

Mr. BRIDWELL. I believe, Senator Baker, that it is our feeling that assisting a displaced individual—family and so forth—in finding a replacement structure is just as much a part of a highway project as any other activity within that highway project and that it should not be treated separately and distinct from other activities within that project and the meeting of Federal criteria. These are engineering criteria and many other criteria which have very important sociological and economical interests and overtones.

Senator BAKER. Senator Muskie, I think, put the question, is it not so that the States have not really performed very well in this field of displacement assistance and the like? Might the States not perform better in your view if they were entitled to a 90-percent contribution across the table in the allowance of moving expenses?

Mr. BRIDWELL. Well, of course, under our suggestion, Senator Baker, for those families, businesses, et cetera, who are displaced on an interstate project, the State would be eligible for a 90-percent reimbursement.

In other words, a replacement cost is like any other cost, so it would be 90–10 or 50–50, according to the type of project involved.

Senator BAKER. The question I am getting at is do you see any apparent built-in reluctance or resistance on the part of the States to the making of moving cost payments, other than the economic factor?

Mr. BRIDWELL. I think I have to answer the question honestly, Senator, by saying yes and no. The yes part is that there is some resistance; again, not philosophical resistance. It is much more pragmatic resistance because State highway departments are not trained, experienced, and practiced in this kind of activity and some of them are reluctant to undertake it because they consider this a field foreign to the engineering portions of constructing a highway.

I frankly would have to say that I am disappointed that under the 1962 act, there are still some States that are not taking advantage of the provisions of that act, inadequate though it may be.

Now, the other side of that is that some States do a really excellent job, a thoroughly good job. In some instances, the State highway department does it itself; in some instances, it contracts with a local agency, usually the redevelopment agency, that also handles relocation assistance under urban renewal and other federally aided programs. I think it is pretty hard to come up with any kind of consistent pattern and say the States generally do or do not perform well.

I would add two points to this. One is that as you are probably aware, the Federal-aid highway program, to a very heavy extent, operates under State law, so the States also are either aided or constrained by their own State law.

The second factor that I would like to mention is that some of the States have complained or, in another sense, have requested us to seek improvements in what we are able to accomplish under the 1962 act.

Senator BAKER. One last question, Mr. Bridwell or Mr. Turner. Are you prepared to say today, and if you are not, I fully understand, but are you prepared to say today whether or not you will support a proposal that would allow moving costs, relocation costs, without an arbitrary limitation as to amount, as a part of the award in the course of litigation in the eminent domain proceeding? These costs would be borne on the formula now applicable to highway and interstate high-