

renewal is the most comprehensive. The Federal highway program provides no service to businesses and individuals, and only TVA among other Federal programs is required to give any kind of advisory help.

Varying State and local practices lead to still further inequalities in relocation in different parts of the country and even within individual States and communities. Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania contribute to the local share of urban renewal costs, including the cost of relocation administration. Relocation expenses, however, are 100 percent federally financed. In New York, the State reviews local urban renewal relocation plans and performance in determining eligibility for State contributions to urban renewal. A few States also provide technical assistance for local renewal programs, including assistance in techniques of relocation. Several States have general statutes requiring relocation payments to people and businesses displaced by any property takings by State or local authorities: among them are Maryland, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Tennessee. A few other States have established study commissions to review eminent domain procedures; the work of these commissions may well lead to additional comprehensive State legislation affecting relocation payments and procedures.

At the local level, about half the cities that reported displacements for public buildings in response to the ACIR-CM survey paid moving expenses for both families and businesses. Almost all offer relocation advisory service to people and businesses displaced for public buildings. Fewer localities offer relocation aid to people displaced by code enforcement. Only 5 of the 69 cities reporting code enforcement displacement in the ACIR-CM survey paid for moving expenses and property losses. Many more provide some form of advisory assistance.

Cities in the ACIR-CM survey were asked their views on the desirability of uniformity. A typical response was: "The reason for uniform practices in relocation payment and service among agencies of all three levels of government seems readily apparent." Of the 100 cities responding, 86 answered this question:

\* \* \* 71 favored uniform practices in relocation payments and services among *all local agencies*.

\* \* \* 70 favored uniformity among *all State agencies* causing displacement.

\* \* \* 74 favored uniformity among *all Federal agencies* causing displacement.

\* \* \* 72 favored uniformity among agencies of *all three levels of government* causing displacement.

Adding emphasis to these opinions, a substantial number of cities mentioned "uniformity" when asked what actions, at each of the levels, would contribute to more effective resolution of their relocation problems. A number described the impact of nonuniformity on citizens forced to move. Chicago commented, for example:

Families on one side of a street may be displaced by urban renewal and obtain numerous services, whereas families on the other side of the same street may be displaced by an expressway and receive relatively few services. In the one case a relocation payment is processed; in the other there is no relocation payment.