

grams, training programs—and would facilitate financially the use of these programs by localities by the supplementary grant as proposed.

Mr. FINO. What is the total funding you are suggesting or proposing for the various housing bills before this committee?

Mr. KEITH. Well, as far as housing is concerned, Mr. Chairman, while we see over the long run a need for substantial increases in Federal financial assistance for housing programs to serve low and moderate income families, at this particular moment in time we do not see any imperative need for an increase in those programs at this time. There will be a need over the years, without question.

The real limitation, as we see it, that exists in the funding of existing programs—the most important and crucial limitation—is the limitation on urban renewal contract capital grant funds. In that respect, what we are recommending for this committee's consideration is either to include in the legislation an increase in the urban renewal contract authority, an increase that we suggest will be needed at the rate of \$1 billion a year for 3 years, or if that is not feasible, we recommend that the urban renewal authorization already passed by Congress last year, in the 1965 act, be made available as needed, without a limitation as to fiscal years, which at the current rate of demand in our opinion is found to slow up the whole rate of progress in urban renewal.

Mr. FINO. Would you care to give us a figure of how much you think?

Mr. KEITH. Well, as far as urban renewal is concerned, if our basic suggestion would be followed, this would make available an additional \$3 billion for urban renewal. Our alternative selection—our alternative recommendation would not involve any increase in the amount of funds already authorized by Congress for urban renewal, but would make them available without an arbitrary limitation as to fiscal year.

I think it also should be pointed out that either one of those actions would have a very minimal impact on the actual budgetary expenditures of the Federal Government for the next few years, because of the long leadtime that is inevitably involved in urban renewal undertakings between the date that funds are committed or earmarked and the date when the projects are actually being carried out and the Federal funds are expended.

The experience has been there is a leadtime in almost all cases of at least 3 years before any Federal expenditures are made under an urban renewal contract with a locality for a particular project, and those expenditures then will typically be spread out over a period of anywhere from 4 to 6 years. The release of Federal funds already authorized by the Congress for commitments to needed urban renewal projects can be made without any increase in the funds already authorized by Congress, and with practically no impact on the actual Federal budget for the next several years.

Mr. FINO. Well, Mr. Keith, do you realize that out of the over \$7 billion authorized for urban renewal, only \$1.5 billion has been actually paid out in these 16 years that the program has been in operation; that we are running \$4 billion behind in our commitment; that