

5-27-1966

## City Club of Portland Bulletin vol. 46, no. 52 (1966-5-27)

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityclub](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub)



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

---

### Recommended Citation

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "City Club of Portland Bulletin vol. 46, no. 52 (1966-5-27)" (1966). *City Club of Portland*. 226.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_cityclub/226](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/226)

This Bulletin is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in City Club of Portland by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

PORTLAND

City Club

BULLETIN

Mayfair Room • Benson Hotel  
FRIDAY . . . 12:10 P. M.

PORTLAND, OREGON - May 27, 1966 - Vol. 46, No. 52

Printed in this issue and scheduled for presentation, discussion and action at this week's meeting, Friday, May 27, 1966:

REPORT

ON

**SUPERVISED HOUSING**  
**for**  
**MINORS AND YOUNG SINGLE ADULTS**

*The Committee:* GARRY BULLARD, A. N. DAVIDSON, RICHARD M. GRAY,  
TOM DARGAN, KENNETH LEWIS and WILLIAM B. CATE, *Chairman.*

**Members are reminded that non-members may not participate  
in the debate or vote on City Club reports.**

*"To inform its members and the community in public matters and to  
arouse in them a realization of the obligations of citizenship."*

**PORTLAND CITY CLUB BULLETIN**

Published each Friday by the

**CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND**420 Park Building Portland, Oregon 97205  
Phone 228-7231**ELLAMAE W. NAYLOR, Editor  
and Executive Secretary****MORRIS S. ISSEKS, Archivist**Second Class Postage Paid at Portland,  
Oregon. Subscription rates \$5.00 per year  
included in annual dues.**OFFICERS OF THE CLUB**Stetson B. Harman ..... President  
George D. Dysart ..... First Vice-President  
Del Leeson ..... Second Vice-President  
Bruce H. Russell ..... Secretary  
Timothy F. Maginnis ..... Treasurer**GOVERNORS OF THE CLUB**Roy F. Bessey ..... Francis S. Murphy  
Gunther F. Krause ..... Leo Samuel  
Branford P. Millar ..... Samuel B. Stewart  
Carleton Whitehead, Past President**RESEARCH BOARD**George D. Dysart, Chairman  
Stanton W. Allison, Secretary  
Dr. Charles W. Bursch ..... Carl O. Strand  
Myron Katz ..... Waldo B. Taylor  
Paul R. Meyer ..... Dr. Jack Urner  
Carl R. Neil ..... Dr. Harry J. White  
James A. Nelson ..... George S. Woodworth  
Douglas C. Strain ..... Justice Harold WarnerCITY CLUB DUES: Senior, members with over 35 years  
membership, \$5.00 per year; Regular, age 28 and over,  
\$30.00 per year; Junior, age 27 and under, \$15.00 per  
year; Non-Resident, \$6.00 per year; Sustaining, those  
who contribute \$10.00 or more per year over and above  
the dues in their category for the Portland City Club  
Foundation, Inc. The regular FRIDAY LUNCHEON MEET-  
INGS are held in the Mayfair Room of the Benson  
Hotel.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### I. INTRODUCTION

### II. METHOD AND SCOPE OF RESEARCH

#### A. METHODS OF RESEARCH

1. Interviews
2. Field Trips
3. Questionnaires

#### B. LIMITATION OF STUDY

### III. BACKGROUND OF STUDY

### IV. PRESENT HOUSING SITUATION

#### A. EXTENT OF THE KNOWN NEED AMONG STUDENTS

#### B. AVAILABILITY OF SUPERVISED HOUSING FOR STUDENTS IN DOWNTOWN BOWL

#### C. QUALITY OF STUDENT HOUSING

#### D. SUPERVISED HOUSING FOR YOUNG WORKING PEOPLE

### V. PORTLAND STATE COLLEGE

### VI. HOUSING FINANCES

#### A. LIVING COSTS

#### B. FINANCING METHODS

### VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### A. EMPLOYED YOUNG WOMEN AND YOUNG MEN

#### B. STUDENTS AND TRAINEES, GENERALLY

#### C. ADDITIONAL STUDENT HOUSING AND ITS FINANCING

#### D. CITY HOUSING INSPECTION

## APPENDICES

Appendix I Summary of Responses from Training and Educational Institutions

Appendix II Summary of Responses from Minor PSC Students Not Living at Home

Appendix III Summary of Responses from Parents of Minor PSC Students Not Living at Home

Appendix IV Summary of Responses from Young Single Working Women

Appendix V Bibliography

**REPORT**  
**ON**  
**SUPERVISED HOUSING**  
**for**  
**MINORS AND YOUNG SINGLE ADULTS**

To the Board of Governors,  
The City Club of Portland:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Your Committee was authorized "to study and submit recommendations on supervised housing for minors and young adults in the various public and private post-high school educational programs in Portland."

It was suggested to the Committee that it include in its survey the policies, needs of and planning for supervised housing for Portland State College, the University of Oregon Dental and Medical schools, certain private institutions and the organized apprenticeship programs.

The Committee was also urged to include a study of the present adequacy and potential utility of such institutional housing as that now provided by the various private colleges and universities, as well as the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), and other controlled living facilities; various types of cooperative housing development with private investment but institutionally sponsored and supervised; proprietary supervised housing, and such other forms of supervised housing as might be brought to the Committee's attention.

Your Committee felt the immediate need was to clarify terms before beginning its assignment.

The Committee determined that, for the purpose of this study, "Supervised Housing" is housing where personal concern for the individual welfare of the dwellers is expressed. This concern can cover the spectrum from college dormitory living to proprietary establishments, from the establishment of minimal rules of conduct to the establishment of standards which must be met as a condition to listing housing as approved by an educational or training institution.

The Committee further decided that the study should be limited to minors not living at home. These persons were to include both students in various training and educational institutions and young working men and women.

## II. METHOD AND SCOPE OF RESEARCH

### A. METHODS OF RESEARCH

Three basic methods of acquiring information were utilized: interviews, field trips, and questionnaires.

#### 1. Interviews

The Committee interviewed representatives in education, organizations providing or contemplating supervised housing, community planning agencies and investment companies, including:

Charles R. Holloway, Jr., Chairman, Oregon State Board of Higher Education

Dan Davis, President, Dan Davis Company

Clarence C. Crank, Chief Building Inspector, City of Portland

Dr. Branford P. Millar, President, Portland State College

Dr. James V. Moore, Financial Aids and Housing Officer, Portland State College

Dr. John S. Griffith, President, Multnomah College

Mrs. Frances Six, then Manager, The Martha Washington

Mrs. Gertrude Scobel, Manager and Housemother, The Princess

Jack Walden, Housing Director, Downtown YMCA

Miss Roberta Chapman, then Executive Director, YWCA

Mrs. Eleanor Meyers, then Associate Executive Director and now Executive Director, YWCA

Miss Eugenia Patterson, owner, Cambrian Apartments

Dr. Harold Glen Brown, Pastor, First Christian Church

John B. Kenward, Executive Director, Portland Development Commission

William Sparks, Portland Center Development Project

Ray Howard, Commerce Investment Company

William Bader, National Mortgage Company

Dr. Jack Urner, then Acting Director, Metropolitan Planning Commission

Students living in the downtown bowl area.

#### 2. Field Trips

The Committee or members of the Committee visited the following housing facilities:

YWCA

YMCA

The Campbell Court

The Martha Washington

Cambrian Apartments

The Jeanne d'Arc, which subsequently has become The Princess

Individual student residences.

#### 3. Questionnaires

The Committee made extensive use of questionnaires as the best method of assembling a large amount of factual information not previously collected.

At the outset of the study, questionnaires were sent to a selected, representative list of fifty-six training and educational institutions. Twenty-eight responses were received (See Appendix I)

After the scope of the study had been defined, two hundred questionnaires were sent to minors attending Portland State College but who were not living with their parents. Ninety-two replies were received. (See Appendix II)

Another two hundred questionnaires were sent to the parents of minors not living at home but attending Portland State College, and sixty-three responses were received. (See Appendix III)

Finally, sixty-four representative businesses and industries were sent supplies of questionnaires to be filled out by minor single women employees. One hundred and three responses were received from these employees. (See Appendix IV)

A bibliography of publications and documents consulted is contained in Appendix V.

## **B. LIMITATION OF STUDY**

In the light of the information received from the questionnaires reported above, the Committee determined that the greatest need for supervised housing facilities is in an area referred to as the "downtown bowl." The scope of the study was limited to this area. (See Appendix I.) Your Committee defines the "downtown bowl" as that portion of Portland which is bounded by the Willamette River, the Southwest Hills, Duniway Park and the Northwest industrial area.

The need for supervised housing is not as pressing in colleges and training institutions in other areas of Portland. The purpose of the data cited in the following paragraphs is not to give an exhaustive report of the questionnaires' findings, but rather to detail the condition of supervised housing in a few representative schools, in order that the tenor of the response to the questionnaires can be understood.

Cascade College had 250 students enrolled, of which number 55 men and 75 women do not live at home. The college provides supervised housing for all of its students not living at home.

Lewis and Clark College reported 1000 students enrolled. Of that number, 500 men and 400 women do not live at home. The college reported that it had "adequate space" for its students in its own supervised housing.

Reed College responded that of its 819 students enrolled, 527 were living on campus, 250 off campus, and the remainder at their own homes with parents. Reed College has supervised housing for single students. All freshmen must live on campus unless living with parents. Other students may live off campus with permission of parents and the dean. Reed College indicated no need for additional supervised housing at this time.

The University of Oregon School of Nursing now provides supervised housing for its students. The University of Oregon Medical and Dental schools indicated they had no need for additional supervised housing.

The University of Portland reported 1450 students enrolled, of which 350 men and 250 women do not live at home. The University provides supervised housing for those 600 non-resident students.

Smaller institutions in the downtown bowl, such as Beau Monde College of Beauty, Bassist School for Fashion Careers, Hastings Business School, Pacific Beauty School, Pacific Business School and other similar training institutions reported varying degrees of need. They usually handle the housing problem by recommending to their students the YWCA, YMCA, the Martha Washington, The Princess and other supervised housing units. Most training institutions expressed a need for supervised housing which they themselves did not provide.

Multnomah College, with about 1600 students enrolled, reported 95 per cent of its students single, but 90 per cent living at home. The college owns and operates the Campbell Court Hotel as a supervised facility for those students desiring a supervised domicile.

Portland State College, a rapidly-expanding large public educational institution in the downtown bowl, provides no supervised housing for its thousands of students. It represents the largest situation of need in the whole area. Its particular problem will be dealt with at length in a later section of this study.

### III. BACKGROUND OF STUDY

The Public Affairs Committee of the YWCA concerned for the housing of the several hundred applicants which that Association's limited capacity could not accommodate, made a preliminary survey of supervised housing in the city early in 1961, and referred the problem to the City Club for a more comprehensive investigation.

Precipitating factors affecting demand for and availability of supervised housing facilities in the downtown bowl in Portland have been (1) the change in land use in this area, with elimination of many residences which were razed for the South Auditorium Urban Renewal program and the construction of the Stadium Freeway, (2) the rapid expansion of the physical facilities of Portland State College and (3) the outstanding growth of the student population at PSC.

Traditionally, in America, colleges and training institutions have been "substitute parents" for minors who are enrolled and are not living at home. Control and supervision are provided primarily for young women. Recent studies<sup>(1)</sup> show that, even with the development of large, urban universities, most parents of minor students expect some degree of supervision by college authorities, especially for their daughters.

However, the trend in recent years seems to have modified. For instance, a 1961-62 survey made by the U. S. Office of Education<sup>(2)</sup> concerning the percentage of men and women students accommodated in college and university residential facilities found that very few of the private, technological, business and other vocational schools provide residential facilities for men or women, and only sixty per cent of public and private institutions of higher education provide housing accommodations for students. In every situation a higher percentage of housing was provided for women than for men students.

### IV. PRESENT HOUSING SITUATION

#### A. EXTENT OF THE KNOWN NEED AMONG STUDENTS

One of the first tasks of the Committee was to ascertain the need for supervised housing for minors not living at home, both among students and among working young people in the downtown bowl. Inquiries at Portland State College, and questionnaires to other post-high school educational or training institutions in the downtown bowl, revealed the following numbers of minor single students not living at home at the beginning of the 1964-65 fall term:

School	Single Minor Students Not Living at Home		
	Men	Women	Total
Portland State College (According to PSC spokesmen, about 90% of all single students are minors)	445	502	947
Business, Vocational and Technical Schools ...	25	400	425
<b>TOTAL KNOWN NUMBER of single, minor students not living at home</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>902</b>	<b>1372</b>

These figures represent a conservative estimate for the area, because replies to the questionnaires were not received from all educational and training institutions. PSC's yearly enrollment has increased ten to fifteen per cent each year. At the beginning of the 1964-65 fall term, about 7500 students were enrolled at PSC. Of these, 1906 were living away from their parental homes. (This includes 843 married students.) The influx of students brought in by Portland State College has already overtaxed the living quarters adjacent to the school and the problem will be aggravated as the school expands.

(1) *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, American College Personnel Association, Vol. V, No. 3, March, 1964.

(2) "Percentage of Men and Women Students Accommodated in College and University Residential Facilities", U. S. Office of Education Survey, pp. 171-175.



In 1964, the State System of Higher Education projected the following enrollment for Portland State College:

1965 .....	8,368*	1970 .....	11,664
1966 .....	8,945	1971 .....	12,325
1967 .....	9,650	1972 .....	12,864
1968 .....	10,421	1973 .....	13,447
1969 .....	10,960	1974 .....	14,010

\*Actual enrollment for 1965 Fall was 9100 and the subsequent passage of the "Cold War GI Bill" may throw these forecasts off further.

## **B. AVAILABILITY OF SUPERVISED HOUSING FOR STUDENTS IN DOWNTOWN BOWL**

Good supervised housing for students is to be found in the downtown bowl area at the YWCA, YMCA, the Martha Washington, The Princess, and the Campbell Court Hotel which is operated as a dormitory by Multnomah College.

The YWCA has twenty-six beds available for permanent residents, but most of these are reserved for working girls and there is a long waiting list for this housing. The Martha Washington, which is near Portland State College, reserves approximately half of its 150 rooms for students. There are usually fifty girls on its waiting list in June and September, which are the peak periods. The Jeanne d'Arc housed both students and working girls and had to turn away applicants in June and September. This facility was renovated and renamed "The Princess" in 1964 and can now house 140 girls. The Campbell Court Hotel, which has room for 248 students on a two-to-a-room basis, can accommodate even more by higher per-room occupancy in some of the larger quarters. Applications for Campbell Court dorm for fall term, 1965, indicated nearly 270 Multnomah College enrollees desiring dormitory space there. Previously, residents of the dormitory have included up to 35 per cent students enrolled at other schools, including Peace Corps trainees at PSC (Summer, 1965, up to 150 at a time). Of the 1965 fall term applicants at the time of the survey, 173 were men, 90 were women.

The YMCA, which reserves a total of 80 of its 240 beds for permanent residents, experiences a 92 per cent occupancy rate. It handles only a small number of students.

Availability of housing for students is affected by the policy of the owners of those better apartments which are within financial reach of students, when those owners limit the proportion of units available to students. For example, a typical apartment in the area reported that 17 of its 48 residents were students, but the management has purposely limited the percentage of students in the building as protection against an inevitable turnover. The owner of this apartment feels that she has no assurance from one term to the next that she will be able to maintain her occupancy rate for student housing, because of such an unpredictable rate of turnover in student rentals.

## **C. QUALITY OF STUDENT HOUSING**

Committee members investigated the quality of student housing to be found in the general area of Portland State College. It is the observation of the Committee that although there is housing in the area which is adequate, some of the housing is a potential danger to the health and welfare of the students living there, due to generally crowded, drafty, unsanitary and unsafe living conditions.

There are situations where students are living in housing in which one bathroom has to serve an entire floor of student apartment dwellers. Some of the housing visited appeared to be a fire hazard. Some could be characterized as being in a slum condition. An additional unfortunate part of the situation is that rents for this substandard housing are not low.

An interview with the Chief Building Inspector of the city indicated that the City of Portland has strict codes governing the construction or remodeling of buildings for use as apartments. Beyond the city housing regulations, there are

several reasons for the existence of inadequate student housing near Portland State College.

First, there is some non-conforming apartment use existing from prior to the first housing regulations in 1911. In addition, housing codes were relaxed during World War II in order to handle the wartime housing problem. At that time, 3,300 permits were issued in the city under the relaxation of codes. Approximately half of these permits are still in force. Finally, some bootleg apartment situations exist because of the limited city building inspection staff.

The Committee found a number of situations where single young men and women were in unsupervised housing with no resident landlord.

#### **D. SUPERVISED HOUSING FOR YOUNG WORKING PEOPLE**

During 1963, between 500 and 600 young women sought housing at the YWCA. The YWCA has only 48 beds available, 26 of which are available for permanent residents. The remaining 22 are reserved for temporary guests. Consequently, almost all of those who sought housing had to be referred to rooms elsewhere in the city. Such rooms were recommended only after the YWCA's Housing Committee had inspected and approved them. According to the YWCA Housing Secretary, these statistics did not change appreciably in 1964. The YWCA continues to operate a program of providing listings of approved housing.

The Martha Washington was established in 1887 to provide supervised housing for single working girls. It is operated by the Portland Women's Union, a membership organization whose sole function is to administer the residence. It is generally filled to capacity. The occupancy pattern shows approximately half of the 150 rooms are occupied by working girls.

The Princess has always designated some of its beds for working women. Following the facility's recent renovation, it has a capacity for 140 women, with rates for room and board ranging from \$80 to \$125 per month. These rates tend to make it more acceptable to employed young women than to students, although currently there are about 130 in residence and the manager reports an almost even division of students and working girls. The end of the school term in June may mean a change in ratio, with an outgo of students and an income of recent graduates moving to Portland to seek employment.

The statistics of the YWCA seem to indicate that there is a definite lack of adequate housing for young working girls, especially as a "first residence" when arriving in the city. In many cases, these girls live in supervised housing units when they first arrive, and later move on to an apartment with other girls, or by themselves.

The Committee's study indicates that the YWCA, the Martha Washington and the other previously mentioned living units apparently are providing suitable facilities for those working girls, within the limits of their capacities.

The answers to the Committee's questionnaire to working girls showed no great desire for supervised housing facilities. The typical comments from the group were to the effect that their accommodations weren't exactly what the occupants wanted—they could be nearer to bus lines or closer to downtown, and so forth. It must be realized that many young people do not want supervised housing, preferring complete freedom and independence, however inadequate the facility.

On the other hand, the experience of the YWCA which had to refer nearly 600 applicants to other housing accommodations in a one-year period, indicates the existence of a definite need at that or a similar facility. These applicants represented a wide range of personal circumstances and ages. However, the majority were younger girls who were new arrivals in the community. It is the judgment of the Committee that the present need could be met through construction of additional facilities by the YWCA and similar agencies—for instance, when the YWCA was built, it was so designed that additional stories could be added if the need for more space arose.

As for single young working men, the YMCA with its 185 rooms and 240 beds has been able to satisfy the demand for rooms since, as stated earlier, it operates at 92 per cent capacity throughout the year and does not have a waiting list.

## V. PORTLAND STATE COLLEGE

The largest educational institution in the downtown bowl area, and the one around which the greatest need for additional supervised housing in the Portland area exists, is Portland State College. Consequently, any discussion of the need for additional housing must consider the housing policy of that institution.

Portland State College was established in 1955, by the action of the State Legislature, as an urban educational institution. The law provides in part:

"Section 1. There is created a separate and distinct department in the higher educational system to be under the jurisdiction, management and control of the board of higher education, to be located on the site of the former Lincoln High School property and any areas in the vicinity of such property in the City of Portland and to be known as Portland State College. *Portland State College shall be a downtown city college, and shall not be a college of the campus type.* The board of higher education may acquire such land and acquire or construct such buildings and facilities as are necessary for Portland State College."<sup>(3)</sup>  
[Emphasis supplied]

The interpretation of this legislative act as meaning the provision of no dormitory facilities was reinforced by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education's action dated July 25, 1961 in which long-range plans stated that "No provision is to be made for site of dormitories or student apartments." This position was further reaffirmed by the minutes of the Board meeting on July 24, 1962, which state that plans for PSC include "no provision for dormitories or student apartments."

The chairman of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, in a letter to your Committee dated February 4, 1966, said further that:

"The Board has not in any of its deliberation concerning the future of Portland State received a request from the Institution for consideration of any type of student housing."

In this same letter, the Board chairman stated that:

"Since we have six other campus-type institutions, it has been our conviction that a student resident of Oregon who wishes to leave his home to attend school can choose one of the six domiciliary institutions."

Thus, the student housing practice at PSC is one of purposive design by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education and one with which the administration of PSC concurs.

The principal philosophical argument advanced by the administration of PSC, in support of its practice concerning student housing, is that the *European* approach is most desirable for such an urban institution. This concept holds that the institution should concern itself only with academic matters. Students are responsible entirely for their own accommodations. In contrast, the traditional *American* approach, which assumes responsibility for student housing, applies at the six "campus type" state institutions of higher education in Oregon.

Potent arguments can be advanced as to why the original mandate at PSC is no longer justified. With the development of specialized departments such as the Middle East Studies Center, and the Graduate School of Social Work, PSC is now one of the principal educational institutions in the state. Master degrees are also now or soon will be offered in the schools of Education, Science, Social Science, Business Administration and Arts and Letters. Officials of the school state that doctorates in selected fields will be offered in the near future. Indeed, some areas of study are offered at PSC which are not available anywhere else in this state. PSC's academic offerings of this nature will undoubtedly continue to develop rapidly, because of the school's location in the state's largest metropolitan area. At the present time, PSC offers twenty-one B.A. and B.S. degrees in various disciplines.

<sup>(3)</sup>ORS 352.195 (1).

This growth in graduate study opportunities brings not only graduate students to the community, but attracts many undergraduates to PSC as well. PSC is no longer purely a local school. Both its status and service to the state are entirely different than visualized in the original concept. Statistics reported earlier in the study showed that about 947 students not living at home attended the school in 1964-65. The Chairman of the Board of Higher Education states that a survey made in 1964-65 disclosed that 200 of these students came from other states or foreign countries (128 of the former were from California). Therefore, it is the conviction of the Committee that one of the principal reasons for considering Portland State College students on an entirely different basis than students at the other state institutions no longer exists.

Through questionnaires to students not living at home, and to the parents of such students, your Committee sought to gain their feeling toward the need for student housing at Portland State College.

Parents were asked, in their questionnaires, "Do you think that your son (or daughter) should live in supervised housing when away from home at college?" Forty-seven said "yes" and sixteen said "no". Thirty-nine said they thought the college should assume responsibility for housing the students. Twenty felt the college should not. Most parents seemed to be aware of the practice of PSC in relation to student housing.

In reply to the key question, "If supervised housing were provided in some form at PSC, would you use parental control to make sure your children used it?", forty parents said "yes", and fourteen said "no".

One mother's comment was typical of the general attitude of these parents who favored supervised housing for their minor child who is way at college: "As parents, we feel that our son is living in unsuitable quarters, keeping irregular hours and eating inadequate meals. We do not believe that he has formed bad associations, but we do feel that he would benefit from living in supervised housing."

The *Journal of College Student Personnel*, in various studies, found an apparent, widely-accepted opinion among college administrators that supervised student group living is an important part of the learning experience for the student.<sup>(4)</sup>

Portland State College students not living at home were asked, "Should student housing be provided near the campus for Portland State College students?" The responses were:

	Men	Women	Total
Yes .....	60	24	84
No .....	14	1	15

In answer to a more personal question, "If such housing were available and if you could afford it, would you be interested in living in it?" The responses were:

	Men	Women	Total
Yes .....	50	20	70
No .....	15	5	20

In the Committee's opinion, the original mandate for the school is now outmoded. Single students not living at home, and parents of such students who were questioned, feel the need for supervised student housing at PSC. Student housing available in the vicinity of the school is presently inadequate in quality and quantity. The overriding question, then, is: Who shall fulfill this recognized need—the school or private investors? The following section on financing seeks to analyze the possible alternatives available to meet this need.

<sup>(4)</sup>"Academic Influence in Student Housing: Theory and Practice", Daniel A. Ferber, *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, Vol. IV, No. 1, October 1962, p. 2.

## VI. HOUSING FINANCES

### A. LIVING COSTS

PSC students, in answer to questionnaires sent to them in the fall of 1964, said they could afford to pay between \$70 and \$80 a month for room and board. This is approximately what young people are now paying at housing facilities in the area. At the Martha Washington, the cost is \$80 a month for room and two meals a day. Campbell Court charges \$75 to \$80 a month for room and three meals a day. The costs at The Princess for room and three meals a day varies from \$80 to \$125 a month. The YMCA charges \$82 a month for room and two meals. The YWCA charges from \$34 to \$42 for a four-week period for room, with \$2.00 a week added for kitchen privileges. The monthly room and board costs in dormitories operated by the University of Oregon and Oregon State University now are approximately \$89 a month, or \$740 per school year. Beginning in the fall of 1966, these rates will be raised to \$790 per school year.

The Portland Center Development Company, which is completing a building project of 1500 apartments in the South Auditorium Urban Renewal area near Portland State College, will have single units beginning at \$140.00 a month rent, not including board. This is well beyond the reach of most students.

### B. FINANCING METHODS

Early in this study, several private investors were interviewed by your Committee concerning the feasibility of providing student housing at PSC. A spokesman for Commerce Investment Company said it would be feasible "if the proper degree of support from PSC's President, Dean of Men and Dean of Women would insure filling units in summer as well as in winter, so that investors could receive a 6 to 6¼ per cent return." A representative of the National Mortgage Company said, "It is not economically possible for a private investor to provide housing under present conditions."

On the other hand, the October 13, 1964 edition of the *Wall Street Journal* told of interest in student housing on the part of a number of nationally known private companies. The article said:

"The private concerns are attracted by the rapidly expanding demand for student housing, especially because it comes at a time when other residential construction shows signs of lagging. Also, for some, the lure of potentially high returns is attractive . . . Colleges, often cool to outside developers in years past, are beginning to welcome them."

Some private developers offer colleges a "lease-purchase" plan for student housing facilities.

On the negative side, the article reports that Educational Facilities Laboratories, a Ford Foundation offshoot, argues that the frame construction used by some private developers will not stand up to the hard knocks to which a dormitory is subjected. Maintenance costs on such buildings run very high. More substantial buildings tend to make room and board costs for students higher than in college-financed and college-owned facilities. The *Wall Street Journal* reports that room and board costs in privately-provided facilities tend not to be comparable with college-financed and -owned facilities. Similarly, Chancellor Roy Lieuallen of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education was reported in the October 27, 1965 edition of the *Oregonian* as saying:

"Firms hoping to build privately-owned dormitories at Oregon colleges and universities face several roadblocks . . . [Lieuallen] said students who live in private dorms pay more for education. Our responsibility is to try to reduce that cost.

"Private dorm rates are higher because owners must pay taxes, show a profit, and pay higher borrowing rates than the state."

He further pointed out that private dorms are often more luxurious than those built by the state, and the owners have to charge higher room and board. Private dorms cannot be built on state-owned campuses. Often they are situated too far from classrooms, he said.

Private groups are now actively considering new housing for Portland State College students. One Portland concern, the Dan Davis Company, is presently constructing a coeducational student resident hall at S.W. Sixth and Hall Streets, for 540 students. It is expected to be ready for occupancy by October, 1966. This student housing project will receive PSC cooperation but has no organic relationship to the school. It will have a resident manager and will also have a graduate student counsellor on at least every other floor. Each floor will elect a member to a student council which will establish the living rules governing the building. The residence hall will provide room and twenty meals a week. It will have maid service. There will be two persons per room, and two rooms per bathroom. Each floor will have a private study room.

Room and board rental for nine months in the Dan Davis facility will be \$1025, or approximately \$114 per month. This is considerably more than the \$70 and \$80 a month the students at PSC indicated they could pay, and the \$790 per school year which will be charged in 1966-67 at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon.

Although it favors private development where it can be carried out with equity for the students, your Committee questions whether the present private development at PSC can meet the need entirely, in light of the limited financial resources of a large percentage of the students.

Another organization considering student housing in the PSC area is a church which indicates it could afford to do this only because of the tax benefit it presently enjoys.

Many colleges throughout the country are building dormitories by borrowing money at low interest rates from the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA) of the Federal government, and then repaying it from residence hall income. The newly-enacted Federal Housing Law authorizes about a billion dollars in loans for the construction of college dormitories over the next four years. The law also allows federal savings and loan associations to make large loans for dormitories or for fraternity or sorority houses. There are no fraternities or sororities at PSC which provide living accommodations for its members.

Student housing is provided at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon by means of a state-operated, self-liquidating bonding program<sup>(5)</sup> which allows even lower interest rates than the HHFA. This bonding program is designed to provide for the construction of housing facilities without cost to the taxpayers. Revenues from those living in the facilities are sufficient to pay off the loan.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Having first determined that the principal problem in supervised housing in the City of Portland involves only the downtown bowl area, your Committee has reached the following conclusions and makes the following recommendations with respect to housing for students and other young people in that area of Portland:

### A. EMPLOYED YOUNG WOMEN AND YOUNG MEN

#### Conclusions

1. **Young women:** Any need for additional supervised housing for young working women can be provided fully by some expansion of present facilities. Organizations involved in providing supervised housing are in the best position to determine the manner and extent to which this should be done.

2. **Young men:** There seems to be little if any problem respecting young working men; the YMCA and other facilities have adequate space available for present needs.

#### Recommendation

Your Committee recommends that the YWCA study the feasibility of its providing more housing for young working women.

<sup>(5)</sup> Authorized by Art. XI F(1) of the State of Oregon Constitution, and ORS 351.160 (1).

## **B. STUDENTS AND TRAINEES, GENERALLY**

### **Conclusion**

There is a need for all educational and training institutions in the downtown bowl area, including PSC, to make a concentrated effort to provide lists of recommended housing for their students. Your Committee believes that PSC especially has an obligation to the student to seek out, assess and list available suitable housing, as well as to determine the extent of needs and desires of married students for adequate, economically feasible housing. There is need for better coordination between all institutions whose enrollees need housing and those agencies that provide housing.

### **Recommendation**

Your Committee recommends that all educational and training institutions in the downtown bowl which attract young adults and minors to Portland make every effort to assist their enrollees with their housing problems by having available a list of inspected and approved private housing, including supervised housing for those who desire it.

## **C. ADDITIONAL STUDENT HOUSING AND ITS FINANCING**

### **Conclusions**

1. The original concept on which PSC was established as a non-domiciliary institution has been outgrown in many important respects.

2. There is an urgent need for housing at PSC and several financing methods are available if the college wishes to use them. Private investors, if properly encouraged, might build good student housing within financial reach of many PSC students and the students of other training institutions in the area. It is also possible that, if they are convinced of the need and properly encouraged, some non-profit organization such as a church, a social group, a fraternal organization, or a foundation might develop satisfactory housing facilities through federal programs available to them. It appears to your Committee that PSC, however, is in the best position to provide low-cost housing for its students through the state bonding program.

Serious as it may now appear, the present housing problem is minor compared with the problems which will exist in the future if the annual increase in student enrollment continues and this increasingly large number of students is concentrated in the immediate area surrounding PSC where facilities are already inadequate. This problem will become even more serious under the impact of the recently enacted "Cold War G.I. Bill".

3. In light of PSC's present and projected growth and the unique nature of many of its academic offerings, it appears to your Committee to be inconsistent to provide housing for students at all other state institutions of higher education and not to provide housing for that portion of PSC students needing it. Some of them are enrolled in special courses not elsewhere available.

4. The Oregon State Board of Higher Education appears to have construed the statutory limitation on its authority as precluding the provision of dormitories at Portland State College. While the Committee is not convinced that the Board's authority is so limited, it might be desirable to secure an opinion from the Attorney General as to whether the Board can legally build student housing at Portland State College.

### **Recommendation**

Your Committee recommends that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education seek to provide student housing at Portland State College and that it investigate the means to finance appropriate student housing, including state bonds for dormitories, federal loans, increased private investments, or nonprofit sponsorship to cope with the present need and prepare for the obvious future increase in housing needs. If the Board determines that it cannot legally provide such housing under present enabling legislation, recourse should be had to the 1967 Legislature to grant such authority.

**D. CITY HOUSING INSPECTION****Conclusions**

1. The City of Portland Bureau of Buildings needs to locate all building permits issued under the relaxation of building codes and zoning rules during World War II, and put an equitable time limit upon their conforming to current standards.

2. The Bureau of Buildings needs to expand its building inspection program either by having additional inspectors or by reassigning men, or by both, to inspect conditions in areas where housing may be a hazard to health or safety.

**Recommendation**

Your Committee recommends that the City of Portland Bureau of Buildings examine—through a bolstered inspection staff—the housing facilities available to students in the downtown bowl, so as to ascertain the extent to which conditions adversely affect the students' health and welfare. It further recommends that the Bureau, after checking the relaxing agreements made during World War II and the existing violations of wartime variance from the housing code or the building code, set a time limit for property owners to comply with current codes.

Respectfully submitted,

Garry Bullard  
A. N. Davidson  
Richard M. Gray  
Tom Dargan  
Kenneth Lewis  
William B. Cate, *Chairman*

Approved April 26, 1966 by the Research Board for transmittal to the Board of Governors.

Received by the Board of Governors May 16, 1966 and ordered printed and submitted to the membership for presentation and action.



## APPENDIX I

### Summary of Responses from Training and Educational Institutions (Portland Metropolitan Area)

Number of institutions to which questionnaires were sent .....	56
Responses received .....	28
Number of institutions indicating a need for supervised housing for minor and single students .....	13
Number of these institutions that are not in the downtown bowl .....	0
Number of minor and single students not living at home, enrolled in training and educational institutions in downtown bowl .....	1,372
Business and vocational and technical schools .....	425
Portland State College .....	947

**APPENDIX II**

**Summary of Responses  
from  
PSC Minor Students Not Living at Home**

Questionnaires sent: 200

Responses received: 92

Men: 67

Women: 25

Question		Men	Women	Total
1. Should student housing be provided near the campus for Portland State College students?	Yes	60	24	84
	No	14	1	15
If yes answer given, which type of housing is preferred?				
a. Dormitory		27	10	37
b. Apartment		43	16	59
2. If such housing were available—and if you could afford it—would you be interested in living there?	Yes	50	20	70
	No	15	5	20
3. Do you think a student housing facility should provide for meals as well as room?	Yes	49	18	67
	No	11	6	17
4. Which meals?				
a. Breakfast		42	15	57
b. Lunch		21	9	30
c. Dinner		47	17	64
5. How much could you afford to pay per month for room alone?				
a. \$30		25	6	31
b. \$40		24	12	36
c. \$50		8	4	12
d. Other		6	3	9
6. How much could you afford to pay per month for meals alone?				
a. \$30		26	14	40
b. \$40		23	9	32
c. \$50		6	1	7
d. Other		5	2	7
7. What type of living accommodations do you now have?				
a. Men's or Women's Residence Apartment		2	1	3
b. Apartment		16	10	26
c. Boarding House		2	4	6
d. Room in Home		18	5	23
e. Other		18	2	20
8. What class are you in?				
a. Freshman		13	6	19
b. Sophomore		10	7	17
c. Junior		13	5	18
d. Senior		26	6	32
e. Graduate Student		1	0	1
9. Where do your parents reside?				
a. Portland		13	7	20
b. Suburban Portland		15	4	19
c. Outside Portland		34	13	47

**APPENDIX III**

**Summary of Responses  
from  
Parents of Minor PSC Students Not Living At Home**

Questionnaires sent: ..... 200  
 Responses received: ..... 63  
 Parents of sons: 36  
 Parents of daughters: 22

<b>Question</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>						
1. Do you feel your son or daughter should live in supervised housing when away from home at college? *Freshman year: 5 First two years: 4	47*	16						
2. Do you feel the college should assume responsibility for housing of students?	39	20						
3. Do you feel there is a greater need for supervised housing for women than there is for men? *Note above proportion of responses from parents of sons to parents of daughters.	30*	27						
4. If your son/daughter has lived in unsupervised housing, have there been any undesirable conditions? *If yes: a. Bad effect on studies 1 b. Malnutrition 7 c. Unsuitable living quarters 1 d. Unregulated life 6 e. Bad associations 2	19*	26						
5. If supervised housing were provided, would you use your parental control to make sure your son/daughter utilized it?	40	14						
6. Have you or your spouse attended college?	29	30						
7. If supervised housing were provided, what price range for housing could you afford for your son/daughter?								
	<b>\$30</b>	<b>\$40</b>	<b>\$50</b>	<b>\$60</b>	<b>\$70</b>	<b>\$80</b>	<b>\$90</b>	<b>\$100</b>
Room	1	6	6	4	2	2		
Room and Board		1	4	7	6	19	5	5
8. What portion of support do you provide for your son's/daughter's education?								
Entire		13						
One-half		18						
One-fourth		7						
Some		2						
None		10						

**APPENDIX IV**  
**Summary of Responses**  
**from**  
**Young Single Working Women<sup>(1)</sup>**

Several questionnaires each were sent to personnel directors of 64 representative firms, businesses and industries in the Portland Metropolitan Area.  
 Individual Responses Received: 103

Age group represented: <sup>(1)</sup>	18/20	21/25	26/30	31/35	36/40	41/50	over 50	"over 21"		
	16	33	18	8	11	10	1	1		
Present living quarters:	Total Responding	Number paying rent in varying categories:								
		\$20+	\$30+	\$40+	\$50+	\$60+	\$70+	\$80+	\$90+	\$100
a) at home	29			2	1	1				
b) Apartment	63		4	12	9	14	7	9	3	5
c) Room	2		1					1		
d) House (rent)	3			2		1				
e) Hotel	1					1				
f) Trailer House	1	1								
What is the top rental you could pay?	Under \$50	\$50-70	\$70-80	\$80-90	\$90-100	\$100-110	\$110-135			
	38	1	9	8	8	8	2	2		
Do you share facilities with others?	With one person?		Two?	Three?	Four?					
Yes	40	23	10	6	1					
No	35									
Note: One rents with four others; one shares with her two daughters <sup>(1)</sup>										
Would you object to having men live in the same building, on a completely separate basis except for eating and social rooms?	Yes	No								
	8	89 <sup>(2)</sup>								
In what area of the Portland community do you:	Work?	Live?								
Northwest	7	12								
Northeast	4	25								
Southwest	14	29								
Southeast	5	24								
North	—	2								
Suburban	15	7*								
Downtown Core Area	54	—								
*Includes 1 in Milwaukie and 1 in Washington										

**General Comments:**

The responses indicated very little feeling of inadequacy of present accommodations. Most women listed many good features and only a few bad features. Some of the bad features included: distance from bus or poor bus service; no rugs or no drapes; leaky faucets; no garage; poor parking; proximity to neighbor; lack of privacy; lack of storage space, and one mentioned lack of social contacts. It must be stressed, however, that most responses did not indicate bad features.

Persons living at home emphasized low cost and the importance of family or close acquaintances. Almost all who lived at home shared accommodations with others.

Those who did not live at home stressed such good features as: independence, closeness to shopping and transportation, laundry facilities, location, view, luxury items such as swimming pool, privacy and lack of restrictions. Those who enjoyed the lack of restrictions did not seem to object to building guards or other protection methods.

One reply seemed to be a composite of the general remarks received: "I would desire cooking and laundry facilities, location near bus, store and church, with rent below \$..... per month, good light, parking facilities, good appliances." This person also said she felt there was no need for "Junior Citizen" low-cost apartments such as those developed for "Senior Citizens".

(1) It is obvious from some of the answers that the women filling out the questionnaires were not all in the "junior" classification and some had not always been single.

(2) One young lady replied, "What a silly question!"

## APPENDIX V

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Experimental Educational Advising in Men's Residence Hall", Daryl L. Sander, *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, April 1, 1964, Volume XLII, No. 8, p. 787.
- "Housing of Foreign Students—An Educational Experience?", Mabell G. McCullough and Joseph A. Mestenhouser, *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, October, 1963, Volume V, No. 1, p. 2.
- "Special Housing for Athletes—Banc or Benefit?", Donald Loucks, *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, October, 1963, Volume V, No. 1, p. 40.
- "Do Head Residents Advance Student Development?", Earl A. Koile and Lou Dora Halp, *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, December, 1962, Volume IV, No. 2, p. 90.
- "Evaluating Residence Halls through Trifocals", Ellen Fairchild, *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, March, 1963, Volume IV, No. 3, p. 171.
- "College Housing", *Bulletin of the American Institute of Architects*, Sept.-October, 1956, Vol. 10, No. 5.
- "Planning Functions; College Housing", Harold C. Riker, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956, p. 178.
- "College Students Residence and Academic Achievement", Ralph E. Prusok and N. Bruce Walsh, *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, March, 1964, Volume V, No. 3, p. 180.
- "Re-Examination of Closing Hours for College Women", T. Roger Nudd, *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, March, 1964, Volume V, No. 3, p. 170.
- "Freedom and Authority on the Campus", Harold Taylor, *The American College*, New York, 1962, John Wiley.
- "Academic Influence in Student Housing: Theory and Practice", Daniel A. Ferber, *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, October, 1962, Vol. IV, No. 1, p. 2.
- "Residence Halls and the Higher Learning", W. Max Wise, *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, February, 1958, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 398-401.
- "The History of Student Residential Housing", W. H. Cowley, *Schools and Society*, No. 1040, December 1, 1934, Vol. 40.
- "Housing of Students", Robert M. Strozier, *American Council on Educational Studies*, Washington, D. C., 1950, Series VI, No. 14.
- "Storage for Students", *Architectural Forum*, December, 1961.
- "New Urban Pattern: Married Student Housing Yale University", M. Burchard, *Architectural Forum*, March, 1962.