

before the committee. It seems to me of all the statements we have had, this goes to the heart of the matter.

You have told us some of the problems that arise out of the proposed legislation—the fact that as you say it is inherently discriminatory because of the few towns that would get the benefit out of it.

I notice in the report that you have, the blue pages, which are most interesting—I have not seen any other city submitting anything like this before—you mention 26,615 substandard housing units have been eliminated, in the area since 1950 through urban renewal at a total cost of \$142.5 million, to which local government contributed \$40,800,000 mainly in street, sewer, and other project area improvements.

Now, how many of those contributions given credit to Cincinnati were actually in existence at the time the urban renewal project started?

Mr. BACHRACH. These would be the noncash grants-in-aid.

Mr. WIDNALL. How much of your \$140 million was noncash?

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, in order to answer this specifically, I think we will have to get additional figures, which we will do. I would like to answer it in part in this way: We have had urban renewal bond issues, two of them, one in 1956, and one in 1962 approved by the voters. These are put on the tax levy.

In addition, the council has power, under its own charter and State laws, to issue bonds for public improvements, and has done so, in addition to voted authority to provide funds for urban development purposes.

Over and above this, we have had additional bond issues approved, particularly for streets, sewers, and schools, which have provided the noncash credits which you mentioned.

Mr. WIDNALL. Well, would you submit for the record something that is more accurate than you can remember at this time—a breakdown of your noncash contributions toward these various urban renewal projects?

Mr. BARRETT. That may be done. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The information referred to follows:)

OHIO R-6 AVONDALE I—CORRYVILLE PROJECT

Rehabilitation and new construction as of Mar. 11, 1966

	Number of buildings	Cost
Rehabilitation:		
Completed.....	848	\$2,105,736
Started.....	818	1,039,689
New construction:		
Private, completed.....	39	14,162,500
Public and semipublic, completed.....	10	14,554,300
Private, started.....	8	4,100,871
Public and semipublic, started.....	10	20,961,968

Budget

Original approved budget.—

Project expenditures (Federal cost).....	\$9,721,967
Noncash local grants-in-aid (includes sec. 112).....	8,818,370
Total gross project cost.....	18,540,337