

A perfect example of this inequity is Tremont Street in Roxbury, Mass. This street divides land being taken for highway from land being taken by the Boston Redevelopment Authority. West side of street evictees are allowed \$3,000 for moving, those on the east side, \$25,000. Yet, \$25,000 is often not enough. Bills for our firm total \$49,000 for moving material alone, not reerecting shelves, racks, et cetera. This is certainly as much a part of the cost of a highway, as is the cost of steel and concrete. If a highway is financed 90 percent by Federal funds, and 10 percent by State funds, then moving costs should be met in the same manner—90 percent by the Federal Government, and 10 percent by the State. This should be a specific part of the highway grant. There is no limit put on the value of a building—how can there be a limit put on the value of a move?

Thirdly—relocation assistance should include the replacement cost of a plant, rather than market value. Market value at best is an arbitrary figure—since buildings are not up for sale. The only fair method is replacement costs, and this amount can be readily determined, either by the actual expenditure made for a new building, or by the known square foot constructions costs in the area.

We who have been doing business from a specific location for many years, in our case 43, should be entitled to a like amount of space in a reasonably similar location where we can continue our business; in a retail section if we are retailers, in a wholesale section if we are wholesalers, or in a good labor section, if we are manufacturers—all without additional cost to ourselves. These expenses of acquiring like facilities are part of the highway cost. As a matter of fact, no new location can be equal to an old established one, and this is a loss for which there can be no reimbursement.

As further assistance, those businesses displaced should be given first consideration to acquire Redevelopment Authority land, or other available land near their displaced businesses. For example, we, in Boston, victims of the Inner-Belt Highway and Interstate 95 acquisitions, should have been given first consideration for Boston Redevelopment Authority land. There is much talk about encouraging business to move into areas of high unemployment, we are leaving one. We would have preferred to stay in the Roxbury, South End area, but were given no consideration for available land. Certainly our situation is one repeated hundreds of times throughout the urban areas of our country—just as many jobs are being removed from much needed areas in Los Angeles and Boston, as in Miami and Seattle, all for lack of coordination and cooperation.

We are being as cooperative as possible. We appreciate the need for highway and redevelopment projects, but we should not be asked to bear more than our proportionate share of the burden. Each taxpayer pays a part; but we, who are not totally reimbursed for expenses and losses, are being ask to pay a disproportionate share of the project, beyond what our tax portion would be. Thank you for your courtesy. Mr. Goralnick and I, as representatives of the Roxbury, Mass. Chamber of Commerce, are deeply appreciative of your concern, not only for ourselves, but for all those affected by highway and redevelopment programs.

Senator BAKER. Thank you very much. I wonder if it might be in order for the witnesses to continue with their statements before I start with a few questions that may occur to me?