	24-Hour Census of Cases Under Care								
	September 1935			September 1936			Percent Change		
	Total	Unattached	Family	Total	Unattached	Family	Total	Unattached	Family
All cities	6,809	6,249	560	7,224	6,783	441	+6	+9	-21
Atlanta	117	107	10	209	189	20	+79	+77	+100
Chicago	847	773	74	1,129	1,029	100	+33	+33	+35
Denver	382	267	115	211	202	9	-45	-24	-92
Jacksonville, Fla.	27	23	4	66	54	12	*	*	*
Kansas City, Mo.	1,112	1,068	44	1,532	1,509	23	+38	+41	-48
Los Angeles	1,370	1,231	139	1,666	1,557	109	+22	+26	-22
Memphis	76	59	17	81	63	18	+7	+7	*
Minneapolis	186	154	32	97	94	3	-48	-39	*
New Orleans	447	405	42	477	447	30	+7	+10	-29
Philadelphia	1,147	*1,146	1	164	* 439	25	-60	-62	*
Portland, Oreg.	389	378	11	531	506	25	+37	+34	*
Washington, D. C.	709	638	71	761	694	67	+7	+10	-6

* Percentage not computed because of small numbers involved.

The increased load of the private agencies is probably made up largely of nonresidents who, since the close of intake at the transient bureaus, have experienced greater difficulty than the local homeless in securing public aid. The local homeless are ordinarily legal residents of the communities in which they live, and accordingly have a legal claim for relief from the State or local public agencies. Inter-State transients have no such claim. Except in special cases they are denied relief at the public agencies, and accepted only at the private agencies.

In general, the data on the relief loads of public and private agencies indicate that the transient relief problem has declined in importance during the year following the stoppage of transient bureau intake. However, in view of the inadequacy of private agency care for transient and homeless persons in most communities, and of the perennial shortage of funds at private agencies, the reasonable supposition would be that the case loads of the private agencies should have increased more than they actually did, if the agencies had been able to accept all cases applying for relief. Indeed, there is good reason for believing that many of the private agencies were not able to meet the demands made upon them a year after intake closed at the transient bureaus. Data justifying this conclusion are presented in a later section of the report (see pp. 34-36).

The evidence, then, that the size of the needy transient and homeless population under agency care had declined 1 year after the closing of intake at transient bureaus cannot of itself support the conclusions that the total problem of transiency and homelessness had declined proportionately. Additional facts are needed to show whether the number of persons on the road or homeless in the cities, but *outside* the agencies, had increased or decreased during the year. The evidence available from the 12-city survey covers the following subjects: the volume of illegal train riding; the increase or decrease in the size of the shelterless population in jungles, parks, etc.; begging and panhandling; the amount of vagrancy; and observations of agency and city officials on the number of transient persons outside the public and private agencies.

CHANGES IN THE SIZE OF THE NEEDY TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS GROUP OUTSIDE RELIEF AGENCIES

Illegal Train Riders.

Data on the change in the number of illegal train riders leave little doubt that the total transient and homeless population, as well as that part of it receiving care, did decline substantially between September 1935 and September 1936. Earlier studies

Table 8—ILLEGAL TRAIN RIDERS, OR TRESPASSERS REMOVED FROM TRAINS, PREVENTED FROM GETTING ON TRAINS, OR EJECTED FROM RAILROAD PREMISES DURING AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER, 1935 AND 1936

Month and Year	Number of Illegal Riders, Trespassers, etc.	
	All Railroads ^a (United States Totals)	Selected Railroads (in the Study-Cities)
August 1935	651,418	63,174 ^b
August 1936	416,462	43,154 ^b
Percent change	-36	-32
September 1935	509,461	18,984 ^c
September 1936	353,607	12,046 ^c
Percent change	-31	-37

^aIncludes total figures for 62 railroads which reported data for all the months concerned.

^bRepresents the divisional reports of 30 railroads in 10 of the study-cities.

^cRepresents the divisional reports of 19 railroads in 8 of the study-cities.

Source: Proceedings of Sixteenth Annual Meeting, Protective Section of the Association of American Railroads, May 20-21, 1936, pp. 59-60, and supplementary releases.

have established the fact that the method of travel most frequently used by unattached transients is the freight train. For example, in February 1935, 61 percent of the unattached transients reported that they used this means of transportation in coming to the city of registration.² Thus, observations and

²See Webb, John N., Transients in January and February 1935, Research Bulletin TR-4, Division of Research, Statistics, and Finance, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Washington, D. C., April 1935, p. 4.

16 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

data reported by special railway police should be of value in determining relative changes in the volume of transiency after the closing of intake at FERA transient bureaus. The available data for August and September of 1935 and 1936 are summarized in the preceding table.

The absolute figures presented in table 8 must not be thought of as representing the size of the transient population in either the United States as a whole or in the 12 cities. This caution is necessary both because of an indeterminate number of transients omitted, and of much more importance, the duplications resulting from counting the same individual several times. On the other hand, the changes in the number of illegal riders, trespassers, etc., do reflect trends in the size and in the mobility of the total transient and homeless population.

Between August 1935 and August 1936 the number of illegal train riders, trespassers, etc., decreased 36 percent on all railroads in the United States, and 32 percent on selected railroads in 10 of the 12 study-cities. A similar comparison of September figures shows a decline of 31 percent for all railroads and 37 percent for those in 8 of the 12 study-cities. Insofar as these figures permit conclusions, it may be said that the size of the transient and homeless population on the road decreased about one-third during the year following the closing of intake at transient bureaus. The decreases reported for the study-cities, taken as a group, followed very closely those for all railroads in the United States.

Among the 12 cities studied, 3—Kansas City, Mo., Minneapolis, and New Orleans—showed especially marked decreases. In Minneapolis, the police of six railroads all reported decreases; in both Kansas City, Mo., and New Orleans, the police of five of the six lines reported decreases, and those of the sixth reported no change. Illegal riding in Portland, Oreg., declined moderately. In Chicago, where data on illegal train riding is especially significant because of the importance of this city as a railroad center in transcontinental travel, the combined reports of 10 railroads showed a decrease of 23 percent for September 1936 as compared with September 1935. The railroad police in Atlanta observed that illegal train riders had decreased slightly; and in Denver one railroad estimated a decrease of 15 percent, while two other lines noticed no change.

In Los Angeles and Memphis the reports on illegal train riding were contradictory in that both increases and decreases were reported by the police of different railroads. Information is not available as to the number of illegal riders and persons ejected from trains and railroad property in Jacksonville, Fla., and Washington, D. C. However, the police of railroads entering Jacksonville, Fla., did report that there had been a substantial increase in the number of arrests for robbing freight cars and

illegal riding during the months immediately following the close of transient bureau intake, and that the number of such arrests had remained consistently high throughout the first 9 months of 1936. In Philadelphia alone of the 12 cities a considerable increase in illegal train riding was noted by railroad police. The police of three railroads reported increases ranging from 13 to 30 percent.

Thus, there was evidence of a decrease in illegal train riding in all but 1 of the 12 cities. It is important that the general decrease was registered at a time when the policy of giving inter-State transients overnight care and an invitation to move on was being revived. Naturally the return of the "passing-on" policy would tend to increase mobility and, likewise, the number of illegal train riders. It is reasonable to conclude, then, that although the number of illegal train riders per month decreased on an average of about 30 percent between August 1935 and September 1936, the actual size of the transient and homeless population must have decreased somewhat more than 30 percent during the same period.

The Shelterless Population.

Further evidence of a decline in the size of the transient and homeless population during the year following the closing of transient bureau intake is found in reports from the 12 survey-cities on the size of the shelterless population.

Representing as it does the group of transient and homeless persons not receiving agency care, the shelterless population would be expected to decline only when agency care was fairly adequate for existing needs or when there was an actual decline in the total number of needy persons. Thus, if the cases closed by the transient bureaus during the liquidation process had continued in large numbers to need assistance, there would have been a substantial increase in the size of the shelterless population. Actually, the reports from the 12 cities show that there was only a slight increase in the size of the shelterless population between September 1935 and September 1936.

Before the initiation of the FERA Transient Program in 1933, there were persistent reports of a large shelterless population. Men, boys, and even women were observed sleeping in jungles, freight cars, unoccupied buildings, and parks. Evidence of the great numbers of destitute persons in the shelterless population was presented in the public hearings on the various relief bills introduced in Congress between December 1929 and March 1933. The following testimony from the hearings is typical:

In one small part of Pittsburgh a war veteran, his wife, and their 4-month old baby were found by the

18 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

police who at that time counted 478 men and 17 women sleeping in the same park.³

A census taken in 765 cities by the Committee on Care of Transient and Homeless on March 22, 1933, revealed a total of 201,596 transient and homeless persons, of whom 11,000 were in jails and police stations, 15,000 in shantytowns, and 18,000 in jungles, boxcars, etc.⁴

During the operation of the Transient Program the size of the shelterless population declined sharply. Transient bureaus housed those who formerly had slept in the parks, vacant buildings, and police stations; and jungles were either abandoned, or broken up by the police. In Atlanta, for example, a special agent of the Southern Railway stated: "During 1935 when the transient bureau was in full swing, jungles were practically extinct because it was the policy of the railway police to 'shake down' the jungles several times a week and send the men to the transient bureau."

During the year following the close of intake at the transient bureaus, the shelterless population appeared once again, but on a much smaller scale than before. In September 1936, there were jungles in only 5 of the 12 survey-cities, and the number of persons found to be living in them was small. The largest jungle population was reported in Portland, Oreg., where there were 4 jungles with a total population of about 100 persons. There were also four jungles in Minneapolis, but at the time of inspection two were uninhabited and only eight persons were in the others. There were 2 jungles in Kansas City, Mo., and 1 each in Atlanta and Memphis, but none contained more than 20 persons.

In the other seven cities, the police had prevented the return of jungles. The survey supervisor in Jacksonville, Fla., reported: "These jungles were considered a menace, and the railroad police, by constant watchfulness, have prevented them from springing up again." Likewise, from Chicago comes the report: "During 1933 and 1934 a few jungles were in operation, but because of a number of thefts and two fatalities occurring in these, they were broken up by the police and have not been permitted to form again." In Denver the situation was summarized as follows: "Jungles are prohibited in the Denver district and when started they are immediately broken up by the police, railway agents, or section gangs."

The shelterless population sleeping in parks, old buildings, etc., did not appear to have increased greatly. In two of the

³Unemployment Relief Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Manufactures, U. S. Senate, 72d Congress, S. 174 and S. 262, December 28, 1931-January 9, 1932, p. 196.

⁴Report of the Census of Transient and Homeless for March 22, 1933, Committee on Care of Transient and Homeless, June 1, 1933, table 2, p. 3.

study-cities, however, an increase was reported. In Philadelphia an increased number of persons were observed sleeping in parks and vacant buildings and in Chicago the police reported the same condition.

It appears, therefore, that the shelterless population not receiving care from relief agencies at the time of the 24-hour census in September 1936 was relatively small. Accordingly, the decreased case loads of all agencies considered together represent largely a decreased transient and homeless population.

Despite the evidence of a general decline in number of transient and homeless persons it is nevertheless true that a shelterless population was in existence in September 1936. The fact that it was not a large group in all of the survey-cities is conditioned by the equally important fact that in some cities it was large enough to constitute a problem.

UNMET NEEDS OF THE TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS GROUP

Unfortunately, the agencies included in the survey kept no records of the cases which applied for relief and were refused; and without such data, there is no way of measuring accurately the increase or decrease in the number of needy applicants who were refused relief. However, information on arrests for vagrancy, on begging and panhandling, and the testimony of observers regarding the numbers of needy transient and homeless persons may serve as a substitute for data on the actual numbers refused care at the various relief agencies.

Arrests for Vagrancy.

Although arrests for vagrancy depend upon the attitude of the police in the individual cities, there is a relationship between vagrancy and the transient and homeless problem. This relationship may be illustrated by the following: Among the total of 1,656 persons arrested and convicted for vagrancy in Los Angeles during January 1936, 85 percent had been in the county less than 1 year and 73 percent had been in the State less than 1 year.⁵

Accordingly, an increase in arrests for vagrancy would probably indicate either an increase in the number of transient or homeless persons, or a lack of facilities for their care. Since it is fairly certain that there was not an increase in the total transient and homeless population between September 1935 and September 1936, an increase in vagrancy would reveal the increase in unmet needs.

⁵See Report on Indigent Alien Transients, Los Angeles Police Department, March 11, 1936.

20 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

In the majority of the 12 survey-cities, arrests for vagrancy either increased or remained the same during the year following the close of intake at the transient bureaus. In Jacksonville, Fla., Memphis, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Portland, Oreg., and Washington, D. C., the police reported in September 1936 that the number of arrests for vagrancy had increased during the year. In Atlanta, Kansas City, Mo., and Los Angeles, the police had observed little or no change. In view of the evidence pointing towards a decrease in the number of transient and homeless persons on the road, the general persistence of vagrancy in these cities would seem to reflect the difficulty that transient and homeless persons face in securing relief from social agencies.

Panhandling and Begging.

In the 12 cities, there was little agreement between the number of arrests for vagrancy and the prevalence of panhandling and begging. There was no uniform attitude on the part of police towards either vagrancy or panhandling; the police were strict or lenient according to local conditions and attitudes. To illustrate, panhandling and begging increased markedly in Jacksonville, Fla., and some months prior to September 1936 the Mayor issued the following statement: "As a humane measure, law enforcement officials are to practice tolerancy and, when possible, ignore those individuals resorting to the act of street begging." In Memphis, on the other hand, a concerted police drive against transients had caused an increase in arrests for vagrancy and a decrease in panhandling.

Information on panhandling and begging, like the data on arrests for vagrancy, throws some light on the extent of unmet needs among the transient and homeless population. In a majority of the 12 cities panhandling and begging were of fairly common occurrence in September 1936, and had actually decreased in only 4 cities—Chicago, Denver, Memphis, and Philadelphia. Atlanta, Kansas City, Mo., Los Angeles, and Washington, D. C., reported little or no change during the year following the close of intake at the transient bureaus. And in New Orleans and Portland, Oreg., as well as Jacksonville, Fla., panhandling and begging were reported to be increasing.

Testimony of Local Observers.

The interviewers in the 12 cities obtained opinions from over 150 persons regarding the seriousness of the transient and homeless problem in their localities. Among these persons were officials of public and private agencies, public officials, heads of civic organizations, and other persons in a position

to observe conditions. There was some difference of opinion among these observers; divergencies occurred either because the observers were discussing different phases of the problem or because of differences in their points of view. Generally speaking, however, local opinions were in accord with other findings of the survey. For the purposes of summary, the opinions of local observers permit the cities to be classified as follows: (1) those in which the problem was not regarded as serious; (2) those in which it was regarded as moderately acute; and (3) those in which, according to local observers, a serious transient and homeless problem seemed to exist.

There was one city, Kansas City, Mo., in which local opinion held that the transient and homeless problem was not serious. Typical of witnesses in this city are one private agency official who reported that there had been few requests for aid since the closing of the transient bureaus, and another who remarked that there had been "a great let-down in transiency" in his community.

From the opinions given in four cities—Atlanta, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Portland, Oreg.—it appears that the local problem was only moderately acute. According to an official of the Travelers Aid Society in Atlanta, for example, the current number of transients could be cared for by the agencies in operation at that time; and a public agency official thought that the problem of transiency had not been as acute during the past year as had been anticipated. The head of the Philadelphia Community Fund observed that transiency in his city was not a great problem, and in Portland, Oreg., similar reports were given.

In seven cities—Chicago, Denver, Jacksonville, Fla., Memphis, Minneapolis, New Orleans, and Washington, D. C.—the most reliable opinions reflected unsatisfactory transient and homeless programs. The following are typical of the testimony: The director of the New Orleans Community Chest reported, "Facilities for the care of transients are almost entirely inadequate." An official of Travelers Aid was of the opinion that unattached adults and family cases had little chance of obtaining relief in Chicago, and probably resorted to flop houses if they possibly could. The opinion of a Department of Public Welfare transient intake worker in Denver was: "The present system of caring for transients is inhuman, inadequate, and unsatisfactory in every respect."

Testimony of Transients.

In addition to the opinions discussed above, interviews were conducted with over 100 transients in the survey-cities. From them it is possible to gain first-hand information concerning

22 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

the most recent experiences of persons on the road, and their success in obtaining relief since the time transient bureaus closed intake. The details of these interviews were extremely varied, but in general the experiences which were reported showed the inadequacy of transient and homeless relief in some of the 12 cities. A typical interview, obtained in Jacksonville, Fla., on September 25, 1936, is quoted in its entirety.

Interviewer's note: This transient youth comes from a marginal Jewish family of New York City. His migration covers a period of approximately 2 years, during which time he had been in a number of transient camps. After nearly 11 months in the transient boys' camp at Ocala, Fla., he secured WFA employment November 14, 1935, on the Florida ship canal project. In May 1936 this work ended. From this point he began a series of wanderings that had carried him west to San Antonio, Tex.; north to Cincinnati; and east to Richmond, Va. The following information is given as told by the transient.

Leaving Ocala, I went to New Orleans hoping to ship out on a fruit steamer, but I found it necessary to be a member of the Union, and, not having the required \$15, I was out of luck.

I headed for Dallas with the intention of getting something to do at the Texas Centennial, but I was refused everywhere I applied because I did not have 6 months' residence in that city.

Learning that opportunity was more abundant in Houston, I next went there, though I did not get a job. A relief agency, known as the City Bureau for Transients, gave me a week's meal ticket in exchange for 24 hours' work in its dining room. There were lots of men there, but every one of us had to provide his own place to sleep, which generally turned out to be the city park. This agency would not give more than a week's care to anyone, so after my time was up I started for the oil fields of Texas, hoping to get something to do.

At San Antonio I was picked up on a vagrancy charge of railroad trespassing, and the next morning the Judge lined us up—some 15 or 20—and gave us all the same sentence—15 days' hard work on a pea farm operated by the city. When released, I decided to get out of Texas at once, and railroaded it back to New Orleans, staying overnight and going on to Louisville, Ky.

There were lots of men riding the train, and it was easier for us to stay on than to try and make our way in the small towns. Whenever we could, we panhandled on the streets and hit the back doors. But police pressure was so great that we had to keep on moving. At Louisville I spent 2 days at the Sally. They would not permit us to stay longer. While there, I tried to get on one of the WPA projects, but even though I had an identification card they told me that I was not a resident and they could not help me.

I left there and went to Cincinnati, where I found some kind of a transient bureau, also operated by the city; but here again I ran into the same old story, 'Sorry, unless you can prove that you are a resident we can give you only overnight care.' By this time, I was getting pretty much disgusted with things, but, having no place to stay, I was forced to take to the road again.

At Charlestown, W. Va., I was again picked up as a vag and given 21 days in the county jail. It was my first experience of this kind—that is, being confined to a jail. They made me work about the building. When discharged, I struck out for Richmond, Va., where the Travelers Aid Society sent me out to the city produce farm. Living accommodations were satisfactory, and I would have been content to have stayed indefinitely, but they also had a maximum stay limit, which was 2 weeks. We were required to work 8 hours a day in the field in return for meals and lodging and tobacco—no clothing or cash was given.

I left Richmond planning to return to the Ocala Boys' Camp, but I got no farther than Savannah, Ga., before I was again arrested as a vagrant. This time they jolted me for 10 days at the city's convict farm.

When they turned me loose, I set out immediately for Jacksonville, and shortly after arrival I learned that the boys' camp had been closed. Sick and tired of the road, I made the rounds of the relief agencies, trying to get some assistance, but was unsuccessful. I panhandled on the streets for a few days and got by pretty well. The cops didn't bother me, and people were rather cheerful about giving. However, I didn't like this way of getting by, and so when I learned that newsboys were needed by a local newspaper I went around and applied. They

24 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

put me on, and for the next month and a half I sold papers on the streets. I was unable to realize anything more than the price of a flop and a couple of cheap meals each day on this job.

At present I have a job as assistant cook in a small restaurant, which allows me my room and board for my services.

Chapter III

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION

The decline in the size of the needy transient and homeless population during the year following the closing of transient bureau intake was accompanied by changes in the personal characteristics of this group. In brief, these changes were (1) a decrease in the proportion of family cases as compared to the unattached; (2) a decrease in the proportion of transients as compared to the resident homeless; (3) an increase in the proportion of older persons; and (4) an increase in the proportion of women.

PROPORTION OF UNATTACHED AND FAMILY CASES

Returns from the two 24-hour censuses of cases under care in the 12 survey-cities show that there was a smaller proportion of migrant family groups on September 24, 1936, than on September 27, 1935. The relation between unattached and family group cases on the two census dates is presented in table 9 below.

Table 9—UNATTACHED AND FAMILY CASES UNDER CARE IN 12 CITIES,
SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936

Type of Agency and Date of Census	Total		Type of Case	
	Number	Percent	Unattached	Family
September 27, 1935				
All agencies	37,424	100	76	24
Transient bureau	12,242	100	70	30
Other public agencies	18,373	100	75	25
Private agencies	6,809	100	92	8
September 24, 1936				
All agencies	14,911	100	90	10
Public agencies	7,687	100	86	14
Private agencies	7,224	100	94	6

Immediately after the closing of transient bureau intake about one-quarter of the cases under care in all agencies in the 12 cities were families and the remainder were unattached. One year later (September 24, 1936) family cases represented only one-tenth of the total. The more rapid decline in the proportion

26 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

of family cases must have been the result either of a restricted intake policy towards families or of a change in the composition of the transient and homeless population. Because relief agencies are much more liberal in their intake policies towards family cases than towards unattached cases, the more than proportionate decline could mean only a change in the total transient and homeless population.

The principal reasons for the more rapid decline in the proportion of family groups than of unattached cases appear to be clear. During the liquidation of the Transient Program, the transfer of the more stable families to the resident relief rolls was a frequent occurrence. The heads of migrant family groups were better qualified than the unattached in terms of skill and experience for private employment.¹ In some, if not all, cities there was a tendency for family heads to be more successful than unattached persons in securing WPA assignments. Finally, the closing of the transient bureaus was more likely to act as a deterrent to the migration of family groups than of unattached cases, because of the hardships of travel and the uncertainties of obtaining assistance.

PROPORTION OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES

A second important change in the transient and homeless population 1 year after the closing of transient bureau intake was the decline in the proportion of inter-State cases, and the corresponding increase in the proportion of intra-State and local homeless cases. Comparisons are particularly difficult in this instance because the transient bureau distinctions of inter-State (Federal), intra-State (State), and local homeless (residents) were not recorded by most of the public and private agencies.

In the comparison which follows, data on composition at the time of closing transient bureau intake are based upon the transient bureau census of September 21, 1935, for 11 States² which had regularly accepted inter-State, intra-State, and local homeless cases. Data on the composition 1 year later were obtained

¹See Webb, John N., *The Transient Unemployed*, Research Monograph III, Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C., March 1936, pp. 47 and 50-51.

²The States were California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Washington. These were the most important of the States giving care to local homeless and intra-State transients as well as inter-State transients. In a few of the remaining States, occasional assistance was given to intra-State and local homeless cases at transient bureaus, but the number of such cases was negligible in comparison with the number in the 11 States listed above. It should be noted that 6 of the 11 States contained 1 of the 12 survey-cities.

by asking each of the agencies in the 12 survey-cities of September 1936 to estimate what proportion of its case load was nonresidents. A comparison of the composition of the transient and homeless population follows:

Table 10—RESIDENCE STATUS OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES UNDER CARE IN 11 STATES, SEPTEMBER 1935, AND 12 CITIES, SEPTEMBER 1936

Residence Status	11 States September 21, 1935	12 Cities—September 24, 1936		
		All Agencies	Public Agencies	Private Agencies
All cases	61,898	14,911	7,687	7,224
		<i>Percent Distribution</i>		
All cases	100	100	100	100
Inter-State	56	27	14	41
Intra-State and local homeless	44	53	70	36
Not ascertainable	—	20	16	23

This rather remarkable decrease in the proportion of inter-State transients may be attributable in part to a more rapid decline in the transient than in the homeless population. It is probable, however, that a more important cause of the change is the increased reluctance on the part of existing agencies to accept nonresident cases. Table 10 presents evidence that inter-State transients were largely dependent for care on the private agencies (missions, Salvation Army, etc.) while intra-State transients and local homeless cases—many of whom were unemployable—made up the bulk of the public agencies (municipal lodging houses, etc.) load.

AGE

During the operation of the FERA Transient Program youth was a characteristic of transients, and local homeless persons were a distinctly older group.³ In the present study it was not always possible to separate the transients from the homeless; and accordingly, it is impossible to arrive at completely accurate conclusions concerning the age of transients as compared with homeless persons. It is nevertheless clear that in September 1936 the total transient and homeless group was older than the group at the transient bureaus.

Examination of table 11 shows that the cases under care at the private agencies tended to be considerably younger than those at the public agencies. The age distribution of cases at private agencies in September 1936 was more like that for unattached persons and heads of families at transient bureaus

³See *The Transient Unemployed*, op. cit., pp. 28-29.

28 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

in September 1935. Since it is known that transients were younger than the homeless, these age data furnish additional evidence that the case loads of private agencies were composed primarily of transients; and the older age of unattached persons at public agencies reflects the preponderance of local homeless. To account further for the more advanced age of both unattached and heads of families at public agencies, it may be recalled that many transient bureaus transferred their unemployable cases, many of whom were in the older age brackets, to general relief rolls upon final liquidation.

Table 11—AGE OF UNATTACHED TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS PERSONS AND HEADS OF FAMILY GROUPS,
SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936
(Percent Distribution)

Family Type and Age	September 30, 1935	12 Cities—September 24, 1936		
		All Agencies	Public Agencies	Private Agencies
Unattached	100 ^a	100	100	100
Under 16 years:	*	2	1	3
16-24 years	15	12	5	18
25-44 years	35	33	26	38
45 years or over	50	53	62	41
Heads of families	100 ^b	100	100	100
Under 16 years	—	—	—	—
16-24 years	13	10	5	20
25-44 years	65	48	39	63
45 years or over	22	42	56	17

* Less than 0.5 percent.

^a Distribution based on FERA Transient Division Quarterly Census Report of 49,195 individuals under care at Transient Bureaus in 11 States (accepting local homeless and intra-State transients as well as inter-State transients) on September 30, 1935. For the identity of the 11 States, see footnote 2, p. 26.

^b Distribution based on a sample of 5,469 migrant families under care during September 1935. See Webb, John M., and Bryan, Jack Y., Migrant Families (II), Research Bulletin TR-11, Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C., April 21, 1936.

Public agency case loads in September 1936 were also older than the cases under care in transient bureaus in September 1935. This difference appears to be the result of three factors: (1) the higher proportion of local homeless persons receiving care in September 1936; (2) the presence at the agencies surveyed of many unemployable cases formerly at transient bureaus but ineligible for Works Program certification; and (3) the policy of many agencies to accept only unemployable and other special cases.

PROPORTION OF MEN AND WOMEN

During the operation of the FERA Transient Program, women constituted a relatively small proportion of the cases receiving care. This small proportion was particularly marked among unattached transients, of whom not more than 3 percent were women. Although more women were heads of transient family groups, the proportion seldom exceeded 15 percent. The relatively small number of women at the transient bureaus reflected the difficulties and hardships attending their migration.⁴

⁴ See Transient Unemployed, op. cit., pp. 31 ff.

Surprisingly, 1 year after the closing of transient bureau intake the proportion of women, both unattached and heads of family groups, had increased. Table 12 below compares the sex composition of transient and homeless persons in September 1935 with the composition 1 year later.

Table 12—SEX OF UNATTACHED TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS PERSONS AND HEADS OF FAMILY GROUPS,
SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936

Family Type and Sex	September 30, 1935	12 Cities—September 24, 1936		
		All Agencies	Public Agencies	Private Agencies
Unattached	100 ^a	100	100	100
Male	97	92	96	88
Female	3	8	4	12
Heads of families	100 ^b	100	100	100
Male	86	61	68	52
Female	14	39	32	48

^aDistribution based on FERA Transient Division Quarterly Census Report of Individuals Under Care at Transient Bureaus in 11 States, on September 30, 1935. For the identity of the 11 States see footnote, 2, p. 26.

^bDistribution based on a sample of 5,489 migrant families under care during September 1935. See Migrant Families (11), op. cit.

Among unattached persons the proportion of women increased from 3 percent in 11 States on September 30, 1935, to 8 percent at agencies in the 12 cities in September 1936. The corresponding increase among heads of families was from 14 percent to 39 percent. At private agencies in the 12 cities the increases were even more marked.

In spite of the general increase in the proportion of women under care, it does not necessarily follow that the transient and homeless population included a higher proportion of women in September 1936 than it had a year before. It is not reasonable to suppose that, with transient bureaus closed, an increasing number of lone women or women with families would have begun migration.

Changed intake policies at the relief agencies account for the changed composition. In September 1936 both public and private agencies, because of demands in excess of their funds and facilities, accepted only the more distressed cases. Unattached women and women with families, including unmarried mothers, were usually accepted for care in preference to less urgent cases. On the other hand, employable men, whether unattached or with families, were frequently refused care or were accepted for overnight care only. Thus, although the ratio of women among the transient and homeless group receiving care had increased, the explanation lies not in their increased importance within the total group, but rather in the exclusion of employable men from the program of many agencies.

Chapter IV

AGENCIES EXTENDING RELIEF TO THE TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION

THE INTAKE POLICIES OF THE RELIEF AGENCIES

The explanation for many of the changes that have been described in the preceding chapters is to be found in the administration of the agencies extending relief to the transient and homeless population. The shift of the transient and homeless relief burden from public to private agencies after September 1935, for example, or the decreased size of the group and the accompanying changes in age, sex, and family composition are to be accounted for, at least in part, on the basis of changed facilities and intake policies at the social agencies.

Intake Policies at Public Agencies.

In four of the survey-cities, Jacksonville, Fla., Kansas City, Mo., Memphis, and New Orleans, the public agencies did not have programs for either transient or homeless persons in September 1936; in these cities, needy transient and homeless cases were accepted only at private agencies. In the remaining cities, although the public agencies were often providing for the needy homeless and for emergency transient cases, employable nonresident men were refused care in most instances. Among the eight cities¹ with public agency programs, not one failed to make some sort of provision for transient families, transient women, and local homeless persons. On the other hand, the public agencies in these cities had either barred inter-State transient men or limited their care.

In Philadelphia, the only public relief available to unattached male transients consisted of lodging in precinct police stations. The Chicago public agencies refused care to unattached employable males. The same condition existed in Los Angeles, except for one public agency which accepted transient juveniles (under 18); and in Portland, Oreg., except that transient men were allowed to sleep on the floor of the shower-room

¹These cities were Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Portland, Oreg., and Washington, D. C. It should be noted that in a number of cities throughout the country there were unexpended balances of FERA grants for transient relief. This fact influenced the intake policies of public agencies directly, and of private agencies indirectly through referral of cases on a contract basis.

32 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

at the city jail. At the public agencies in Atlanta and Denver care was given to employable transient men, but for 24 hours only. In Minneapolis, employable cases were referred to a private agency. The public agencies in the remaining city, Washington, D. C., were carrying on a fairly comprehensive program for transient men, but lack of funds was limiting the number that could be given care.

The significance of the restrictions against employable inter-State men at the public relief agencies is that, during the operation of the transient bureaus, employable men made up a substantial majority of the total case load at all times. Naturally, their exclusion from public agencies after the close of intake resulted in changes in both the size and the composition of the case loads. The intake policies of the public agencies are largely responsible for: (1) the shifting of the transient and homeless relief burden to the private agencies whose intake policies are less restricted, and (2) the greater proportion of transient families, transient women, and older persons—in comparison with younger unattached men—at the public agencies.

Intake Policies at Private Agencies.

Unlike the public agencies, the private agencies in the 12 cities were accepting all types of needy cases to the limit of their resources. Only a very few private agencies definitely limited the types of cases they accepted. At some of the private agencies, however, special factors, such as the collection of a small fee whenever possible, operated more or less indirectly to create restrictions.

Missions. Private agencies of the mission type generally accepted without question all needy transient and homeless cases who applied for care. They required applicants to be sober and to attend the religious services, and about one-fourth of the missions, especially those hard pressed for funds, made a small charge of 10 to 15 cents for a bed or meal whenever the applicant was able to pay. Otherwise they accepted cases up to the limit that their funds would allow.

Missions were lenient in regard to length of stay. Typical interviewers' reports on missions state: "Free food and shelter are given as long as the case is deserving." "The transient may remain indefinitely, provided he is sober and not unruly." "The Mission seldom asks a man to leave, because the longer he is around, the more chance of converting him."

The basic policy of the missions is "salvation first." "The first consideration," says one report, "is to save the man's soul. If he refuses to have his soul saved, it is the opinion of the agency that he isn't worthy of assistance." But "the men resent having to be saved before they can be fed." Undoubtedly this policy, together with the otherwise unsatisfactory

care at these shelters,² tended to make the missions a place of last resort. Accordingly, the number of cases under care at missions in the 12 cities during September 1936 (see table 13) indicates that many transient and homeless persons had failed in their effort to obtain relief elsewhere.

Table 13—24-HOUR CENSUS OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES AT PRIVATE AGENCIES
IN 12 CITIES, BY TYPE OF AGENCY, SEPTEMBER 1936

Type of Private Agency	Total Cases	Unattached Persons	Family Groups
Total	7,224	6,783	441
Missions	3,720	3,669	51
Other private agencies	3,504	3,114	390
<i>Percent Distribution</i>			
Total	100	100	100
Missions	51	54	12
Other private agencies	49	46	88

In September 1936 one-half (51 percent) of the cases receiving care at private agencies were at missions.³ Practically all of these cases were unattached men. Because of the missions' liberality to transients ineligible for relief at public agencies, it is clear that a large part of the men in the missions were inter-State transients, although in many instances these agencies themselves kept no records of the residence status of their cases.

Other Agencies. Private agencies other than those of the mission type were somewhat less lenient towards the transient and homeless group. In some instances, the restrictions upon intake and length of stay resulted from interagency referral and contract agreements. In Atlanta, for example, the Salvation Army had contracted to take cases referred from the Transiency Program of the Department of Public Welfare, which was providing for only 24-hour care to able-bodied transient men. Regardless of its policy in other cities, the Salvation Army in Atlanta, as a result of the contract agreement, was operating principally on the restricted basis of the Transiency Program. The largest mission in Atlanta, however, did not have a contract with the Transiency Program, and was accordingly not restricting care to 24 hours.

Some private agencies made a policy of charging for care whenever possible. It was pointed out above that about one-fourth of the missions followed this practice. Among the other private agencies⁴ slightly over one-fifth (21 percent) reported

²See the discussion on pp. 34-36.

³Among the 137 private agencies in the 12 study-cities, 32 were of the mission type.

⁴Agencies which gave no free care were excluded from this study.

34 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

the same practice. The fact that applicants were expected to pay probably kept the case loads of some agencies at a minimum. Needy cases without funds hesitated to apply; while those who could earn or panhandle enough money to pay for their care preferred the independence of eating in cheap restaurants and sleeping in flophouses to the restrictions of shelter life.

Still other private agencies definitely limited the types of cases they accepted for care. Most Travelers Aid Societies were accepting only transient families, juveniles, and cases presenting urgent social problems, although they sometimes gave temporary care to other types of cases pending referral to another agency. The exclusion of employable men limited their scope to such an extent that only 4 percent of the cases under care at private agencies during the 24-hour census in September 1936 were found at Travelers Aid Societies.

A second group of private agencies accepted only problem cases, such as unmarried mothers, delinquent women, or dependent or delinquent children. After the closing of the transient bureaus they became an important source of relief for transient women, and runaway boys and girls. This group of agencies reported 7 percent of the private agency case load.

In summary, private agencies were more liberal in their intake policies than were public agencies. It is true that over one-fifth of all private agencies requested applicants to pay a small amount whenever possible; and that a small group of agencies, accounting for about 11 percent of the private agency case load, accepted only special cases. But private agencies of the mission type, which were caring for over half of the private agency case load, had virtually no administrative restrictions as to either intake or length of stay.

AGENCY CARE

Nature of Care.

Excluding agencies with facilities for the care of less than 10 persons, a total of 159 agencies (137 private and 22 public) gave some kind of relief to the transient and homeless population in the 12 cities in September 1936. Data on the nature of care given, i.e., meals, lodging, case work, and clothing, were available for each of the 159 agencies and are presented in table 14.

About nine-tenths (89 percent) of the agencies were providing meals; while nearly as large a proportion (85 percent) were furnishing lodging. A cross-tabulation revealed that 80 percent were providing both meals and lodging. Clothing was given by 76 percent of the agencies, but less than one-half (46 percent) were providing case work.

Table 14—AGENCY CARE AVAILABLE TO TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES IN 12 CITIES,
SEPTEMBER 1936

Nature of Care	All Agencies		Public Agencies		Private Agencies	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All agencies	159	—	22	—	137	—
Agencies providing:						
Meals ^a	141	89	17	†	124	91
Lodging ^a	135	85	18	†	116	85
Case work	73	46	14	†	60	44
Clothing	121	76	11	†	100	80

† Percentages not computed because of small numbers involved.

^a Includes agencies which provided outdoor relief and contract care.

Quality of Care.

These figures are somewhat misleading, in that they do not show that a *meal* may consist of sinkers and coffee, that a *lodging* may consist of a mat on the floor, and that *clothing* may consist of an occasional secondhand garment. Of course, some private agencies were offering adequate care. Likewise, the public agencies operating a transient and homeless program ordinarily provided satisfactory care; it must be remembered, however, that only about half of the cases were receiving care at public agencies.

Equipment.

It was impossible to measure precisely how much physical equipment for the care of the transient and homeless group was available in the 12 cities. For example, information on the capacity of many agencies was reported in terms of funds available, rather than equipment; and at the agencies in which applicants were permitted to sleep on the floor when all available beds were filled, the reports on equipment were confused by the fact that capacity could be expanded to meet emergencies.

Despite these difficulties, it was nevertheless clear to observers in the 12 survey-cities that physical equipment for the care of transient and homeless cases was not lacking. Moreover, in those cities in which consistent data could be obtained, physical capacity exceeded the case loads under care. For example, at 6 agencies in Atlanta, there was equipment for 2,188 cases, but only 1,744 cases under care. In Chicago, where the transient and homeless problem was acute, 11 of the 14 shelters whose reports appeared to be reliable were operating at less than three-quarters capacity. In Denver, where the problem was also acute, one agency had stored 200 beds for lack of money to operate them.

Funds.

Both public and private agencies reported funds insufficient to meet the transient and homeless problem adequately. This

36 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

was the basic difficulty in meeting the transient and homeless problem in September 1936, and was responsible for the restricted intake policies, the unused equipment, and the generally inadequate care provided by the agencies.

CITY-WIDE COORDINATION OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS RELIEF ACTIVITIES

In September 1935 the existence of transient committees was reported in a number of the survey-cities. These committees, usually sponsored by Councils of Social Agencies and composed of persons familiar with local transient problems, were organized in order to work out and put into effect local programs to replace those of the transient bureaus. By September 1936 the committees in four of the cities, Atlanta, Jacksonville, Fla., New Orleans, and Washington, D. C.,⁵ had recommended that central application bureaus be established. In other cities, Atlanta,⁶ Denver, Kansas City, Mo., Los Angeles, and Memphis, either upon a committee recommendation or by mutual consent, one agency had been designated as a clearing house for all transient cases, and cooperating agencies had agreed to accept referrals to the limit of their facilities. It is interesting to note the extent to which such plans were actually operating at the time the September 1936 survey was made.

Central Application Bureaus.

In September 1936 Jacksonville, Fla., was the only one of the 12 cities in which a central application bureau had been set up. As stated above, recommendations for others had been made, but, in the majority of cities, lack of funds had prevented the plan from progressing beyond the committee report stage. The State Board of Social Welfare established and was maintaining the Central Application Bureau in Jacksonville, Fla. It was giving no relief, but was acting solely as a referral and service agency.

Interagency Agreements.

The need for cooperation in meeting the transient problem was recognized in some of the cities. In three cities, Atlanta, Denver, and Los Angeles, a public agency was chosen to act as a central application bureau for all cases, and in two cities,

⁵The transient committee in one other city was about to recommend the establishment of a central application bureau, but requested that its plans be kept confidential.

⁶Since the plan for a central application bureau in Atlanta never materialized, this city can also be included in this group.

Kansas City, Mo., and Memphis, a private agency was selected to act in this capacity. With each of these agencies as a nucleus, a well-organized interagency plan was to be developed. However, no such plan was operating in September 1936.

PLANS FOR THE CARE OF THE TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION

Planned Changes in Intake Policy.

Despite the obvious limitations of existing intake policies, no fundamental changes were contemplated by either public or private agencies in most of the study-cities. In eight of the cities, no changes of any sort were planned; and those projected in the other four cities were as often contrary to the interests of the transient and homeless group as not. In Chicago and Los Angeles only, the relief administrations were attempting to work out programs that would permit them to give at least a small amount of help to employable transient men. On the other hand, public agencies for the local homeless in Philadelphia were planning to discontinue all care about November 1, 1936; and in Denver, the largest agency was planning to reduce its transient care from two meals a day and a bed to one meal and a place to sleep on the floor.

Planned Changes in Equipment and Facilities.

Private agencies planned additions to existing equipment for the care of transients and the homeless in 6 of the 12 cities. The total effect of these changes was likely to be small, however, since the aggregate of the new additions was to have increased capacity by less than 300 cases.

Typical instances of the changes contemplated will show how little they were to affect the total transient and homeless problem. In Los Angeles, a mission was planning to open a home outside the city to provide for 25 boys between the ages of 16 and 22. In Chicago, 2 private agencies with a combined capacity of 80 cases were planning to expand to a combined capacity of 170 cases. In Philadelphia, a mission which had been giving only food to 135 persons was planning to provide beds and other care as well.

Requests for Additional Money.

In view of the almost universal shortage of funds to handle properly the needs of the transient and homeless population, it might be thought that a large number of the agencies would have been campaigning for increases in their budgets. As a matter of fact, however, very few agencies were planning to ask for more money. It will be recalled that observers reported serious

38 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

unmet needs in seven cities: Chicago, Denver, Jacksonville, Fla., Memphis, Minneapolis, New Orleans, and Washington, D. C. But in only four of these seven cities—Denver, Jacksonville, Fla., Memphis, and New Orleans—were agencies requesting additional money from the local Community Chest.

Chapter V

CONDITIONS AFFECTING THE STABILIZATION OF THE TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS IN SEPTEMBER 1936

COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

Among the conditions affecting the stabilization of the needy transient and homeless population, community attitudes are of basic importance. These attitudes are rarely sympathetic. The resident population has a tendency to look with disfavor on the needy nonresidents in their communities, particularly during periods of depression. Although this tendency was modified somewhat during the operation of the transient bureaus, it was again apparent in September 1936, as extensive interviews within the 12 survey-cities reveal.

About half of the persons interviewed in September 1936 showed a definitely antagonistic attitude towards the transient and homeless group. For example, a private agency official stated: "Transients are chronic bums and always will be; they have a wanderlust, so let them wander." An interviewer reported this statement by a police official: "Only those shiftless or lazy ones were still on the road * * * those were just 'bums', and nothing could probably be done for them." Business men, civic organization officials, municipal and railway police, and public and private agency officials—all expressed animosity towards transient and homeless persons.

In nearly all of the 12 cities a few people were beginning to think of the "cure" for transiency in terms of cutting off all assistance, and thus forcing needy nonresidents to go elsewhere. "It is a mistake to care for them," said one private agency official, "the problem could be eliminated if care were discontinued." In Denver, this view received official approval. The Rocky Mountain News, of September 30, 1936, quotes the Denver manager of health and charities as follows: "Professional bums and hoboese, as well as needy transients, had better stay out of Denver. They had better stay out of here as they won't get much consideration in the future."

Some persons, however, did believe that relief for transient and homeless persons should be an essential part of a well-planned relief program. They stated that the transient problem is inter-State in essence, and that Federal assistance is necessary.

In any case, it was certain that the attitudes which were reported in September 1936 reflected a lack of local funds to provide adequately for the transient and homeless population, a condition that has been chronic in the past. Under the circumstances it is scarcely to be expected that local relief agencies, either public or private, will become more liberal towards transient and homeless persons in the future.

ELIGIBILITY FOR RESIDENT RELIEF

The eligibility for resident relief of transient and homeless persons measures to some extent the likelihood of their stabilization in communities where at present they represent an excluded group. During the liquidation of the transient bureaus many nonresident cases were transferred to local relief rolls.¹ This procedure might indicate that communities had become resigned to the acceptance of responsibility for cases on the basis of need rather than on the basis of residence. However, the residence requirements for local relief in the 12 study-cities during September 1936 did not support this contention. In general, the agencies in the 12 cities were defining residence in accordance with the legal settlement laws of their respective States.² Moreover, there was not a single instance where residence for relief purposes could be acquired in less than 1 year in the county or State.³ Los Angeles was the only city in which the residence requirement for relief (1 year in the State) was less stringent than the statutory provisions of the State legal settlement law (3 years in the State and 1 year in the county).

It is true that in some cities the residence requirements were being waived in special cases. For example, family cases which had no verifiable legal residence and which involved the care of small children, unattached women, or persons who were ill were sometimes accepted even though they did not meet the residence requirements. However, waiving residence requirements for transient and homeless cases was the exception rather than the rule.

Some communities, indeed, were practicing various methods of avoiding responsibility for the return of their own residents. This evasion of responsibility was constantly adding to the group of permanent wanderers who had no legal settlement status anywhere. Often relief authorities would refuse to pay the fare for return of cases from some other State, even though

¹See the discussion on page 8.

²The District of Columbia, Georgia, and Louisiana had no statutory provisions for the acquisition of legal settlement.

³One city (Portland, Oreg.) required more than a year's residence, namely, 3 years in the State and 1 year in the county.

there was no uncertainty of residence status involved. Again, they would refuse to authorize the return of cases requiring special care.⁴ Extensions of time would not be granted for cases where illness or other conditions beyond control prevented return to place of legal settlement before settlement was lost.⁵ Sometimes letters requesting certification for return of residents would simply be ignored over a period of months until the case had been away long enough to lose residence, whereupon notification of loss of residence would be sent to the agency seeking to return the case.⁶

In September 1936, the great majority of States required that applicants for relief have at least 1 year's residence in the county or State; otherwise they were considered ineligible for local relief. Accordingly, nonresidents in need had recourse only to such public and private agencies as were described in chapter IV. The way in which those agencies administered relief made it extremely difficult for transients to stay in one community long enough to fulfill the 1 year settlement requirement of most States. The policy toward transients applying for relief at either public or private agencies in the 12 cities was to treat them as if they had stopped temporarily on their way elsewhere. They were given limited, strictly temporary care, and "passed on" as soon as possible. Mobility, thus enforced, made it difficult for transients to acquire legal settlement status and be absorbed on resident relief rolls.

ELIGIBILITY FOR WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT

Employment of transient and homeless persons on the Works Program offers another possibility of stabilizing the group. Various administrative orders and bulletins issued between May 22, 1935, and September 28, 1935, provided that employable cases which received care from Federal transient bureaus should be certified for employment on the Works Program.⁷ There was some

⁴From a letter to an agency which had requested authorization return of a case: "We have secured permission for Mrs. K's return to S---, on the condition that she will not need hospitalization when she gets here." (She had been given a great deal of hospital care just before leaving S--- and had gone to C---, which was requesting that she be returned for her health.)

⁵One city reports: "The State of --- recently, in two cases, verified residence and then refused to accept the family when unavoidable delay (illness and confinement) prevented return before settlement was lost; * * *. At the present time there are two cases of pregnant women who cannot be returned, by doctors' orders, until after the birth of the child. Extension of settlement status has been refused."

⁶"A letter sent to Y---, August 16, regarding a family, was answered November 20, when the Y--- relief officials pointed out that the family had lost residence October 16. Several follow-up letters had been sent between August and October."

⁷FERA Bulletin No. 7 and Administrative Memoranda, coded series, A 84, Supp. A 84, A 90, A 94, and A 104.

42 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

evidence of community opposition to the assignment of nonresidents to locally sponsored projects where projects in operation were insufficient in number and size to absorb all resident eligibles. However, reports from the 12 study-cities indicate that, in general, nonresident cases were certified and assigned to work projects without favor or prejudice.

Since that time very few transient and homeless cases have been certified for the Works Program. During September 1936, in 8 of the 12 survey-cities no transient persons were being certified. In the other four cities⁸ minor exceptions were made. For instance, in Jacksonville unattached men and families who at any time had had transient case numbers in the State of Florida, and who could present a reasonable demonstration of need, were eligible for certification. Also eligible were those cases without legal residence who could prove conclusively that they had good reason to remain in Jacksonville, Fla. From April to September (1936), 52 certifications were made on this basis. In Los Angeles a few nonresident families and unattached women were being accepted for direct relief, and, if employable, were in turn being certified for work projects. Agencies in Minneapolis were certifying State homeless persons who had no legal residence and inter-State transients who had been under care at transient bureaus or camps when Federal funds were withdrawn. In Portland, Oreg., a few transient and homeless persons were being certified for the Works Program, but only when all other plans for a case had failed.

ELIGIBILITY FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

The Federal Social Security Act and social legislation in the States provide benefits for which transient and homeless persons might be eligible, depending upon their ability to meet the residence and employment requirements imposed by the various laws.

With respect to unemployment compensation, acts already have been passed⁹ in 35 States and the District of Columbia. The minimum requirements for benefits, as defined by these acts, range from 13 to 36 weeks of covered¹⁰ employment (or a corresponding amount of earnings) within the State during the year prior to application. These requirements suggest that many transient and homeless persons will be ineligible for unemployment compensation.¹¹ Some will not be able to show even the

⁸These cities were Jacksonville, Fla., Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and Portland, Oreg.

⁹Analysis of State Unemployment Compensation Laws, January 1, 1937, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C., 1937.

¹⁰Generally excludes the following: agricultural employment, domestic service in private homes, self-employment, employment in nonprofit organizations, and employment in firms which engage less than eight persons.

¹¹The date on which unemployment compensation benefits become payable is dependent upon the various State acts. Wisconsin is the only State in which payments are being made at present.

minimum amount, i.e., 13 to 26 weeks of covered employment during the previous year; while others, especially migratory-casual workers, will have had the required amount of employment, but not enough in any one State to entitle them to compensation. This last difficulty may be eliminated, however, if States adopt the reciprocal agreements now under consideration.

Other phases of social security, namely, State old age assistance, Federal old age annuities, widows' or mothers' pensions, and blind assistance, offer possibilities of aiding some portion of the unemployable transient and homeless population. However, as in the case of unemployment compensation, it is doubtful whether a sizable number of transient and homeless persons would be eligible for such benefits. For instance, in the majority of States eligibility for old age assistance is dependent upon residence in that State during 5 of the 9 years prior to application, and continuous for the year immediately preceding application.¹² Similar residence requirements are written into the State Blind Assistance Acts, although in most cases provision is made for persons who lost their sight while legal residents of that State.¹³ Further, aid to dependent children through widows' or mothers' pensions is usually contingent upon residence in the State for a period of 1 or 2 years.¹⁴ No Federal old age annuities will be paid until January 1, 1940, and then only to persons 65 years of age who have been previously employed in covered industries. However, the absence of residence requirements in the act makes it possible for nonresidents eventually to receive such annuities.

In general, it appears that very few transient and homeless persons will be eligible for social security benefits. Because of residence requirements, most of the transient and homeless population will not qualify for State old age assistance, blind assistance, and aid to dependent children. With respect to unemployment compensation and Federal old age annuities, nonresidents will be eligible to participate insofar as they are successful in obtaining private employment in covered industries.

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT

Employment in private industry offers another possibility of stabilizing transient and homeless persons. Immediate prospects

¹²Lowe, Robert C. and Staff, *Digest of Old Age Assistance Laws of the Several States and Territories as of September 1, 1936*, Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C., 1936.

¹³Lowe, Robert C. and Staff, *Digest of Blind Assistance Laws of the Several States and Territories as of September 1, 1936*, Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C., 1936.

¹⁴Lowe, Robert C. and Staff, *Digest of State and Territorial Laws Granting Aid to Dependent Children in Their Own Homes as of September 1, 1936*, Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C., 1936.

44 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

for private employment are somewhat more difficult to measure than are eligibility for relief, social security benefits, and Works Program employment; but information concerning U.S.E.S.¹⁵ activities and the attitudes of private employers toward nonresidents may indicate the extent of opportunity for the transient and homeless group in private industry.

During September 1936, nonresidents were being registered for private employment at all U.S.E.S. offices in the 12 survey-cities. In one city (Jacksonville, Fla.) the registration cards of nonresidents were being placed in the inactive file until such time as those persons acquired a local residence. In another city (Philadelphia) the policy was to discourage nonresident registrations and suggest a return to home communities. With these two exceptions, transients were being registered for private employment on the same basis as local residents.

When it came to actual placement, however, additional restrictions appeared. In two cities (Denver and Philadelphia) officials of U.S.E.S. offices stated that no transients were being placed in private employment; while in Chicago and Kansas City, Mo., it was reported that preference was being given to resident persons. These restrictions do not reflect the policies of the U.S.E.S., but rather community and employer attitudes. For example, the employment offices in Denver, Jacksonville, Fla., and Kansas City, Mo., had been informed by employers that only local persons would be considered for jobs. In the majority of cities, however, transients were being accepted for private employment either upon referral from U.S.E.S. offices or upon direct application. Thus, the absorption of transient and homeless persons through private employment was dependent to a large extent upon the continued improvement of economic conditions.

The conditions affecting the stabilization of the transient and homeless population in September 1936 can be summarized as follows:

- (1) There were practically no impending changes in relief programs for the group.
- (2) Few transient and homeless persons were being accepted for resident relief or Works Program employment.
- (3) The majority of the transient and homeless population could not meet the requirements for social security benefits.
- (4) Private employment opportunities were limited by community and employer antagonism towards nonresidents.

¹⁵United States Employment Service, including State Employment Services and National Reemployment Service.

APPENDIX A
Supplementary Tables

Table 1—NEW AND REOPENED CASES ACCEPTED FOR CARE AT TRANSIENT BUREAUS,
TOTAL UNITED STATES, MAY 1935 THROUGH OCTOBER 1936

Year and Month	Total Cases	Unattached Persons ^a	Family Groups
1935			
May	364,228	348,105	16,123
June	350,891	334,426	16,465
July	349,386	331,105	18,281
August	324,896	307,423	17,473
September	171,985	160,731	10,654
October	27,346	26,142	1,204
November	29,691	27,913	1,778
December	19,592	17,546	2,046
1936		17546	
January	11,113	9,732	1,381
February	8,263	7,184	1,179
March	7,602	6,998	604
April	7,389	6,828	561
May	7,826	7,494	332
June	6,012	5,704	308
July	3,183	2,797	386
August	3,695	3,329	366
September	2,990 ^b	2,597 ^b	393 ^t
October	3,938 ^b	3,427 ^b	511 ^b

^a Includes local homeless.

^b Preliminary, subject to revision.

Source: Reports to the FERA Division of Transient Activities. Includes cases transferred between other transient centers or camps.

Table 2—CASES CLOSED AT TRANSIENT BUREAUS, TOTAL UNITED STATES,
MAY 1935 THROUGH OCTOBER 1936

Year and Month	Total Cases	Unattached Persons ^a	Family Groups
1935			
May	373,619	356,876	16,743
June	364,470	346,605	17,865
July	355,249	336,061	19,188
August	334,209	316,237	17,972
September	194,344	176,055	18,289
October	58,628	48,350	10,278
November	54,172	46,633	7,539
December	58,040	52,747	5,293
1936			
January	28,403	25,059	3,344
February	11,761	10,107	1,654
March	11,539	9,523	2,016
April	10,578	9,270	1,308
May	10,122	9,485	637
June	6,785	6,301	484
July	4,666	4,175	491
August	4,131	3,753	378
September	2,994 ^b	2,680 ^b	314 ^b
October	3,836 ^b	3,319 ^b	517 ^b

^a Includes local homeless.

^b Preliminary, subject to revision.

Source: Reports to the FERA Division of Transient Activities. Includes cases transferred between other transient centers or camps.

48 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

Table 3—24-HOUR CENSUS OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES (EXCLUDING SERVICE ONLY CASES)
UNDER CARE AT THE PRINCIPAL AGENCIES IN 12 CITIES, ACCORDING TO CITY,
SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936

Cities	24-Hour Census of Cases Under Care								
	September 1935			September 1936			Percent Change		
	Total	Unattached	Family	Total	Unattached	Family	Total	Unattached	Family
All cities	37,424	28,520	8,904	14,911	13,424	1,487	-61	-53	-83
Atlanta	2,829	2,246	583	1,778	1,758	20	-37	-22	-97
Chicago	5,572	4,096	1,476	1,840	1,537	303	-67	-62	-79
Denver	2,764	1,264	1,500	378	327	51	-86	-74	-97
Jacksonville, Fla.	714	474	240	66	54	12	-91	-89	-95
Kansas City, Mo.	2,059	1,743	316	1,532	1,509	23	-26	-13	-93
Los Angeles	5,403	2,126	3,277	2,437	1,807	630	-55	-15	-81
Memphis	1,493	1,328	165	81	63	18	-95	-95	-89
Minneapolis	5,927	5,792	135	2,907	2,723	184	-61	-53	+36
New Orleans	1,931	1,571	360	477	447	30	-75	-72	-92
Philadelphia	3,948	3,694	254	1,578	1,549	29	-60	-58	-89
Portland, Oreg.	1,770	1,622	148	993	885	108	-44	-45	-27
Washington, D. C.	3,014	2,564	450	844	765	79	-72	-70	-82

Table 4—24-HOUR CENSUS OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS CASES UNDER CARE AT FERA
TRANSIENT BUREAUS IN 12 CITIES, ACCORDING TO CITY,
SEPTEMBER 1935 AND SEPTEMBER 1936

Cities	24-Hour Census of Cases Under Care					
	September 1935			September 1936		
	Total	Unattached	Family	Total	Unattached	Family
All Cities	12,242	8,559	3,683	88	55	33
Atlanta	914	512	402	-	-	-
Chicago	1,346	793	553	-	-	-
Denver	2,128	930	1,198	88	55	33
Jacksonville, Fla.	398	398	a	-	-	-
Kansas City, Mo.	947	675	272	-	-	-
Los Angeles	b	b	b	-	-	-
Memphis	798	726	72	-	-	-
Minneapolis	120	17	103	-	-	-
New Orleans	1,473	1,155	318	-	-	-
Philadelphia	900	651	249	-	-	-
Portland, Oreg.	1,078	941	137	-	-	-
Washington, D. C.	2,140	1,761	379	-	-	-

^aThe case load (unattached women and family groups) of the FERA Transient Bureau was taken over by the Transient Unit of the Duval County ERA on July 31, 1935.

^bAdministrative responsibility for the entire case load of the FERA Transient Bureau was taken over by the LACRA and SERA on August 31, 1935.

APPENDIX B
Schedules

DRS-130A

Social Research Division
W. P. A.

Operating Schedule

A SURVEY OF THE CURRENT TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS PROBLEM

Section I. General Information

1. Name of Agency _____ 2. Address _____
(Number) (Street) (City) (State)
3. Type of Agency: Public () Private () 4. Source of Funds _____
5. Name and position of person interviewed _____
6. Capacity per diem: (a) Individuals _____ (b) Meals _____ (c) Beds _____ 7. Date Schedule Completed _____
8. Have there been changes in capacity since Sept. 1935? Yes () No () If so, list in order: (a) Previous capacities: Meals _____ Beds _____ (b) Dates of changes _____
9. What percentage of accepted cases are referred from a central intake or registration bureau? _____ %
10. Type or types of cases accepted for care: (a) Transient families () (b) Unattached transients: Males () Females () (c) Local homeless unattached () (d) Prevailing type (Specify) _____
11. Does agency care for persons of any particular color, nativity, age, religious or social group? Yes () No () If so, specify _____
12. Is all relief free to all clients? Yes () No () If not, explain _____
13. Nature of care extended: (a) Meals: 1 per day () 2 per day () 3 per day () (b) Lodging () (c) Clothing () (d) Service () (e) Case Work () (f) Comment on quality and completeness of care _____
14. Average length of present relief period: (a) For unattached persons _____ days (b) For family cases _____ days
15. (a) What percentage of accepted cases are out-of-State transients? _____ %
(b) Specify the area from which the majority of these cases come _____
16. Disposition of cases (Explain fully) _____

17. Agency's opinions, attitudes, or criticisms regarding the transient problem (Explain fully) _____

18. Agency's plans and outlook for the future (Explain fully) _____

19. Interviewer's Comments _____

52 TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS POPULATION IN 12 CITIES

DRS-1308

Social Research Division
W. P. A.

Operating Schedule

A SURVEY OF THE CURRENT TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS PROBLEM

Section II. Daily Average Care Given to Transient and Homeless Cases September 1935
Through September 1936

Name of Agency _____ Address _____

Line No.	Year and Month	No. Serv-ings Per Day	Care Given				Number of Cases					
			Meals		Beds		Given Care		Referred to Other Agencies		Refused Care (Without Referral)	
			Free	Paid	Free	Paid	Unat-tached	Family	Unat-tached	Family	Unat-tached	Family
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
		1 2 3										
1	1935 Sept.											
2	Oct.											
3	Nov.											
4	Dec.											
5	1936 Jan.											
6	Feb.											
7	Mar.											
8	Apr.											
9	May											
10	June											
11	July											
12	Aug.											
13	Sept.											

Section III. 24-Hour Census of Transients and Homeless Persons Under Care

Date (hour, month, day) From _____ To _____

Line No.	Age	Unattached Persons		Heads of Families		Other Members of Families	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
1	Under 16						
2	16-24						
3	25-44						
4	45 and over						
5	Total (All Ages)						

144808-0 U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1937

APPENDIX C
Chart

