

17 and 18 and renumbering subsections (1)-(5) to subsections (9)-(13) of section 4(b).

The next recommendation is the most important.

5. As a condition of receiving demonstration cities or urban renewal funds those relocated should be relocated to a suitable living environment. Our various suggestions on relocation also encompass changes in the requirement of the workable program. The relocation standards required in section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 are insufficient.

Mr. BARRETT. You say on 4 that "We believe that the comprehensive city demonstration should be included as one of the criteria for funding sections"—so forth and so forth. You submit a deletion on page 5 of lines, you said 17.

Mr. DAVIDOFF. 17 and 18. Yes, I am making the change because it is subsection (c) that we are deleting, that should be changed so that subsections (1) through (5) following that are continued after subsection (8) of section 4(b).

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you.

Mr. DAVIDOFF. We say that a system should be established whereby the Federal coordinator, or the regional HUD office, would be able to effectively inspect and verify that those relocated for any purpose are relocated to a suitable living environment. This applies to all relocating caused by federally sponsored programs. And we believe that this can be accomplished by the simple change, though not simple in its administration, to see that the person who is relocated is relocated in a decent neighborhood. And we will have more to say about that later.

6. Persons should not be relocated to areas which are planned for condemnation within 5 years. Part of the culture and psychology of poverty is that a citizen is often relocated to a dwelling that will be torn down shortly after he gets settled in it. This guarantees moving families and individuals from one slum to another. Where a community has already planned to tear down an area it is both unfair and expensive to relocate persons into this area. And it is this practice as well which has led to much of the objection by many to the way the urban renewal program has been practiced.

7. Those relocated should be permitted greater compensation than they now currently receive. Too often those relocated, usually low-income families, pay higher rents than before relocation, but their incomes are not correspondingly increased. Compensation, with adequate controls, should include payment of full rent differential and include compensation for the purchase of furniture.

8. Those relocated should not be relocated to the census tract where the median income is in the lowest quantile of the city's population. Low-income housing too often means slums and relocatees should not be placed there. This provision would tend to assure that relocatees are placed in desirable neighborhoods. This would probably be unnecessary if our proposal in regard to relocation in suitable living environment were put into effect.

9. In code enforcement the Housing Act of 1964 clearly demonstrates the congressional intent was that HUD should certify only those workable programs producing effective local code enforcement efforts. The same requirement should apply to the demonstration