

he ought to receive the top appraisal of the two that are normally taken in these situations. We feel that the two appraisals are usually reasonably close one to another; but if there is a wide difference, a third appraisal could be made. That these people are entitled to the top price.

More importantly, as we see reflected in title IX, we would like to go beyond the fair market value and we note, for example, and have submitted for the record, the recent law adopted by the State of Maryland where for the first time it talks about paying compensation for hardships over and above fair market value. We think that this philosophy also ought to be in title IX.

This represents a summary of our testimony, and we appreciate very much this opportunity to have this oral presentation as well.

Senator MUSKIE. Thank you very much, Mr. Rafsky. We appreciate your patience and also the excellent and very constructive statement which you made. I know that each one of your suggestions will get serious considerations.

Mr. RAFSKY. Thank you.

(The supplementary statement follows:)

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING AND
REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS

TITLE VIII OF S. 698, UNIFORM RELOCATION—SECTION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL
COOPERATION ACT OF 1968

In testimony on May 14 and 16 before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, NAHRO President William L. Rafsky was given permission to file for the hearing record any additional comments or recommendations on title VIII which might result from the local relocation directors from throughout the country meeting in Washington on May 16-17, under the sponsorship of NAHRO. The statement below is the result of that meeting. Attached is a listing of the local relocation directors who attended.

Endorsement of NAHRO testimony

The local relocation directors endorsed the testimony which NAHRO gave to the Subcommittee on May 14 and 16 on title VIII of S. 698. They specifically endorsed these points:

1. That the proposed \$300 payment for potential home purchasers, Section 802(c)(2), is not adequate and supported the NAHRO recommendations—that a flat payment be made to supplement the down payment of a home owner up to the point necessary to enable him to purchase a suitable home within 20 percent of his income, and that potential home purchasers be given special priority for federally-assisted home ownership programs.

2. Elimination of the relocation adjustment payments (RAP), section 802(e) of S. 698. The relocation directors agreed that the present system of RAP payments is complex and inequitable.

3. In substitution for elimination of the RAP payments, the group recommended:

- a. Establishment of a flat displacement payment based on household size as follows: 1 person—\$200; 2-4 persons—\$300; 5-6 persons—\$400; and 7 or more persons—\$500. This flat displacement payment would go to *all* households displaced by public action and would compensate for necessary costs involved in adjusting to a new location.

- b. Expansion and additional flexibility in the Section 23 leasing program of the Housing Act of 1937. This would involve not only sufficient authorization in Section 23 to cover relocation housing needs, but also additional flexibility in making local agencies eligible to receive federal assistance under the section 23 leasing program. It would extend the eligibility now given directly to a local housing authority to include any other agencies designated by the governing body of the local community.

- c. A special priority for the rental assistance programs of the Federal