



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
August 3, 1967

In Reply, Please Refer to
File No.

RACIAL INCIDENT
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA
AUGUST 2, 1967

Lt. Clark Tomer, Pittsburgh, Pa., Police Department, advised on August 2, 1967, that on August 2, 1967, Pittsburgh Police Department Detectives John Mook and William Sievers arrested Edward Smith, Negro male, 319 Roberts Street, Pittsburgh, for numbers violation. The arrest was made with a search warrant. Smith broke away from arresting officers and was chased and caught by Detective Mook. After a struggle, Smith was placed in a police car.

A crowd of about two hundred Negroes gathered during arrest, and arresting officers radioed for additional help. Before the arrival of help, bottles were thrown at police car, which was hit twice, and a door hinge was broken on the police car by the crowd while trying to pull the police officers from the car.

After the arrival of additional police officers, Booker Dixon, Negro male, 2527 Aliquippa Street, and Ronald Scott, Negro male, 120 Bonifay Street, both Pittsburgh, were arrested and the crowd was dispersed. Dixon and Scott were both arrested for disorderly conduct, assault and battery, interfering with a police officer, inciting to riot, and resisting arrest.

Lt. Tomer advised that Smith was released by the Pittsburgh Police Department when no numbers slips were found in his possession. Dixon and Scott were both held.

Lt. Tomer subsequently advised on August 2, 1967, that no further incidents occurred at Pittsburgh during August 2, 1967.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

This confirms information furnished orally to Mr. _____, Criminal Division, on _____.

Attached are excerpts
from an OEO evaluation of
The Pittsburgh Community
Action Program. The entire evaluation,
approximately 40 pages long, is
available through George Frank.

PITTSBURG
Summary

Source: OEO
date: Feb. 1967

SOURCE: 1960 U. S. CENSUS

Pittsburg provides an excellent example of a Community Action Program in which a focus on delivery of services and institutional change has laid the groundwork for increased participation of the poor. As a result, the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources (MCHR), with some urging from the Regional Office, has shown a willingness to stress community organization more now that its basic programs are established.

Although a private nonprofit community action agency, MCHR, is closely related to the Mayor's office. The Mayor is president of the Board and his special assistant is deeply involved in the work of the CAA. Moreover, all programs have been delegated as a result of these factors, coordination with city departments and local agencies, in general, has been excellent. These organizations have been particularly receptive to re-directing their programs toward the deprived population.

Despite the lack of involvement of the poor in the past, MCHR has been particularly effective in organizing the neighborhood for community action. The Neighborhood Citizen's Committees, which are the basic policy-making groups for the neighborhood centers, are open to all residents which has resulted in a heavy emphasis in representation of the nonpoor. MCHR now requires that these groups meet the one-third OEO standard. In spite of previous underrepresentation of the poor, the Citizen's Committees have been extremely active and have generally acted in the interest of the poor.

Complete decentralization of the CAA programs through delegate agencies has resulted in a weakness in central staff direction. This inadequacy is particularly noticeable in the area of planning and evaluation. In part, the problem is a consequence of a very small central staff.

Despite a service approach, MCHR has not developed an adequate manpower program, particularly with respect to adults. There has been a heavy emphasis on compensatory education, largely determined by programs developed before the OEO Act was passed. Plans are underway to drastically reduce compensatory education and to place more stress on manpower as well as neighborhood organization.

Pittsburg is a community which has brought about considerable institutional change and developed a solid basis to complete the community action framework. The planned increased emphasis on manpower and neighborhood organization plus greater participation of the poor in the decision-making process if successful could make the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources a more productive Community Action Agency.

PITTSBURGH DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

26

Pittsburgh - a city of 555,300 persons with 150,000 poor (27%) - was among the first 10 cities to receive grants from OEO and the first city to be refunded. Planning for an anti-poverty program began almost a year before the Economic Opportunity Act became law, under a group selected by Mayor Joseph M. Barr. The group became the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc. (MCHR), a private, non-profit community action agency formed on November 12, 1964 and receiving an initial OEO grant of \$1,518,146. To date \$17 million has been granted to Pittsburgh for over 45 programs.

The Mayor's Committee is closely related to the Mayor's Office. The Mayor is president of the Board of Directors, and his special assistant has been deeply involved in the work of the CAA.

The Mayor's Committee has had as its two principal goals institutional change and involvement of the poor. Real participation of the poor proceeded slowly at first, with stress being on institutional change and delivery of services. Neighborhood and resident organization has now become MCHR's greatest priority, however, and will be stressed in the budget beginning July 1, 1967.

The Board of Directors of 22 members includes 10 representatives of the poor, of whom 8 are poor target area representatives themselves. Representatives of the poor also sit on the Advisory Council and its subcommittees. The poor have less prestige and influence in these groups than the non-poor. In the past their role in the very active

SOURCE: 1960 U. S. CENSUS

PITTSBURGH DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

and effective Neighborhood Citizens Committees has also been weak, but in compliance with the 1966 amendment, MCHR is now requiring 1/3 of the membership of these groups to be representatives of the poor. Participation of the poor did take place in last summer's Head Start program and caused the Inspection team to state that "Low-income people are actually involved at all levels of the project from planning to actual execution."

The Mayor's Committee has delegated its programs to other agencies except for the 6.2% of funds which have gone to central administration. The central staff of about 30 persons is too small and not completely effective. Centralized data collection and evaluation is extremely insufficient at present and existing efforts are poor in quality. More sophisticated plans have been made, including a RAPA system.

Much of the administration takes place at the neighborhood level. A neighborhood Coordination and Development component, run by a delegate agency in each of the 8 target areas, consists of a center with an Area Coordinator and professional and non-professional staff who together with the Citizens Committees have considerable authority to govern and coordinate all OEO programs in their area as well as to aid in planning and evaluation. Some programs are offered in all 8 neighborhoods; others, in only one or a few. More direction is needed from the central staff, as well as clarification of the Coordinators' roles. In spite of some confusion between the neighborhood and central administrative units, neighborhood groups have taken initiative when the occasion demands, notably in the creation of a Health Advisory Council for all target areas, which has become an effective coordinating mechanism.

SOURCE: 1960 U. S. CENSUS

PITTSBURGH DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

In addition to NYC youth, 425 nonprofessionals are employed in programs operated under the Mayor's Committee, working with 720 professionals. The nonprofessionals are utilized to varying extent in 13 programs, with the most used in Compensatory Education, Health Services, and the Homemaker program. A major weakness, noted in the Yankelevitch study of the nonprofessionals in Pittsburgh, is the absence of provisions for upgrading.

There is fairly good cross-referral among most of the CAP component programs. The Family Services program has been particularly effective in providing casework aid to participants in other OEO programs. Administratively there is apparently little connection between the CAA and other poverty programs such as Adult Basic Education, Work Experience, or even NYC. However, NYC youth have been closely involved in CAP activities through working in the neighborhood centers and in summer Head Start classes. Coordination among manpower programs is particularly deficient.

Coordination with city departments and local agencies has in general been excellent. Most of the major agencies are represented either on the governing board or advisory board or as one of the delegate agencies. There has been no political pressure or hostilities. About 20 interagency staff meetings are held each month throughout the target areas. Furthermore, the agencies have cooperated in planning for future programs, such as demonstration cities projects. A major defect has been the lack of a good city-wide data system.

The program mix was largely determined by the original programs developed before the Act was passed. The delegate agencies are excellent, but the programs have not been very innovative, and the mixture of them has been haphazard. Programs of Individual Improvement (Educa-

tion and Head Start) have accounted for 46% of the total OEO funds going to Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh's future program has now been modified to comply more with OEO priorities. Compensatory education will be drastically reduced, low-priority programs will be funded by other agencies or dropped, and more stress will be placed on neighborhood organization and manpower.

The percentage of the total universe being served is unknown, due to faulty data collection and lack of information on the number of participants who are poor. This information will be available in a few months; in the meantime, one can only say that poverty criteria have not been stressed or strictly applied.

A special census study in the poorest target area showed that 4 out of 10 families below poverty and 3 out of 10 above had had some contact with an OEO-supported program or service.

Overall, the 8 target areas contained in 1960, 16,714 poor families or 27% of the total families in the target areas and 60% of the total poor families in Pittsburgh. Every census tract in which median income was less than \$4,000 in 1960 lies within a target area.

→ Coverage by the major programs for all 8 target areas is as follows

*(see Appendix C for Chart):

1. Employment

Programs have been successful in placing youths in training and jobs, but have done little for adults. There is little or no follow-up on individuals, and CAP Employment Centers offer mostly a referral program rather than comprehensive manpower.

*Percentages are distorted to the extent that participants are not all poor.