

the courts have changed them somewhat radically from time to time, so I cannot say with certainty.

Mr. CRAMER. Have you gotten any clearances or explored with the Bureau of Public Roads the concept which you have explained here with the Federal Government paying an equal share to what the cost of acquiring a house would be, the fair market value for the purpose of investing in the property on which it is to be relocated?

Mr. RHYNER. No, we have not, Mr. Cramer.

Mr. CRAMER. You do not know whether that is permissible under the present law?

Mr. RHYNER. We have not gotten it and I would not anticipate that we would get it until we have a firmer plan.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand the bill involved, and I think it is quite interesting, the reason that I am taking this time, I compliment California, but section 135.5 of it says, the Department may acquire either in fee or in any lessor any unimproved or unoccupied real property or real property not for residential use to provide replacement houses for economically displaced areas, and so forth, displaced because of Federal highway construction and what have you.

That authorization took the Department to acquire the land, there has been no advance clearance of any sort with the Bureau of Public Roads, the Department of Transportation, that that acquisition cost could be reimbursed in any portion by the Federal Government as a relocation cost.

Mr. RHYNER. There has not been a clearance. We have been discussing this in working with them, but as far as getting a clearance, we do not have it, Mr. Cramer.

Mr. CRAMER. Now, how about what happens under this program to those who do not want to have their houses moved to a replacement area? What option do they have?

Mr. RHYNER. That is one of the first questions that I asked, Mr. Cramer, and it is a good question.

The only thing I can say is number one, we would try to make the end result attractive enough so that most of the people would want to do it. If they do not, we cannot force them.

The only thing that we can do is to pay them what we or a court determines is the fair market value of the existing dwelling and I do not know where else you would go.

Mr. CRAMER. Actually, so far as those persons are concerned who may not be happy with the house they are in, they would not care to have it moved someplace else and would get no relief under this proposed program.

Mr. RHYNER. Unless we can come up with something, they would not.

Mr. CRAMER. Does this permit you to negotiate or your plan to negotiate with owners of present houses as to whether they might be interested in occupying some other house that you have purchased as an alternative and are willing to move to this relocation area?

Mr. RHYNER. Yes, it does.

Mr. CRAMER. I just have one other question and I think this opens up some pretty interesting ideas.

Relocation obviously is a serious problem that we have to deal with.

A proposal has been made for advance acquisition of the right-of-