

available for *all* public displacement. Daily, they encounter situations of "unequal treatment" because families are displaced by different public programs and receive different levels of assistance. It is difficult to explain to a displaced family why it must receive fewer benefits because the public program causing the displacement is different. We commend the sponsors of this bill in seeking to end this unfair treatment.

Mr. Chairman, we are at a new stage in the evolution of knowledge and experience about the impact and approach to relocation—because of the leadership role in the urban renewal program since 1949. NAHRO is in the process of studying and evaluating this experience, with the view of presenting detailed recommendations to the Congress and to the Administration on changes and adjustments which should be made in relocation policy and administration to meet relocation needs as we see them at the local level. In our study effort, we will shortly complete a four-year study aimed at estimating the impact of relocation on the elderly, in cooperation with the University of Pennsylvania. We will also shortly complete two additional studies—one on the 10-year relocation experience in New Haven, Connecticut and another, a survey of current centralized relocation operations in 11 cities. A full listing of these study reports is attached to our testimony and we request that it be included in the record. In addition to our study effort, we are convening a workshop of relocation practitioners from throughout the nation in Washington at the end of this week (May 16–17) to provide an opportunity to assemble their cumulative advice and counsel on the present status of relocation practice and ways to improve it.

Pending completion and evaluation of these studies and meetings, we would like to respond to the specific provisions of title VIII from the viewpoint of our present experience. At the same time, we request that if any additional recommendations on title VIII should result from the May 16–17 meeting of relocation personnel, we may file them for the record before the close of the hearings.

NAHRO would also like to make very clear that it strongly supports the move toward a uniform relocation system, and we would not want any of the specific recommendations which follow to detract from this central goal.

Here are our specific recommendations on title VIII.

Section 802(c) (3) and 807(a) (2)

We do not believe that under item (3) of section 802(c), providing an additional payment of \$300 if the displaced person purchases a dwelling within one year after displacement, is adequate. We favor a provision that any displaced homeowner who cannot afford to purchase comparable housing in a new location (utilizing the sale price from his property as a down payment and spending 20 percent of his income for housing) be eligible to receive a flat additional payment to supplement his down payment and bring monthly housing costs within his reach. In consideration of this additional grant, the public agency would hold a lien on his property payable when the ownership of the property is transferred. More details on this amendment are attached to this testimony.

We further propose that any displaced renter household wishing to purchase a home be given special priority treatment under the home ownership assistance programs of the Federal government.

Under our comments on title IX, we have a further suggestion about compensation to home owners displaced by public action—a concept based on "hardship," rather than "market value."

Section 805(a) (2) (B) and 807(a) (1)

The moving expense allowance provided under this section does not provide for *direct loss of property* by either an individual family or a business. We believe that such a loss should be compensated as is now provided under Section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949.

Section 802(c) and 807(a) (2)

We do not favor the continuation of the relocation adjustment payment (RAP) as it is currently constituted under the Housing Act, or as it is contained under title VIII of this pending bill. Nor, do we believe that the dislocation allowance up to \$100, as provided under section 802(c) (2) is adequate. Our experience with the RAP in practice is that it is administratively cumbersome and that it is inequitable. As an indication of the experience with RAP payment, we would like to file for the Record an article from the *Journal of Housing* (JOH No. 10,