

Senator MUSKIE. Are Federal agencies presently assisting the States and localities in developing overall relocation agencies?

Mr. HILL. I am not aware of any activities.

Senator MUSKIE. I am not, either.

Again in recommendation 13 of the conference study, it was proposed that States take up the option of sharing in payments to those displaced by highway and other programs. Could the Conference provide us with up-to-date information as to the degree the States are moving in this direction?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Senator MUSKIE. Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony and your support.

I hope you will convey to the Governor our appreciation for his interest and attention.

Mr. GIBBENS. I will; thank you.

(The material previously referred to follows:)

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1968.

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: In our testimony before your subcommittee on May 10, 1968, on the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, you asked that we supply you with additional information on the degree to which the states are reorganizing their executive departments and strengthening the role of the Governor over his budgeting, planning, and programming so as to take advantage of the many sections proposed in S. 698. In this regard, we are enclosing a "Summary of Reorganization Developments in the States, 1963-67" which was prepared for the Governors' Committee on Constitutional Revision and Governmental Reorganization by the staff of the political science department of the University of Washington. This summary notes the significant reorganization activities in the states in the four year period between 1963-67. In Maine, for example, the Governor appointed in 1967 a Task Force to study the reorganization of the Maine state government. In addition, the Governor, by executive order, directed that all applications for non-state funds be reported both to the Office of the Governor and to the state budget office. These are but two examples in one state of vigorous activity in most states in reorganizing state government.

You also requested that information be furnished to the Subcommittee on state activities in the field of relocation assistance. The states have just begun to assume a significant role in relocation efforts. Governor Hughes of New Jersey in his "The States and Urban Problems" estimated that ten states currently offer relocation payments or services for displacements caused by state activities, including non-federal aid highways. The 1962 Federal Aid Highway Act gave the states the option to share in moving cost payments, and at the end of 1967 approximately half of the states were sharing the costs of these payments. Several states have moved very rapidly. In Connecticut, for example, a law was passed in 1967 (Connecticut, PA 552, law 1967 (Section 24) which authorized state grants-in-aid equal to the cost of relocating individuals, families, and businesses displaced by government action who have not been reimbursed for moving cost in a condemnation proceeding and who are not otherwise reimbursed by the federal government or the state.

In Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Wisconsin general statutes require relocation payments in cases where requirements differ from those in federal renewal programs. In several other states, state law requires relocation efforts be made for specific projects. In Rhode Island payments for displacements arising from reservoir construction are required by state law.

States are beginning to realize their responsibility for coordinating relocation efforts. Massachusetts and New Jersey have both authorized specific departments to oversee the total relocation process. These departments have the responsibility