

1967). We would favor the replacement of the relocation adjustment payment as it is currently constituted and the substitution of a flat relocation adjustment payment by size of household (in addition to moving costs) which would be available to all those displaced and which would compensate for all the extra expenses and personal adjustments which result from any move in location. We would recommend also that any displaced family be given priority for any of the housing assistance programs of the federal government; and that his priority be spelled out in the Statute. We further suggest that additional funding be provided for the Section 23 Leasing Program administered by the Housing Assistance Administration to accommodate a supplementation of rents for displaced families in existing housing. We believe that the Section 23 Leasing Program is a much more adequate vehicle for rent assistance than the relocation adjustment payment; and this assistance can continue as long as the housing need continues. The use of the section 23 program might be further enhanced if the lease term was extended from 5 to 10 years, permitting the higher degree of rehabilitation. (Detail on the proposed RAP payment is attached.) We will have additional recommendation relating to the payments for home owners and businessmen displaced by urban renewal or public housing in our comments on title IX.

Title IX.—NAHRO strongly supports a uniform land acquisition policy for all federal and federally-aided programs. We are in general accord with the provisions of this Title. As in the case of relocation, however, we believe there is a need for a complete review of land acquisition experience under federally-aided programs and in particular, the administrative regulations based on the statutory requirements. During the last month, our Association has made a specific recommendation to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development relative to the payment for properties taken from low-income families for urban renewal and public housing. We have recommended that when properties owned by home owners and small businessmen are acquired for urban renewal or public housing, that the top appraisal figure, of the two independently made appraisals required, be given automatically. In many local instances, such a practice is already followed and NAHRO believes it is only equitable that such a practice be extended to cover all such displacement. Since there is some question as to the authority of the Secretary to issue such an administrative regulation, we request that consideration be given to adding such a provision to either title VIII or title IX of S. 698, or indicating approval for such an administrative determination, in the Committee report.

We would also suggest that the subcommittee consider the feasibility of applying nationally a procedure recently adopted by the Maryland legislature which provides for payment of additional compensation, above "fair market" value, for certain owner-occupants of properties acquired by eminent domain. We are attaching to our testimony a copy of this Act of the State of Maryland.

As in the case of our detailed recommendations on title VIII (Uniform Relocation), we hope that these recommendations on title IX (Uniform Land Acquisition), will not be interpreted as detracting from the central goal of achieving uniform policies and procedures in these areas—a goal which we strongly support.

Mr. Chairman, we greatly appreciate the opportunity to present our views to this subcommittee.

EXHIBIT 1

NAHRO TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS OF THE U.S. SENATE, MARCH 12, 1968

NAHRO sees the need for a new concept and mechanism that will make local initiative and responsibility truly possible, and asks for joint deliberations by the Association, the Department of HUD, and the Congress to develop such a new approach. In the meantime, it specifically requests the Congress to reaffirm the principle of local initiative and responsibility.

My full statement is perhaps the most detailed public response NAHRO has ever made to a housing and urban development bill. We are firmly in support of the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

Yet, at the specific direction of the NAHRO Board of Governors, which met in Washington just two weeks ago, I must express to you our belief that none of this promising activity can be effectively moved forward unless there is a new