

TABLE 1.—*Level of operations or performance, fiscal years 1964-67*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Measure	Fiscal year 1964 actual	Fiscal year 1965 actual	Fiscal year 1966 estimated	Fiscal year 1967 estimated
(a) Magnitude of the program:				
Families displaced during year.....	18,232	18,061	25,000	25,000
Individuals displaced during year.....	10,489	9,780	12,000	12,000
Business concerns displaced during year.....	5,836	6,983	6,000	6,000
Relocation payments made in year.....	\$10.3	\$14.5	\$45	\$45
(b) Applicants or participants: ¹ Urban renewal projects with relocation activity underway.....	418	520	660	795
(c) Federal finances ²	-----	-----	-----	-----
(d) Matching or additional expenditures ³	-----	-----	-----	-----
(e) Number of Federal Government employees ⁴	-----	-----	-----	-----
(f) Non-Federal personnel ⁵	-----	-----	-----	-----

¹ There may be more than 1 project in a locality with relocation activity.² Relocation activities are financed as an integral part of the carrying out of urban renewal projects.³ Local staff expenses for administering relocation activities are included as a part of project costs. [¶] All most all relocation payments are covered by 100 percent Federal grant coming from the overall Federal grant authorization for urban renewal projects. Business relocation payments in excess of \$25,000 each are shared by the locality, but the matching expenditures are very limited.⁴ Federal employment for relocation is part of overall employment for urban renewal projects. No separate breakdown available.⁵ Estimates not available.

5. *Estimated magnitude of program in 1970*

Relocation activities are directly tied into the operations of the urban renewal program for which authorizations of funds extend only to 1969. With the continued increased trend of population concentration in the urban areas of the United States, we can see no reason for any reduction in the need for urban renewal in 1970.

6. *Prospective changes in program orientation*

(a) *Pending legislative proposals.*—The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations has conducted hearings on two bills, S. 1201 and S. 1681 which would establish uniform requirements and procedures with respect to persons and businesses displaced under all Federal and federally assisted programs. The substance of the relocation provisions of these bills grows largely out of the urban renewal experience with relocation and is concerned with extending this approach to other Federal programs. The only major change from present urban renewal approach would be to make some changes in the nature and size of relocation payments.

(b) *Proposed administrative and organizational changes.*—The Urban Renewal Administration has been incorporated as a part of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. Other than this, there are no announced organizational or administrative changes pending.

(c) *Probable changes in the conditions under which the program will function in 1970, e.g., technological, economic, or social.*—At this time there are no estimates of possible impacts of changing technological, economic or social conditions on the operations of the urban renewal program.

7. *Coordination and cooperation*

(a) *Within your bureau, division, or office.*—Coordination is achieved through normal administrative channels.

(b) *With other units of your department or agency.*—There is a very close interlocking of urban renewal relocation activities with the