ppeared a story under the title "Businessmen Object to Sacrifice Freeways)emand," from which the following is a direct quote:

". . . just as the Oregon State Highway Department has started buying up ight-of-way, a new problem has arisen:

"Who will recompense the hundreds of small business establishments in its ath?

"Homeowners, of course, can simply sell out and find another home with nore or less degree of inconvenience or emotional impact.

"But what about a small business, with a clientele built up slowly over the 'ears, and with little or no reserve capital stashed away?

"And what about the lost income this little business is bound to suffer hrough relocation?

"Even if the business could be moved—where to? A strictly zoned metropolitan ity such as Portland offers few opportunities to find a suitable substitute loca-ion.

"These were the questions flung at State and federal politicians and bureau-rats alike by a small group of businessmen in Southeast Portland at a public neeting called to seek support for relocation compensation.

" 'A freeway project costing millions in tax money should not be allowed o bankrupt small businesses in its path,' said Jack Jensen, owner of a dry leaning establishment at 9543 SE Division St. . . .

"The state and federal agencies which finance and build the freeways pay nly for the costs of moving the equipment to another location—and not very nuch at that, in most cases.

"The businessmen were told by state and federal representatives that this eimbursement for moving varied by statute from $200 to $3,000 maximum—no natter what the move cost.

"State Rep. Howard D. Willits, who was chairman of the meeting, commented hat the politician frequently described the small business man as the backbone f the economy, especially during political campaigns, but when it came to rotecting his interests in such cases of inequitable dislocations, he is woefully eglected.

"Adolph E. Susan, regional appraiser for the Federal Highway Administra-ion (formerly Bureau of Public Roads) said it was indeed a deplorable situa-on and blamed it on the lawmakers who wrote the statutes allowing only 'easonable and necessary moving expenses.'

"He said he was sympathetic and he thought members of Congress were, but ntil the law was changed nothing but sympathy could be dispensed in the matter f compensation."

On the basis of its findings, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental ≀elations made 14 recommendations for local, State, and Federal action to meet ne problems of persons displaced by governments. The recommendations fell nder six major headings: (a) uniformity of relocation advisory assistance and ayments; (b) assignment of responsibility for determining relocation pay-nents; (c) assurance of the availability of standard housing for displaced peo-le; (d) financing of relocation costs; (e) modification of related Federal rograms to ease the relocation process; and (f) local organization, technical ssistance, and planning for relocation. For Federal action, it recommended:

"1. That the Congress establish a uniform policy of relocation payments and dvisory assistance for persons and businesses displaced by direct Federal pro-rams and by Federal grant-in-aid programs, and that the President direct nat the necessary steps be taken to formulate regulations for carrying out ıch a policy.

"2. The Congress should require that State and local governments adminis-ering Federal grant programs assure the availability of standard housing before roceeding with any property acquisition that displaces people. This requirement nould be at least comparable to that in Federal urban renewal legislation, ssuring that (a) there is a feasible method for temporary relocation of displaced amilies and individuals, and that (b) there are or are being provided standard ousing units within their financial means and in areas reasonably accessible to neir places of employment.

"3. With respect to financing relocation payments under federally assisted rograms, the full costs of payments to any person for relocating a family, and ne costs of payments up to $25,000 to any person relocating a business, should e completely reimbursed by the Federal Government; and the costs of business elocation payments in excess of that amount should be shared on the basis f the cost-sharing formula governing the particular program.