

government for all displaced households, including rehabilitation loan and grant programs.

These changes would cover both the immediate adjustment needs of displaced families and rental assistance on a continuing basis for those displaced households who need it.

It should also be pointed out that in addition to more effective and efficient assistance, the displacement allowances suggested are less than the RAP payments provided in S. 698.

4. That the \$200 maximum moving payment for displaced persons under S. 698, section 802(c) (1), is *adequate* in most instances at the present time. However, they did point out that there were individual hardship circumstances where moving costs for a displaced household were over this figure. The relocation directors recommended that the law be made more flexible by providing that in the case of a hardship situation, documented by the local agency, a moving payment could be made in excess of \$200, subject to review of the federal agency.

5. That compensation for property loss for *displaced households* be provided under S. 698. It is currently provided under Section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949, but *not* under the proposed bill. It is recommended that compensation for property loss be separate from the moving payment, section 802(c) (1), and that it be up to \$200 for any documented property loss.

Additional recommendations on business displacement (Secs. 802, 805 and 807 of S. 698)

NAHRO suggests the following provisions for business relocation:

1. *For all displaced businesses which relocate.*—
 - a. Payment of full and documented moving expenses.
 - b. Payment for documented direct loss of property, up to \$5000.
 - c. A flat *displacement payment* equal to the average net annual earnings of the displaced business or \$5000, whichever is lesser.
2. *An optional fixed payment for displaced businesses which relocate.*—As an option to the provisions of 1, a total fixed payment equal to the average net annual earnings of the business or \$7500, whichever is lesser.
3. *For businesses which go out of business.*—A “going out of business” payment, when this is a result of displacement, equal to the average net annual earnings for a *two-year* period, or \$10,000, whichever is lesser.

Congressional intent and flexibility in relocation program administration

In the two-day discussion on May 16–17, the relocation directors continuously came back to questions about the spirit and intent under which relocation assistance payments are administered. They reported their local experience indicated that because of the detailed requirements in the existing Federal law (and likely in the proposed S. 698) auditing by federal agencies of local relocation practice often became over-detailed and negative. The group recommended that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations consider in any revision to S. 698, the elimination of detailed provisions which can be handled through administration, with more flexibility, and the inclusion of the following points in its report on S. 698:

1. That the intent and spirit of title VIII, Uniform Relocation, is to make the statutory assistance available to displaced households or businesses with the least cumbersome administration;
2. That it is the intent of the Congress that displaced businesses and households *receive* assistance and that the emphasis should be on qualifying (not disqualifying) eligible recipients;
3. That the local administration of relocation assistance be flexible in terms of providing assistance in the survey and planning period of public development activities, as well as making payments *in advance* of actual moving, if necessary to meet hardship situations;
4. That the auditing of relocation practice be made in the spirit of 1, 2, and 3 above.

TITLE IX OF S. 698—UNIFORM LAND ACQUISITION POLICY

The local relocation directors meeting in Washington on May 16–17, had the following suggestions and additions to NAHRO testimony.

Section 904 of S. 698 provides for reimbursement of settlement costs on federally acquired property, but not property acquired with Federal assistance. This same section should apply to properties acquired with Federal assistance.