

Title VI of the new bill is of interest to us as an organization because it does make provision for the consolidation of individual categorical grants within broad functional areas and to affect the inter-agency transfer of administrative responsibility for grant programs, subject of course to the type of congressional veto proviso that governs executive re-organization plans. One of the complaints which we receive from our rural constituency is the difficulty of cutting their way through the tangle of overlapping agencies with vague jurisdictional boundaries. There certainly needs to be something done to clear the air of this confusing situation, not only for the benefit of the constituency and all the members of this distinguished body, but from the standpoint of good business management.

Title VIII of the measure was also passed unanimously by the Senate as S. 1681 in 1966. This title provides for relocation payments for those individuals and businesses which are forced to move as a result of the acquisition of real property for federal and federally assisted programs. It also provides for advisory assistance and the assurance of availability of standard housing as well as federal reimbursement for relocation payments under these federally assisted programs.

This reimbursement suggestion is one which is based on the solid concept of equity. Under the previous rules for condemnation proceedings under eminent domain, at least in the highway takings program in which I was engaged as a professional appraiser for 5 years, there was no consideration permitted for the inconvenience and the cost of moving a business that had been dislocated by these acquisition programs. The best that could be done was to make a little more generous allowance in terms of the damages and hope that they could be negotiated out this way to prevent the maximum of financial loss. As we will indicate later in the testimony, even this was a pretty hopeless gesture, even though those of us who worked on these projects were certain that the whole concept of forcibly moving somebody and making him pay the moving expenses was an offense to our sense of justice.

The allowance of \$100 to \$300 for moving expenses for people whose dwelling has been taken is a modest and reasonable allowance, as is the allowance of \$1,000 which is the maximum which can be allowed for the movement of a farming operation which has been displaced. The movement of the animals and the equipment as well as the furniture on a farmstead is an expensive procedure and the \$1,000 is not beyond the realm of costs under most circumstances.

The granting of assistance to elderly and handicapped individuals in an amount not to exceed a \$1,000 is also within the realm of justice.

The Grange is particularly interested in title IX of this legislation, a uniform land acquisition policy for federal programs. Very frankly, the National Grange each year has numerous suggestions of ways to facilitate the taking procedure and to increase the injustice of the procedure. We are constantly receiving letters from constituents and from those who are not our constituents who plead for our help to either save their property from inundation or destruction or to see that they have equitable and reasonable return for their property. Many of these properties have an intrinsic value far beyond any commercial value. Since this value cannot be satisfied by any kind of monetary payment, at least that which is offered to them and which they are forced to accept should be a reasonable amount.

As I stated earlier in the testimony, I've had considerable experience in this field of preparing appraisals covering the value of and the damage for federal and state acquisitions, primarily as a part of the interstate highway system, but not confined to it. I worked for the Thane Appraisal Service of Binghamton, New York, which contracted with the state of New York for the appraisal of the value of the property and the damage to the property in these takings, and then I later worked for the National Farm Consulting Service of Ithaca, New York, a firm which usually worked for the person who was losing the property.

I would tell you that the experience of working for the latter was considerably more satisfactory than the ones which I had as I worked for the state of New York which was acting as an agency for the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States government. The procedures which we followed will indicate the reason for my dissatisfaction with the employment by those who were taking the land and the reasons for my raising some serious ethical and moral questions which apparently have been raised previously, or this legislation would not have been introduced.

Briefly, the procedure which we followed was to establish land values, measure and type the buildings and calculate the cost of reproduction, and on the basis of comparable sales and fixed land values, we would then figure the depreciation