

ments and assistance available for Federal and federally aided programs. Urban renewal and public housing have gone further than any other programs in making Federal funds available to compensate people for the costs of relocation, and in requiring local governments using the program to help displaced families, individuals, and businesses find new quarters at prices they can afford. Relocating people in sound housing is a particularly appropriate concern in the case of urban renewal, since a major statutory goal of the Federal program is the "realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."³⁰

The Federal aid highway program, the second major source of displacement, provides considerably less assurance that displaced individuals and families will be spared hardship and will be "made whole." Unlike urban renewal, no assurance is required of responsible public officials to show that there is a "feasible method" of relocating families and individuals and an adequate supply of standard housing available or being made available and within their means. An advisory service is required, but it applies only to families, not individuals and businesses, and is far short of the requirement of the Housing Act for a positive relocation assistance program, applicable to all three categories of displacees. Relocation payments are authorized, not required, with the result that in 17 States displacees are not entitled to payments under the Federal act, including such urbanized States as California, Illinois, and Texas. Payments to businesses are limited to a maximum of \$3,000 for expenses of moving up to 50 miles and may not include payment for direct loss of personal property. Finally, the cost of administering the relocation program qualifies for reimbursement by the Federal Government as part of the project cost, that is 90 percent for interstate highways and 50 percent for primary-secondary highways.

The many inconsistencies in relocation aid lead to unequal treatment for people in urban areas where different Federal and Federal grant-in-aid programs displace neighboring properties. A homeowner whose property is taken for a federally aided urban renewal project is entitled to moving costs up to \$200. His neighbor, whose property is taken for a federally aided highway program, is entitled to \$200 only if the State has authorized it. Among the 33 States that have done so, an appreciable number have not authorized payments up to the Federal limit, or not for tenants. A third homeowner in the same neighborhood may receive nothing beyond market value if his property is taken by the General Services Administration for a Federal office building. Inconsistency in payment of business moving expenses is even greater, since the Federal Aid Highway Act allows business moving expenses only up to \$3,000, while displacement by a federally aided urban renewal project entitles a business owner full cost of moving expenses. Displacement by GSA would be without compensation for moving costs. Advisory assistance extended under Federal urban

³⁰ 42 U.S.C.A. 1441 (Housing Act of 1949).