

be willing to sell. So a fair market price, to some extent, can be punitive in this situation.

Other factors come in of the taking of all the comparable property, the fair market price that would be established on the property before the taking began, which is the rule under which appraisers operate, is not possible to accurately determine. He cannot take into account any appreciation of the property due to the projected taking. And I worked for 5 years as a professional appraiser; I know what I am talking about on this subject. Our appraiser is very much bound by what he can do and what he cannot do at this point.

But this just is not adequate nor is it fair to the people who are involved. The previous witness pointed out some of the social implications. Please read what he said on this, because these social implications are pretty tragic sometimes, to say nothing about being important.

Therefore, there has to be another factor brought into this besides just a fair market value. Previously—it has been 5 years since I worked in this field—we were not allowed to make any allowance at all for moving expenses. We could work a little of it into the appraisal, hide it somewhere so the negotiator might have a chance at arriving at a settlement. But you could not itemize it as such. So the man who was being moved had no way of knowing there was any allowance being made for this.

I think the allowances for relocation are reasonable. I would question, though, the \$5,000 limitation on this. I know one man who has been relocated three times due to highway takings—this is par for the course—once now from Philadelphia, another a little farther north in Pennsylvania, and the last time up into New York, where U.S. Interstate 81, took him out again. Well, you do not move a large farming organization—and this was a large operation—150, 200, or 300 miles for \$5,000. It is impossible to do it. There should be some kind of basis on which the total costs of moving—this can become more than the actual cost of a moving van—comes into play. The cost of trying to operate land that is not as good as what you had before is important. If you have good bottom land, you have class one land, this is one thing. But sometimes none of that is available. You take all of your return out, all of your capitalization, and put it on class three land. How much of a loss have you taken at that point? On just your capitalization—you are over capitalized, even on the same amount of land, because it is not as productive.

These are some of the problems that I think you are getting toward in this. I hope that you can do something to expedite this whole proposal in the direction that you are taking.

Now, there are some other factors that enter into this. I just want to throw into the picture this problem of irregularity of takings. This enters into the other question of the remainder of the land. For the Government to be required to take the remainder of the land sometime when it is an uneconomic unit, my experience, would be completely impractical. I have seen uneconomic units of 800 acres, because they were separated from the barns and the buildings. Now, this 800 acres is worth something to somebody, probably the adjacent landowner. It may not be worth as much, because he has it locked in, so the man has no access. So he is in the position to drive the hardest possible bar-