

Section 807 extends the requirements of Sections 802 and 803 covering payments and advisory assistance to federally assisted programs conducted by State and local governments. Section 805(c) carries out the Commission recommendation that the Executive Branch encourage Federal agencies causing displacement in urban areas to establish in each major urban jurisdiction a focal point of responsibility for relocation administration; it provides that the President may require any Federal agency to make relocation payments or provide other relocation services by entering into contracts or agreements with any State or local agency for use of its relocation facilities, personnel, and services.

Section 807(a)(4) carries out the ACIR recommendation that Congress apply to all federally aided programs a requirement as strict as that in the urban renewal and public housing programs that States and local governments administering Federal grant programs assure the availability of standard housing before proceeding with any property acquisition that displaces people. The language here is comparable to that presently contained in Federal urban renewal legislation. Section 807(b) provides that the Federal Government fully reimburse State and local governments for relocation payments up to \$25,000 in federally aided programs and on a formula cost-sharing basis for any portion above \$25,000 per displacement. The Federal reimbursement would be contingent on the State or local agency's agreeing to provide relocation payments and advisory assistance as prescribed by Federal law and regulation. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and the administrative practices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, covering such programs as urban renewal, public housing, mass transit, community facilities, and open space, along with the relocation provisions of the Model Cities legislation, now utilize the cost-sharing formula for relocation payments up to and above \$25,000 as provided in this title. This title, then, merely extends these standards to other Federal grant-in-aid programs.

The various provisions of Title VIII constitute a meaningful answer to those who call for a more uniform, fair, and equitable treatment of owners, tenants and others displaced by the government's acquisition of real property. Equally important, they will not necessitate huge outlays of Federal dollars. Based on the annual displacement figures cited earlier, the total cost would come to approximately \$136 million annually or only \$63 million more than the relocation payments authorized under present legislation—a small price to pay for the benefits of this title.

Like other provisions of S. 698, this relocation title is a good management measure. It clarifies a confusing condition, simplifies the administration of existing relocation programs, and promulgates rules that can be easily applied. Equally important, it humanizes government at a stage when it appears most cold and calculating.

Title IX which establishes a uniform land acquisition policy for Federal and federally assisted programs is a new feature in the legislation, and the Commission has not yet had an opportunity to develop a formal position on the subject.

S. 698 is designed to correct obvious weaknesses in our federal system and to round out our national policies as they relate to regional and local planning, urban development, and relocation. The legislation seeks these objectives, because the largest unit of government in our federal system has a prime responsibility for assisting and strengthening the smaller units and for instituting needed reforms in the area of intergovernmental administration.

Simplified and more flexible administration of Federal grants to the States, strengthening the traditional services-in-aid device, promulgation of a coordinated intergovernmental urban assistance policy, systematic review by Congress of new federal grant programs, establishment of a uniform GSA policy and procedure for urban land transactions and use, and provision for a uniform relocation assistance policy—these are among the critical concerns of this legislation. These implement concrete recommendations of the Advisory Commission. When viewed separately, each appears to be a modest attempt to cope with some of the difficulties facing us in certain conflict areas. But when combined, as they are in this omnibus bill, they constitute a meaningful move towards achieving greater productivity and rationality in intergovernmental relationships, better administrative use of Federal grants-in-aid, more meaningful metropolitan and local planning, and a more equitable relocation program.

These are basic needs that must be met now if the vitality of our federal system is to be sustained. These are goals that have been endorsed by the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the Council of State Governments, U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Governors' Conference, and the