



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20591

Traffic engineers responsible for the safe and efficient movement of traffic, recognize the fact that standardization of traffic control devices simplifies the task of the road user, and because it aids in instant recognition and understanding, results in a smoother and safer flow of traffic. Members of the Institute of Traffic Engineers, through their own technical committees at the local or national level, or working with the National Joint Committee, had an important part in the development of these standards. As most of its members are practicing traffic engineers, they have a responsibility now for assuring prompt and necessary conformance with the new Manual. All levels of government - Federal, State, county and city - must cooperate in this effort to improve highway travel for our citizens.

The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices is not just another government publication for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, but a book of standards for traffic control devices that is backed by much thought and hard work by many individuals, committees and organizations. This Manual, having been completely revised since its last printing in 1961, has been formally approved by all of the parent organizations and concurred in by the Federal Highway Administration. Thus, this revised Manual becomes the basis of design and application of devices utilized for the vital function of traffic control on our Nation's streets and highways open to public travel.

The Federal Highway Administration will continue to look to the National Joint Committee and its parent organizations for cooperation and leadership in the widespread application of the standards contained in the new Manual and in their continuing betterment to the end that the Manual shall at all times, as far as practicable, be a complete and up-to-date presentation of best practices.

Francis C. Turner  
Federal Highway Administrator

Mr. Turner has served with the Federal government in various highway positions throughout the United States, in Canada, the Yukon and Northwest Territories, and in the Philippines since 1929. From 1949-1950, he was Coordinator of the entire Philippine program. He was Director of the Bureau of Public Roads under President Johnson for two years prior to appointment by President Nixon to his current post of Federal Highway Administrator in February, 1969.

Mr. Turner is a registered Professional Engineer, a D.S.C.E. graduate of Texas A&M University, and a member of ASCE, AASHTO, SAME, ARBA, HRE, and Tau Delta Pi. His numerous honors have included the Philippine Legion of Commerce, the Thomas H. Macdonald Memorial Award, the George S. Bartlett Award, selection as the World Highway Man-of-the-Year (1969), and the Roy W. Crum Distinguished Service Award.

## The highway program:

### "New policies, direction, procedures"

*The importance of the 1970 federal highway legislation, and how the highway program's administration has been changed to fit the new social and environmental concepts, were discussed recently by Federal Highway Administrator F. C. Turner. His talk given at the Mississippi Valley Highway Conference in Chicago is considered so important that Rural & Urban Roads here presents a large part of it.*

*Omitted solely for lack of space are Turner's discussion on the vital subjects of manpower training, development of new urban economic centers, relocation assistance, noise abatement, billboard elimination, highway safety, and inventorying and replacement of old bridges. The abridged text of Turner's talk follows. The Editors.*

In the evolution of our national highway program, the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1970 will take its place as benchmark legislation.

It merits this description because it affirms in many practical ways the concerns and the priorities of our time. It looks from this vantage point with a sound plan for the future. And in so doing it provides those of us who manage the highway program with new support and new opportunities to serve our fellow citizens.

We have been administering a program whose foundations were laid in the 1956 legislation. But we have not been constrained by blind adherence to plans and specifications drawn up in 1956. On the contrary, we have approved some very significant change orders along the way. America has been changing these past 15 years and so have we.

**Quality of life:** To use the broadest description, it is the quality of life that has increasingly concerned our fellow citizens. And I believe we in the highway program have been quick to respond to these

emerging concerns—not just with agreeable rhetoric but with meaningful action.

Last year, as the 1970 legislation was being considered, I testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Roads, and I offered this observation:

"I point out that many of the things we are looking at today, that we consider to have been mistakes in the program, are largely things we did under a different policy. We have changes in our policy, changes in our personnel.

**Wanted economy:** "I would point out to you that a little over 10 years ago I sat before this same committee in this same witness chair, and was berated rather heavily along with other highway officials, as to the high cost of this particular program, and the emphasis then was on cost, do it cheaper, cut out fringe things, keep the cost down.

"The policy has changed. The people have changed. This is progress. We changed our policy, procedures, points of emphasis. I believe we are working now in harmony with the policy and legislation that are before us. And I would hope we would be allowed to continue to administer the program and get the job done in the way that you are asking us to do."

**Good Act:** I believe the 1970 Act does give us very substantial support in doing the job ahead. This Act embraces the broadened concept of the highway program that has been growing over the past decade. It is concerned with the social responsibilities of the highway program—with safety, with the environment, and with other human values.

The 1970 Act is particularly responsive to the problems arising from the continuing urbanization of our country. It takes the long

view, setting forth necessary steps for the orderly development of the continuing strong highway program we must have to meet the growing transportation needs of the Nation.

Let's take the last point first—that of formulating policies for the program's future.

First, the Act looks to the conclusion of the Interstate System construction program. It provides for removal from the system by July 1, 1973, of those segments whose construction is not assured, and reallocation of this mileage. It sets a deadline of July 1, 1975, for submission of all Interstate System plans, specifications and estimates.

**Funds extended:** It extends Interstate authorizations through fiscal year 1976, but leaves a final additional authorization to be enacted later, while requiring a final cost estimate to be submitted in 1974. It assures continued funding by extending the Trust Fund five years to October 1, 1977.

Next, looking to the future of the regular Federal-aid program, it directs the Secretary of Transportation to make recommendations in 1972 for the functional realignment of the Federal-aid systems, based on studies made in cooperation with the State highway departments and local governments. Also in 1972, the Secretary is to make recommendations for a continuing Federal-aid highway program for the period 1976 to 1990.

The Act provides for a reduced state matching requirement, by setting up a 70-30 Federal-State funding ratio beginning in fiscal 1974. Meanwhile, it extends the ABC and rural supplement authorizations at their current level through fiscal 1973.

**New mandates:** Now let us turn to the new features which the Act provides in our operating pro-

grams. It is here that we see reflected the concerns—shared by highway officials and the public's representatives in the Congress—over the problems of urbanization, the environment, and human values. It is here that we highway officials are given a mandate to do something about these concerns.

Urban growth has been one of the most remarkable processes of our century, and very likely will continue the remainder of the century. About 70 percent of Americans now live in urban areas, and 80 percent will within another decade or two.

Urban living is made possible, among other things, by the daily, hourly movement of goods and people. The adequacy and efficiency of the transportation available to our urban areas has much to do with the quality of life in those areas.

Today, these urban areas are overwhelmingly dependent on highway transportation. And there is every reason to believe they will continue to be for the rest of this century.

If urban areas continue to grow, so must highway transportation. The challenge to the highway official is to get the most efficiency possible out of the urban highway system with the resources available to him.

The Federal interest in this challenge has grown over the years as urbanization has proceeded. In the '40s, the primary and secondary systems were extended into urban areas. In the '50s, urban freeways were incorporated into the Interstate System. In the early '60s, the urban transportation planning requirement became law, thus providing a necessary foundation for decision-making on which we can call today. And in the late '60s, Federal aid was made available for traffic operations improvements—the TOPICS program.

**New tools:** The 1970 Highway Act adds several new dimensions to the Federal interest in urban transportation. Combining it with existing programs, plus companion legislation for urban mass transportation assistance, we get a comprehensive set of tools to deal with urban transportation problems.

These tools include an active, on-going planning process; the Interstate program to provide the larger urban areas with a limited network of high capacity freeways; ABC funds to improve a limited number of major arterials, and the TOPICS program to increase the capacity

and safety of major street systems beyond the ABC routes.

The 1970 Act provides for creation of a new Federal-aid urban highway system, and authorization to use Federal-aid funds for highway-related improvements to serve bus transit. And the mass transit legislation provides funds to purchase new buses and operating equipment through UMTA.

The Federal-aid urban system will consist of arterial routes other than those now on the primary and secondary systems in urban areas of 50,000 and more. The routes are to be selected cooperatively by local officials and state highway officials. They are to be guided by the urban transportation planning process in determining which routes will best serve the goals and objectives of the community. The Secretary is to report to Congress in 1972 on the designated system and its cost of construction. This system should materially assist the urban areas in meeting their transportation demands.

---

**“It is the quality of life that has increasingly concerned our fellow citizens. And I believe we in the highway program have been quick to respond to these concerns.”**

---

**Rush-hour blamed:** Of course, one of the major problems large cities have today is that of rush-hour traffic congestion. This is what most people have in mind when they complain of the transportation crisis. In the context of the overall urban transportation needs, rush-hour traffic is a relatively small portion of total transportation movement—since trips to and from the downtown comprise only five to 15 percent of total urban trips. But it is a problem when transportation corridors to and from downtown become overtaxed under peak-hour loads.

In all but a handful of cities the only practical solution to this problem is to divert commuters from private autos to higher capacity vehicles, namely buses and car pools, and thereby increase the people-moving capacity of our urban highways. And this is the only solution that can be applied in the immediate future—in a matter of a year or two.

If rubber-tired mass transporta-

tion is to succeed in luring commuters out of their cars, it will have to provide fast, convenient and comfortable service. The highway program can offer a major assist in bringing this about, by providing preferential treatment for buses—and car pools—in moving rush-hour traffic.

**Bus lanes:** The 1970 legislation specifically authorizes this type of assistance by making Federal-aid funds available for the construction of exclusive bus lanes on freeways, bus roadways, traffic signals and other control devices to give buses preferential treatment, bus passenger loading areas. Also, fringe and transportation corridor parking facilities to serve bus and other public mass transportation passengers.

In addition, fringe and corridor parking facilities can be constructed with Federal-aid urban system funds.

Improvement of bus transit is not a unilateral endeavor, of course. It is a joint venture that requires cooperation of all levels of government. It requires cooperation at the Federal level between the Federal Highway Administration and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, and we in turn must cooperate with state and local officials and transit operators if we are to get the necessary assurance that transit-related highway projects will be effectively utilized.

Nevertheless, I believe we have a real opportunity here, and I would urge state officials to examine their opportunities carefully as we prepare the report Congress has directed on the need for additional highway facilities or the adjustment of existing facilities to accommodate highway public transportation.

In addition to the new aids it provides for urban areas the 1970 Act also shows concern for the problems of over-urbanization. It offers a demonstration program which would use highway improvement to help check the migration from rural areas and small towns to overcrowded cities.

I have tried to review the highlights and to show that the 1970 Federal Highway Act, and the highway program, are in step with the times, and are proceeding soundly to meet the long-range needs of the Nation—not only its transportation needs, but the many social and economic objectives which our vital highway program serves. ■