

ment, but apply the Bureau's formula to the highway program and in the new ones to be covered. Well, here we would be defeating what we started out in the first place to achieve, namely, Government-wide uniformity of treatment of individuals and businesses regardless of which particular authorization or which particular statute happens to cause them to become displaced.

Senator MUSKIE. Two more questions. Then I yield to Senator Mundt.

Present law and the provisions of this bill provide that relocation payments and assistance begin only when an agreement is reached between either the Federal Government and the localities to proceed with the project. As far as I know, no assistance is available during the planning stages that precede such an agreement. Yet this is a period when displacement begins under the threat of compulsory removal when the project is actually undertaken. There have been many, many instances of hardships attributable to this point.

Now, what can be done to provide for relocation assistance at an earlier stage than is presently provided for, assistance at the stage when the planning and surveying of the proposed project is announced? What can be done to relieve people of the fear of removal and smooth the road to orderly relocation in this period?

Mr. COLMAN. Well, one possibility might be, Mr. Chairman, revamped operations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Greater planning work could be undertaken to assist the communities in providing interim relocation housing, which is being increasingly done in a number of places, with trailer homes, mobile homes, and that type of thing. Where the final project has not been worked out, and where the bulldozers may finally start to operate and where they may not, but where there is a kind of upheaval and unrest caused because of the planning activities, perhaps some type of housing availabilities might be—

Senator MUSKIE. The problem, I suspect, affects homeowners and landowners who begin to find tenants disappearing or rental properties impossible to rent during this period when it is clear in the whole community that the area is going to be cleared and yet nobody is in a position to buy their property or to reimburse them or to make it possible for them to reinvest elsewhere, and they have to continue to pay taxes. So there is a period of great hardship and considerable loss, not so much for tenants, perhaps, although they may incur some difficulties here, but for the property owners.

Mr. COLMAN. As far as the owners are concerned, Mr. Chairman, would it not be the case that this type of loss of rental income, declining market value, and that sort of thing would all be legitimate considerations, legally, within the acquisition processes as they operate under the condemnation or taking laws of most States? In other words, an owner of rental property who lost his tenants a year in advance of the actual taking would be able to include this loss along with other factors that the Court or the appraisers would take into consideration.

Senator MUSKIE. These costs are not now covered, I do not think, are they?

Mr. COLMAN. It was my impression—I could be wrong on this—that as far as owners are concerned, this type of thing was admissible evidence in terms of losses being suffered by owners.