understanding about the placing of initiative and responsibility at the local level. Over the past year, the members of our Association have been increasingly concerned about the number of important national policies and procedures relating to our programs that have been issued without prior opportunity for local officials to make suggestions and comments. These omissions have covered a wide range of issues, including the "urban goals" policy; property management and land negotiation procedures in the urban renewal program; and the site selection, tenant assignment, and priority production procedures in the public housing program.

This matter is of such serious concern that our Program Policy Resolution for 1967–69, adopted by the full membership of our Association last October, expressed ". . . dismay and frustration . . . over the fact that a full measure of responsibility is not vested in local agencies . . ." and suggested that a first order of business for HUD should be ". . . the granting to local communities of a full measure of initiative and responsibility, in accordance with the declaration of purpose of the Housing Act of 1959."

NAHRO recognizes that there are important, critical matters related to national policy that are the proper concern of the Department of Housing and Urban Development at the federal level. But the full impact of national policy decisions can only be measured accurately at the *local* level. The difficulty concerns no individuals or officials at either the federal or local level—the fault lies in the present method under which national and local goals are established, and the inadequate mechanism that we now use to join them in a common program effort. The present system of detailed federal reviews of local operations breeds delays and frustrations. We need a new concept and a new mechanism that will make local initiative and responsibility truly possible, while recognizing the proper interest of federal government in program goals and the allocation of national resources.

Mr. Chairman, NAHRO realizes that it has an important responsibility in making recommendations that will help to establish the new concept and mechanism for the federal-local relationship. We are presently preparing a report that defines more fully our concept of local housing and urban development goals and a balanced local community development program. We hope we will have an opportunity to present this report to the Congress, as well as to undertake intensive discussions with the Department of HUD. In the meantime, we specifically request that the subcommittee include in its report a reaffirmation of the principle of local initiative and responsibility.

EXHIBIT 2

NAHRO PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ON RELOCATION: 1968 TESTIMONY

1. *Change of relocation adjustment payment to a flat payment for all displaced families.*—The system of *relocation adjustment payments* authorized by section 114 of the Housing Act of 1964 provides for payments of up to $500 to assist a displaced family in paying for the first 12-month period in its new housing, providing it cannot afford standard housing by expending 20 percent of its income for rent. In practice, this provision has proven complex, as well as difficult to administer in a complete equitable manner. In addition, it covers reimbursement for housing expenses only and then only for a 12-month period. NAHRO recommends that the local public agency be authorized to use, as an option, a Relocation Adjustment Payment as a flat payment, based on family size, and available to *all* displaced families to cover the unavoidable expense and distress involved in shifting housing location, in addition to moving expenses. We would recommend the following flat payments: 1–3 persons—$200; 4–6 persons—$300; 7 or more persons—$500.

2. *Assistance to displaced homeowners where the price paid for their property does not permit them to purchase comparable housing in a new location.*—Experience in relocation of families displaced by public activity has shown that there are many hardship cases which concern home owners, many of them elderly, who cannot afford to purchase comparable housing in a new location. The inequity occurs because the sum which they are paid for their property in the clearance area is not sufficient for a down-payment on comparable housing, with the resulting monthly cost still within their incomes. NAHRO proposes that in all cases where displaced home owners cannot purchase comparable housing