1. In relocating a business, a replacement facility should be required before the business is forced to move;
2. The business must have been acquired as a going concern;
3. Loans, with a substantial reduction in the interest rate, would be very helpful;
4. The in-lieu-of payment should be increased; and
5. The interests and aid of the relocation assistant specialists should be expanded.

Of these five suggestions, the last three received the most emphasis with the loan provision favored by the majority.

**NEED FOR NEW LEGISLATION**

The great majority of the conferees thought that no new legislation is required because, it was felt, the existing system for acquisition is working. Some of the conferees suggested that, if legislation were necessary, it take the form of a pilot program in order to test its theories.

**OTHER FACTORS**

A number of other factors were cited during the workshop that related to property acquisition. These are noted below.

Current legislation under study has dropped the relocation assistance for those displaces who had no property taken but were forced to relocate because the traffic pattern changed. The great majority of the conferees agreed that this indirect compensation would have been a very difficult matter to administer and that the cost factor would have been tremendous.

Others felt that the cost of the acquired property could be kept to the actual just compensation if the offer for the take was made at the same time as the offer for the relocation assistance. Use of this "package approach" has proven successful in a number of states.

Most felt that the magic ingredient in a successful program was an efficient and dedicated relocation assistance staff. They felt that the better the program is administered, the more satisfied the landowner will be and the more prone he or she will be to settle without litigation. Also, relocation assistance provisions have substantially reduced the number of condemnation cases. Only about one-third of displaces were dissatisfied with the payments and the treatment that they received.

**Impact of Relocation on People, Businesses, and Communities**

(Cochairmen, Evan Iverson and Raymond Wardwell)

Even though the comments varied considerably, several major subjects were discussed at each workshop. Those involved expressed a strong desire to take whatever action was possible or make statutory changes, if necessary, to achieve equity and justice for those displaced by highway projects. Many felt it was necessary to update and revise federal, state, and local statutes to achieve this objective.

The evaluation of relocation impacts in the project planning stage was also examined. More weight should be given to displacement and relocation problems in determining which corridor or alternative is selected. Although participants emphasized that this should be a major factor, they recognized that numerous other variables had to be considered in making an acceptable decision. Relocation is only one of these important decision-making considerations. Emphasis was placed on improved evaluations in the preparation of environmental impact statements. Authority for such action exists under environmental statutes, but some indicated that more emphasis is placed on physical environmental factors than on social and economic issues. Hence, relocation problems are sometimes not given adequate attention.

**STATUTORY CHANGES**

A number of recommendations were made by participants concerning legislation now under consideration by Congress. These are noted here.

1. Definition of displacees should be restricted to those involuntarily displaced as a result of programs or projects. However, participants expressed a desire to retain existing flexibility to determine properties that are being adversely affected economically and to work out individualized solutions. Strong sentiment to preserve existing merits of the act were expressed. It was pointed out that statutory authority was now hazy regarding expenditure of funds for properties adversely affected that are not part of the necessary right-of-way. If a good case can be made for providing funds, approval is usually possible.

2. Need was expressed for a better working definition of a project. In the planning and design phases of project development, those individuals or institutions adversely affected should be included in project development to enable agencies to take appropriate action to achieve community objectives.

3. The financial maximum should be removed from federal statutes because of the greatly increased property and relocation costs. Such action would simply extend existing practices because agencies are now forced into last-resort housing due to the fact that current limits do not cover costs for satisfactory housing.

4. Federal statutes should standardize requirements among agencies concerning such matters as eligibility (tenure), property tax, and choice of housing.

5. Provisions should be made for a supplement to businesses that are displaced. This would not necessarily mean the same treatment as for residents displaced from homes, but matters such as the cost of acquiring a new business site should receive attention in legislation. If necessary, criteria for applying assistance to businesses could be established within the proposed statute.

6. A desire was expressed to replace services in low-income neighborhoods when these essential services are removed as a result of projects or programs.

7. Provisions should be made in state statutes to remove any uncertainty about the ability to acquire uneconomic remainders.

8. If loans cannot be provided by the U.S. Small Business Administration to assist businesses that lose revenue and experience problems during the relocation process, then other funding should be made available by some process to be established by statute.

9. In the project planning phase, more adequate social, economic, and land use evaluations should be made to determine the feasibility of pursuing a
project or program and defining project boundaries to include those areas that are severely impacted. Such action would make the relocation process more satisfactory. If necessary, statutory requirements concerning these evaluations should be strengthened.

10. The environmental impact statement should contain project analysis that addresses displacements and relocation problems for each alternate evaluated. A need was expressed to upgrade these analyses.

11. People and businesses who might be affected by proposed projects should be notified early. This process should include planning meetings, public involvement programs, and hearings when various alternatives are being considered. When the preferred alternative is adopted, persons directly impacted should be notified so that they can make their desires known prior to project approval and have adequate lead time prior to the relocation process.

12. Greater coordination among agencies, interested groups, and individual citizens should take place prior to project adoption. This becomes part of an effective general public and agency involvement program.