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# THE NEW YORK FINANCIAL SURVEY 

DIGEST OF A SURVEY OF THE FINANCES OF NEW YORK IN 1932, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HIGHWAYS ${ }^{1}$

Reported by ELIZABETH C. PADDOCK, Assistant Highway Engineer-Economist, Division of Control, B Bureau of Public Roads

IN 1934 a legislative committee was appointed in New York to make a survey of road and traffic conditions in order to assist in determining "future policy with respect * * * to the construction of streets, roads, highways, and footpaths" and "to ascertain the facts with regard to volume, character, and distribution of traffic on streets, and on primary, secondary, and tertiary roads." ${ }^{2}$ It was deemed essential "that an economic survey be made to reveal sources of highway revenues to the end that road construction, both rural and urban, may be considered in accordance with the facts and funds equitably distributed for street and highway purposes." ${ }^{2}$

Prior to the initiation of the survey by this legislative committee the Bureau of Public Roads had been conducting investigations in a few other States similar to those desired by New York. Under a cooperative agreement the Bureau assisted the committee in the collection of the desired financial and road-use data. The financial and road-use surveys conducted in New York were modeled after those made in Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico. ${ }^{3}$ Similar studies are a part of the State-wide highway planning surveys currently being conducted by the Bureau in cooperation with about 40 of the various States.

The same general definitions and methods of collecting and analyzing data have been used in all the surveys. Four main processes characterize each study:

1. Collection of data.-In New York this step involved the detailed study of all available records in State offices, personal visits to many counties and localities, and the circulation of about 150,000 questionnaires. The process was simplified to a large extent in New York by the existence in State offices of complete records for all units of government with the exception of Rochester, Buffalo, New York City, and most of the special districts.
2. Analysis of data.-Much of the analysis was done as the data were collected. Where special problems of interpretation arose, however, decisions were made only after consultation with officials of the governmental agency in question.
3. Tabulation of material.-Detailed tabulations showing all data for the several population classifications in each county were made for the entire State. These tabulations formed the basis for the summary tables presented in this report.
4. Preparation of report.-An interpretation of the tabulations provided the material for this summary.

Six primary definitions are basic to an understanding and proper interpretation of the figures compiled for this

[^0]survey. The term "highways" includes all items having to do with the construction, maintenance, marking, signing, and administration of all roads, streets, alleys, and bridges. The term includes all items pertaining to the keeping of roads and streets in a usable and safe condition for vehicular traffic, but such items as sidewalks, sanitary sewers, ornamental lighting, and street cleaning are excluded.

Activities having to do with the construction, maintenance, and administration of and all teaching in public schools, libraries, and museums are classed as "education."
"Public benefit" consists of all items having to do with the protection of lives and property and with the pleasure and well-being of the people, including police and fire protection, courts, sanitation, parks, playgrounds, and charitable and penal institutions.

All general administration and such other activities as do not fall into one of the three classifications given above are classed as "government."

The definition of "expenditure" as used in this survey is synonymous with the net cost which must be met from public revenue funds, including special assessment payments.

Every payment made to a public body through the authority vested in it to collect funds is an "impost." Thus fees, fines, permits, and licenses are imposts. Where there occurs a difference in the amount of impost levied and the amount collected, the levy is shown.

OVER HALF OF THE TOTAL POPULATION AND PROPERTY VALUATION WAS IN NEW YORK CITY
In an effort to place all the surveys on a comparable basis the same population classification is used.
"Rural areas" are all rural territories outside of incorporated places. In New York all such areas are under town government. "Urban" areas are incorporated villages and cities and are grouped according to population as follows:

Places under 2,500 persons.
Places 2,500 to 14,999 persons.
Places 15,000 to 74,999 persons.
Places 75,000 to 399,999 persons.
Places 400,000 to 999,999 persons.
Places over 1,000,000 persons.
The names of individual cities are used in preference to the last two designations in this report since Buffalo is the only place having 400,000 to 999,999 persons and New York City is the only place having over $1,000,000$ persons.

Certain data are basic to a complete understanding of the figures shown by the financial survey and should be kept in mind when reading this summary.

Population concentration in New York State is of more economic and social importance than in many of the other States. The population of New York according to the census of 1930 numbered $12,588,066$ persons, more than one-tenth that of the entire con-
tinental United States (table 1). This population was crowded into a land area of 45,057 square miles. only 1.6 percent of the total gross area of the United States. Less than 14 percent of the people in New York live in rural areas. A further indication of the population concentration is made evident when it is pointed out that more than 50 percent of the population of the State ( $6,930,446$ persons) live in New York City.

Another factor of economic importance is the valuation of property in the various parts of the State. The figures in table 1 show the full value of property, obtained by dividing the assessed value by the ratio of assessed to full value as determined by the State tax commission. This was necessary to put all valuations on a common basis.

All roads and streets in the State are classed under three general headings for the purposes of this survey. The first group includes the State highway system and any other roads or streets for which State moneys are specifically appropriated, exclusive of State aids or revenue distributions. State and county highways are the main roads included in this designation. The second group includes county roads, administered through the county boards of supervisors, while the third group embraces town highways and city and vil-

## NEW YORK TAXES IN 1932

Total taxes and imposts levied for all purposes in New York in 1932 were $\$ 1,212,571,800$. Taxation of general property totaled $\$ 907,941$,700 ; all motor-vehicle imposts, $\$ 81,324,700$; other imposts, including estate taxes, personal and business income taxes, bank taxes, and miscellaneous State, county, and local revenues, $\$ 223,305,400$.

Of the total taxes and imposts levied, rural taxpayers were charged with $\$ 116,841,100$, or 9.6 percent; residents of incorporated places other than New York City, $\$ 362,977,000$ or 30 percent; and residents of New York City, $\$ 732,753,700$ or 60.4 percent.
The average actual tax rates on general property per $\$ 100$ valuation were as follows: Rural areas, $\$ 2.25$; incorporated places under $2,500, \$ 1.70$; places 2,500 to 14,999 , $\$ 2.24$; places 15,000 to 74,999 , $\$ 3.18$; places 75,000 to $399,999, \$ 3.33$; Buffalo, $\$ 3.34$; and New York City, $\$ 2.52$.
Rural motor-vehicle owners paid in registration fees and motor-fuel taxes an average of $\$ 27.63$ per vehicle registered; those resident in incorporated places under $2,500, \$ 28.64$; in places 2,500 to $14,999, \$ 30.78$; in places 15,000 to $74,999, \$ 31.33$; in places 75,000 to 399,999 , $\$ 33.35$; in Buffalo, $\$ 31.58$; and in New York City, $\$ 40.15$.
lage streets. Town highways lie entirely outside the limits of incorporated places and are administered by town boards.
The State highway system in 1932 consisted of 12,402 miles, or approximately one-eighth of the total street and road mileage of the State. This mileage is somewhat less than the legal system of State highways as established by the legislature. The system designated by the legislature totaled some 13,947 miles, but for purposes of classification and administration all roads on the designated system are considered to be on the town highway system until they have been improved. Hence, the difference between the two figures given above is equal to the amount of the designated State highway system that was actually maintained by the towns and included in the total mileage of unimproved town highways. Though carried as part of the system designated by the legislature, these roads are actually included in the town highway system in all State reports, programs, and State-aid financing.
OVER 50 PERCENT OF ROADS ON STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM HAD HIGH-TYPE SURFACES
Table 2 gives in summary form the distribution of the various classes of highways throughout the State in 1932. Table 3 shows that of the total mileage, 15.7 percent was pavement

Table 1.-Population in 1930 and full valuation of taxable real property by class of place in 1932

| Class of place | Population |  |  | Full valuation ? |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Per square mile | Amount | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per } \\ & \text { capita } \end{aligned}$ |
| Rural areas | 1,712, 065 | 13.6 | 39 | \$3, 558, 877, 300 | 10.1 | \$2, 079 |
| Places under 2,500 | 372, 073 | 3.0 | 807 | 1, 052, 444, 600 | 3.0 | 2,829 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 847, 114 | 6. 7 | 2, 354 | 2, 162, 089, 200 | 6.2 | 2, 552 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 1,004, 222 | 8.0 | 3, 837 | 2, 137, 796, 300 | 6.1 | 2,129 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 | 1, 149, 070 | 9.1 | 7,860 | 2, 794, 861, 200 | 8. 0 | 2,432 |
| Buffalo: | 573, 076 | 4.5 | 13, 580 | 1,367, 211, 000 | 3.9 | 2,386 |
| New York City | 6, 930, 446 | 55.1 | 22,015 | 22, 027, 926,000 | 62.7 | 3,178 |
| Total | 12, 588, 066 | 100.0 | 279 | $35,101,205,600$ | 100.0 | 2,788 |
| RECAPITULATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rural <br> Urban <br> Total | 1, 712, 065 | 13.6 | 39 | \$3, 558, 877, 300 | 10.1 | 2,079 |
|  | 10,876, 001 | 86.4 | 6,860 | 31, 542, 328, 300 | 89.9 | 2,900 |
|  | 12,588, 066 | 100.0 | 279 | $35,101,205,600$ | 100.0 | 2,788 |

[^1]Table 2.-Location of the various classes of highways and streets in 1932

| Place where highway was located | State high-ways |  | Countyroads |  | Local roads and streets |  | All bighways and streets |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Miles | Percent | Miles | Percent | Miles | Percent | Miles | Percent |
| Rural areas. | 11,507 | 92.8 | 11,682 | 99.0 | 60, 025 | 78.6 | 83, 214 | 82.7 |
| Places under 2,500 | 635 | 5.1 |  | . 5 | 2,619 | 3.4 | 3,315 | 3.3 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 246 | 2.0 | 51 | . 4 | 3,402 | 4.4 | 3,699 | 3.7 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 13 | . 1 | 12 | . 1 | 2, 424 | 3. 2 | 2,449 | 2.4 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 |  |  |  |  | 2,047 | 2.7 | 2,047 | 2.0 |
| Buffalo. |  |  |  |  | 598 | . 8 | 598 | . |
| New York City | 1 | (1) |  |  | 5,270 | 6.9 | 5,271 | 5.3 |
| Total | 12, 402 | 100.0 | 11,806 | 100.0 | 76,385 | 100.0 | 100, 593 | 100.0 |

## RECAPITULATION

| Rural areas Urban areas | $\begin{array}{r} 11,507 \\ 895 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 92.8 \\ 7.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11,682 \\ 124 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 99.0 \\ 1.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60,025 \\ & 16,360 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78.6 \\ & 21.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83,214 \\ & 17,379 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82.7 \\ & 17.3 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 12,402 | 100.0 | 11, 806 | 100.0 | 76, 385 | 100.0 | 100,593 | 100.0 |

[^2](portland-cement concrete, brick, block, or asphalt) while 42.7 percent was earth. All but 2 miles of the total mileage of earth roads were on the town highway system. Niore than half of the State highway system was surfaced with portland-cement concrete, brick, block, or asphalt (fig. 1). The county roads in general were of intermediate type with 58.9 percent of their total mileage constructed of mixed bituminous material and 32 percent of water bound macadam and gravel.

Table 4 shows the mileage figures reduced to miles per square mile of area and per thousand persons. Thus, there was 0.27 mile of State highways per square mile of area and 0.99 mile per 1,000 persons, compared with a total on all systems in the State of 2.23 miles of roads and streets per square mile of area and 8 miles per 1,000 persons.

Table 3.-Classification of highways and streets by type of surface in 1932

BY MILEAGE AND BY PERCENTAGE OF EACH TYPE

| Type of surface | State highways |  | County roads |  | Local roads and streets |  | All highways and streets |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Miles | Percent | Miles | Percent | Miles | Percent | Miles | Percent |
| High type ${ }^{1}$ | 6,377 | 51.4 | 1, 070 | 9.1 | 8,338 | 10.9 | 15,785 | 15.7 |
| Mixed bituminous ${ }^{2}$ | 689 | 5.6 | 6,953 | 58.9 | 1,352 | 1.8 | 8,994 | 8.9 |
| Surface bituminous ${ }^{3}$ | 3,875 | 31.2 |  |  |  |  | 3, 875 | 3.9 |
| Water-bound macadam and gravel. | 1,459 | 11.8 | 3, 783 | 32.0 | 23, 738 | 31.1 | 28,980 | 28.8 |
| Earth | 2 | (4) |  |  | 42,957 | 56.2 | 42,959 | 42.7 |
| Total ${ }^{5}$ | 12, 402 | 100.0 | 11,806 | 100.0 | 76,385 | 100.0 | 100,593 | 100.0 |

BY PERCENTAGE ON EACH SYSTEM

| High type | 40.4 | 6.8 | 52.8 | 100.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mixed bituminous ${ }^{2}$ | 7.7 | 77.3 | 15.0 | 100.0 |
| Surface bituminous ${ }^{3}$ | 100.0 |  |  | 100.0 |
| Water-bound macadam and gravel | 5.0 | 13.1 | 81.9 | 100.0 |
| Earth | (4) |  | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 12.3 | 11.7 | 76.0 | 100.0 |

1 Includes portland-cement concrete, brick, asphalt, and block pavements.
${ }_{2}$ Includes bituminous macadam and other bituminous mixes.
3 Includes penetration macadam and other low-cost bituminous surfaces.
4 Less than 0.1 percent.
5 System as accepted by State-not routes eligible to become State roads.
Table 4.-Mileages of the various classes of roads per square mile of area and per 1,000 persons ${ }^{1}$

| Highway system | Miles per square mile of area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Miles per } \\ 1,000 \\ \text { persons } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State highways. | 0. 27 | 0.99 |
| County roads. | . 26 | . 94 |
| Local roads and streets. | 1. 70 | 6.07 |
| All highways and streets | 2. 23 | 8.00 |

${ }^{1}$ Road mileage figures for 1932 were used. Population and area figures for 1930 were used.

State expenditures for highway purposes in 1932 constituted 33.5 percent of the total State expenditures for all purposes. When all units of government of the State are considered, the total expenditures for highways and streets amounted to 15.8 percent of all expenditures. The magnitude of highway expenditures is noteworthy in light of the fact that the functions of the local units of government are more especially concerned with education and public benefit.

Annual expenditures on the State highway system grew steadily from 1924 to 1932. Much of this increase in cost was caused by the enlargement of the system. In 1922 there were but 8,285 miles of improved highways, while there were more than 12,400 miles of improved highways in 1932. Also, the State built almost twice as many miles of highway in 1932 as it did in 1922.


Figure 1.-Mileage of all Highways and Streets in New York in 1932, by Types.

Table 5 indicates the considerable drop in expenditures which occurred in 1932. New York, like many other State governments throughout the country, felt in 1930 and 1931 that the economic depression would be of short duration and that its end would be hastened and the unemployed given useful work by the expenditure of large sums of money for public works. The figures for 1932 shown in table 5 are not entirely comparable with those of other years inasmuch as some information available for that year was not available for other years, i. e., expenditures by other agencies, such as the conservation department, for highway purposes. Other items, such as the expenditures by relief organizations, were not significant in the highway expenditures for the years prior to 1932 .

## \$17 PER CAPITA SPENT FOR HIGHWAYS IN 1932

One phenomenon of the 1932 road program in New York was the fact that even though total expenditures dropped more than $\$ 16,000,000$ from the high of 1931, a considerably greater mileage was constructed and maintained than would normally be expected with such a large decrease in expenditures. This resulted from a decrease in labor costs and material prices and from extremely low bidding by contractors.
The total highway program in New York cost \$215,583,200 , or $\$ 17.13$ per capita, in 1932. The extent to which the several units of government participated in the 1932 highway program is shown in table 6. State and county expenditures, allocated to the places where the funds were actually spent, are shown in table 7.

Over 31 percent of the total highway expenditures were made for State highways, and other agencies besides the State made expenditures for the State

Table 5.-Expenditures administered by the State on State highway system, 1924-34

| Year | Construction |  |  | Maintenance | Overhead |  |  | Grand total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Highways ${ }^{1}$ | Grade crossings ${ }^{2}$ | Total |  | General ${ }^{3}$ | Interest | Total |  |
| 1924 | \$23, 312, 000 |  | \$23, 312, 000 | \$8, 053, 600 | \$1, 625, 700 | \$2, 847, 600 | \$4, 473, 300 | \$35, 838, 900 |
| 1925 | 26, 232, 000 |  | 26, 232, 000 | 9, 231, 700 | 2, 178,000 | 2, 800,700 | 4,978, 700 | 40, 442, 400 |
| 1926 | 27, 535, 100 |  | 27, 535, 100 | 9,622,800 | 2, 351, 000 | 2, 944, 700 | 5,295, 700 | $42,453,600$ |
| 1927 | 37, 534, 000 |  | 37, 534, 000 | 11, 690,600 | 1, 831, 800 | 3, 069, 100 | 4,900, 900 | 54, 125, 500 |
| 1928 | 39, 931, 100 | \$400 | 39, 931, 500 | 12, 954, 400 | 1,757,900 | 3, 005, 900 | 4,763, 800 | 57, 649, 700 |
| 1929 | 44, 234, 600 | 1, 228,500 | 45, 463, 100 | 14, 048, 700 | 2, 037, 400 | 2,931, 300 | 4,968, 700 | 64, 480, 500 |
| 1930 | 48, 792, 200 | 5, 190, 300 | $53,982,500$ | 14, 270, 700 | 2, 314, 100 | 2, 887, 200 | 5, 201, 300 | 73, 454, 500 |
| 1931 | $56,254,700$ | 4, 754,900 | 61, 009, 600 | $13,320,000$ | 2, 081,000 | 3, 313,700 | 5, 394, 700 | 79, 724, 300 |
| 1932 | $38,001,400$ | 6, 263, 000 | 44, 264, 400 | 13, 773, 700 | 1, 707, 100 | 3, 869,300 | 5, 576, 400 | ${ }^{4} 63,614,500$ |
| 1933 | 25, 416, 200 | 6,963, 600 | 32, 379, 800 | $10,636,100$ | 1, 512, 100 | 5 4, 111, 800 | 5, 623, 900 | 48, 639, 800 |
| 1934 | 32, 565, 400 | 4, 402, 200 | 36, 967, 600 | 9, 879, 200 | 1,788, 500 | $\delta^{5} 4,190,900$ | 5, 979, 400 | 52, 826, 200 |
| Total | 399, 808, 700 | 28,802,900 | 428, 611, 600 | 127, 481, 500 | 21, 184, 600 | 35, 972, 200 | 57, 156, 800 | $613,249,900$ |

${ }^{1}$ Includes grade crossing expenditures made under supervision of the Division of Highways.
${ }_{2}$ Includes only expenditures in Buffalo, Syracuse, and New York City not administered by Department of Public Works.
${ }^{3}$ Includes operation expenses of Bureau of Motor Vehicles of the Department of Taxation and Finance.
4 Includes $\$ 1,152,900$ of county and local funds administered by the State.
s Approximate.
highway system. These additional expenditures include:

1. Payments by the counties for snow removal on State highways $(\$ 645,800)$.
2. Payments by the counties for right-of-way for new construction or reconstruction projects on State highways $(\$ 3,834,000)$.
3. The contributions to the State for work done on county roads which are part of the State system (\$1,152,900).

Table 6.-Total street and highway expenditures as originally made by the several governmental agencies in 1932

| Unit of government making expenditure | Amount of expenditure | Percent | Expenditure per capita |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State, | \$62, 461, 600 | 29.0 |  |
| Towns -- | 22, 531, 100 | 10.5 | 13.16 |
| Places under 2,500 | 1, 729, 600 | . 8 | $\begin{array}{r} 13.165 \\ 4.65 \end{array}$ |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 4, 178,500 | 1.9 | 4.93 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 4, 902, 800 | 2.3 | 4. 88 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 | 5,697, 400 | 2.6 | 4. 96 |
| Num York City | $1,577,600$ $68,587,500$ | 31.8 |  |
| To | 215, 583, 200 | 100.0 | 7.13 |

Table 7.-Total street and highway expenditures as made in each class of place in 1932

| Place where expenditure was made | Amount of expenditure | Percent | Expenditure per capita |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural areas ........ | \$112, 585, 900 | 52.2 | \$65.76 |
| Places under 2,500 | 4,327,500 | 2. 0 | 11.63 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 6,917,000 | 3. 2 | 8.17 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 6, 209, 300 | 2.9 | 6.18 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 | $10,126,600$ | 4. 7 | 8.81 |
| Buffalo | 2, 187, 600 | 1.0 | 3.82 |
| New York City | 73, 229, 300 | 34.0 | 10.57 |
| Total | 215, 583, 200 | 100.0 | 17. 13 |
| RECAPITULATION |  |  |  |
| Rural areas. | $\$ 112,585,900$ | $52.2$ | \$65. 76 |
| Urban areas | $102,997,300$ | $47.8$ | 9.47 |
| Total | 215, 583, 200 | 100.0 | 17.13 |

A large portion but not all of the State highway expenditures is administered through the Division of Highways. Payments of principal and interest on highway debt are in the hands of the State comptroller. Expenditures for snow removal and the purchase of right-of-way are made by the counties. Certain high-
way expenditures are made by the Conservation Department, by the emergency-relief commissions, and by various other special commissions such as the Westchester County Parkway Commission. Funds for grade crossing elimination projects in Buffalo, Syracuse, and New York City are controlled by city commissions. The cost of operation of the Bureau of Motor Vehicles, considered in this study as a highway expenditure, is under the supervision of the Department of Taxation and Finance.

One difficulty encountered in this survey was in making the distinction between expenditures for construction and those for maintenance. The State authorities realized that the maintenance accounts included more than maintenance figures and in 1933 changed the system of records so that expenditures for betterments would not appear as general maintenance. In the analysis of the 1932 accounts, maintenance expenditures as shown are not the reported mainte-nance-fund disbursements but are made up of those items which, as far as could be ascertained, were truly maintenance costs. Table 8 shows expenditures on the several highway systems by the purposes for which they were made, i. e., construction, maintenance, and overhead. The portion expended in or for the benefit of rural areas is given in table 9 .

Table. 8-Total expenditures on the several highway systems in 1932

| Purpose of expenditure | State high- ways | County roads | Local roads and streets | All highways and streets | Percentage of total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction: Amount. Percent | \$48, 907, 900 35.8 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 33,440,800 \\ 24.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 54,398,000 \\ 39.8 \end{array}$ | $\$ 136,746,700$ 100.0 | 63.4 |
| Maintenance: Amount Percent | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 13,635,800 \\ 23.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 3,999,800 \\ & 6.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 41,284,200 \\ 70.1 \end{array}$ | \$58, 919, 800 <br> 100.0 | 27.3 |
| Overhead: 1 Amount. Percent | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5,550,600 \\ 27.9 \end{array}$ | $\$ 843,800$ 4.2 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 13,522,300 \\ 67.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 19,916,700 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ | 9.3 |
| Total: <br> Amount <br> Percent. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 68,094,300 \\ 31.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 38,284,400 \\ 17.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 109,204,500 \\ 50.6 \end{array}$ | $\$ 215,583,200$ <br> 100.0 | 100.0 |

${ }^{1}$ Includes interest payments.
ONE-HALF OF ALL HIGHWAY EXPENDITURES WAS FOR LOCAL ROADS AND STREETS
Maintenance expenditures in 1932 compared to those of previous years show considerable increase caused not only by the greater mileage of highways maintained but

Table 9．－Total highway expenditures on all highway systems in rural areas in 1932

| Purpose of expenditure | State highways |  | County roads |  | Town roads |  |  | 若 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 若 } \\ & \text { 品 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { a } \\ & \text { 8 } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | \＃ O B K | 号 ¢ ¢ م | 品 O 品 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{U}{0} \\ & \text { A } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Construction： <br> Amount．．．．－ <br> Percent | \＄34，590， 600 | 65． 9 | \＄32，773， 700 | 87.3 | \＄6，317， 300 | 28．0 | $\$ 73,681,600$ 100.0 | 65． 4 |
| Maintenance： Amount | \＄12，782， 300 | 24.4 | \＄3，949， 200 | 10.5 | \＄14，431， 000 | 64.1 | \＄31，162， 500 | 27.7 |
|  | $\$ 5,116,300$ 66.1 | 9． 7 | 12.7 $\$ 842,700$ 10.9 | 2． 2 | $\begin{array}{r} 46.3 \\ \$ 1,782,800 \\ 23.0 \end{array}$ | 7.9 | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ \$ 7,741,800 \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ | 6． 9 |
| Total： <br> Amount | \＄52，489， 200 | 100.0 | \＄37，565， 600 | 100.0 | \＄22，531， 100 | 100.0 | \＄112，585，900 | 100.0 |
| Percent | 46.6 |  | 33.4 |  | 20.0 |  | 100.0 |  |

${ }^{1}$ Includes interest payments．
also by the fact that in 1932 the Division of Highways performed many functions of maintenance which it did not formerly undertake．The costs of maintenance per mile and per vehicle are shown in table 10.

While the county roads constituted 11.7 percent of the total highway mileage of the State，they carried but 5.9 percent of the total travel performed by New York State residents on all New York roads and streets in 1932．The travel figures，obtained through the road－ use survey，indicate the small total travel on county roads．This，however，does not mean that the county roads do not have an important place in the highway system of the State．They are in most cases necessary feeder roads which serve to carry local traffic quickly and cheaply to the State highways and other through routes．

An attempt was made during this survey to deter－ mine the amount of county expenditures made for the acquisition of right－of－way for State highways．On the basis of returns to questionnaires received from approx－ imately two－thirds of the county superintendents of highways or from the boards of supervisors，this ex－ penditure was estimated to have been $\$ 3,834,000$ in 1932．The incidental costs in connection with acquir－ ing the various parcels of land for right－of－way were no inconsiderable portion of the total，amounting to ap－ proximately 10 percent for the State as a whole and in some counties running as high as 20 percent of the total．

Table 10．－Per－mile，per－vehicle，and total expenditures for street and highway maintenance in the various places in New York in 1932

| Unit of government where vehicle was registered and where highway expen－ diture was made | Maintenance expenditures |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Expenditure per mile | Expenditure per vehicle registered | Total |
| Rural areas． | \＄374 | \＄69 | \＄31，162， 500 |
| Places under 2，500 | 502 | 11 | 1，662， 300 |
| Places 2，500 to 14，999 | 687 | 10 | 2，540， 300 |
| Places 15，000 to 74，999 | 897 | 9 | 2，197， 000 |
| Places 75，000 to 399，999 | 758 | 6 | 1，550，700 |
| Buffalo ．．．．．．．．．．－．－． | 980 | 5 | 585， 800 |
| New York City | 365 | 24 | 19，221， 200 |
| Total | 586 | 26 | $58,919,800$ |

By legal interpretation the counties are responsible for the maintenance of the State highways between November 15 and May 1，as the highway law provides that the State shall not be liable for damages suffered by any person from defects on State and county high－
ways except between the first day of May and the fifteenth day of November．

Town highways constitute by far the largest mileage in any one class of roads or streets，totaling 60,025 miles or approximately 60 percent of the total mileage of the State．All of this mileage of town highways was in unincorporated areas and more than two－thirds of it was unsurfaced in 1932．The road－use survey shows that town highways carried an average of 8,410 vehicles per mile per year，or but 23 vehicles per mile per day． There are，of course，sizeable areas，adjacent to incor－ porated places，where town highways are of consider－ able importance，and the traffic on town highways in densely populated areas is much heavier than the aver－ age figure indicates．

Table 9 shows that in 1932 more than $\$ 22,500,000$ was expended on the town highways of New York，or more than $\$ 370$ on each mile of the system．
The total city and village street mileage in the State was more than either the county road or the State high－ way mileage，totaling 16,360 miles．Of this， 35.4 per－ cent was in the city of New York．Forty percent of all highway expenditures in the State was made by urban communities．The State and counties spent $\$ 16,323,900$ on routes in urban places，and the total highway ex－ penditure was $\$ 102,997,300$ in these communities．

A distinction is made in these surveys between the taxes imposed specifically for highway purposes and those imposts which are eventually used for roads and streets．The practice in most communities is to place the proceeds from all imposts into a general fund on which vouchers are drawn for all purposes．Highways are supported by the several types of imposts，therefore， in the same ratio that the proceeds from these imposts bear to the total income of the unit of government． More than half of the amount necessary to pay for the total highway costs in 1932 was raised from specific highway taxes which amounted to $\$ 10.13$ per capita or $\$ 55.52$ per vehicle（table 11）．Over one－third of this amount was raised by levies on property．The towns of New York are the only units of government that levy specific highway taxes on property，with the exception of special assessments levied on property benefited in the several villages and cities of the State．

Tables 12 and 13 and figure 2 indicate that half of the cost of State highways was financed by motor－vehicle imposts．In addition，almost $\$ 17,000,000$ of loans and reserves and $\$ 11,401,700$ of Federal aid were necessary to meet these costs．Table 12 gives the breakdown of the amount spent out of current receipts into payments by taxpayers and motor－vehicle owners in the several classes of local units，and thus shows the contributions by each of these classes to the expenditures on the several highway systems and local streets．

## EXPENDITURES FOR ALL PURPOSES AMOUNTED TO \＄108 PER CAPITA

The presentation of highway data alone does not give an indication of the importance of this activity among all functions of the various governmental agencies．It is necessary to show the cost of all governmental operations and the various sources from which imposts are derived to pay for the activities．

Tax，expenditure，and debt data are shown in two ways：

1．By unit of government levying the tax，making the expenditure，or incurring the debt．

2．By actual incidence of tax payment，expendi－ tures made，and debt liability．This applies not only

Table 11.-Specific highway taxes levied for collection, in 1932, by class of place where tax was paid
AMOUNTS OF IMPOSTS

| Class of place where tax was paid | General property tax | Special assessments | Motor-fuel tax | $\underset{\text { fees }}{\text { Registration }}$ | Miscellaneous charges ${ }^{1}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural areas. | \$13, 044, 600 |  | \$6, 144, 200 | \$6, 246, 700 | \$615,700 | \$26, 051, 200 |
| Places under 2,500 | 549,500 | \$302, 300 | 2, 099, 800 | 2, 158, 800 | 212, 600 | 5, 323, 000 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 489,600 54,200 | 399,900 | 3, 899,000 | 3, 846,300 | 385, 400 | 9,391, 8000 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 |  | 4, 232, 500 | 4,697, 200 | 4, 163, 000 | 402, 600 | 13, 495, 300 |
| Buffalo. |  | 455, 300 | 2, 017, 100 | 1,960,800 | 183,600 | 4, 616, 800 |
| New York City |  | 25, 727, 700 | 17, 527, 600 | 14, 474, 100 | 1,787,900 | 59, 517, 300 |
| Total | 14, 137, 900 | 32, 022, 800 | 40, 340, 900 | 36, 987, 000 | 3, 996, 800 | ${ }^{2} 127,485,400$ |

PERCENTAGE, PER-CAPITA, AND PER-VEHICLE DISTRIBUTION OF IMPOSTS

| Percentage of total | 11.1 | 25.1 | 31.7 | 29.0 | 3.1 | 100. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Amount per capita | \$1. 12 | \$2. 54 | \$3. 21 | \$2. 94 | \$0.32 | \$10.13 |
| Amount per vehicle | 6.16 | 13. 95 | 17. 57 | 16. 11 | 1.73 | 55. 52 |

${ }_{1}$ Drivers' licenses, transfers, etc.
${ }_{2}$ An additional $\$ 237,800$ was derived from nonresidents. This amount was composed of $\$ 206,900$ registration fees and $\$ 30,900$ miscellaneous charges.
Table 12.- Approximate amounts of the 1932 taxes and imposts expended on New York highways listed according to highway system, type of tax, and class of local unit by which the tax was paid

PROPERTY TAXES

| Paid by residents of- | State highways |  | County roads |  | Local roads and streets |  | All highways and streets |  | Percentage of total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent |  |
| Rural areas | \$1,780, 000 | 5.7 | \$9, 269, 200 | 29.4 | \$20, 436, 700 | 64.9 | \$31, 485, 900 | 100.0 |  |
| Places under 2,500 |  | 6.8 | 2, 170,600 | 35. 4 | 3,550, 000 |  | 6, 137, 300 | 100.0 |  |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 906,900 929,400 | 7.3 7.4 | $4,722,600$ $4,840,000$ | 38.3 38.5 | $6,716,300$ $6,812,200$ | 54.4 54.1 | $12,345,800$ $12,581,600$ | 100.0 100.0 |  |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 | 980, 100 | 6.0 | 5, 104, 000 | 31.4 | 10,170,400 | 62. 6 | 16, 254, 500 | 1000 |  |
| Buffalo | 619, 600 | 8.5 | 3,226,600 | 44.2 | 3, 454, 100 | 47.3 | 7, 300. 300 | 100.0 |  |
| New York City |  |  |  |  | 44, 807, 300 | 100.0 | 44, 807, 300 | 100.0 |  |
| Total. | ${ }^{1} 5,632,700$ | 4.3 | 29,333, 000 | 22.4 | 95, 947, 000 | 73.3 | 130, 912, 700 | 100.0 | 60.7 |

MOTOR-VEHICLE IMPOSTS

## Rural areas

Places under 2,500
Places 2,500 to 14,999
Places 15,000 to 74,999
Places 75,000 to 399,999 .
Buffalo
New York City.
Total.

| $\$ 5,456,100$ | 65.0 | $\$ 1,368,400$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1,875,500$ | 65.0 | 470,400 |
| $3,580,500$ | 65.0 | 897,900 |
| $3,410,000$ | 65.0 | 855,200 |
| $3,887,400$ | 65.0 | 975,000 |
| $1,807,300$ | 65.0 | 453,300 |
| $14,083,500$ | 65.0 | $3,532,100$ |
| $34,100,300$ | 65.0 | $8,552,300$ |


| 16.3 | $\$ 1,573,100$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 16.3 | 540,800 |
| 16.3 | $1,032,400$ |
| 16.3 | 983,200 |
| 16.3 | $1,120,900$ |
| 16.3 | 521,100 |
| 16.3 | $4,060,700$ |
| 16.3 | $9,832,200$ |


| 18.7 | \$8, 397, 600 | 100.0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18.7 | 2, 886, 700 | 100.0 |  |
| 18.7 | 5,510, 800 | 100. 0 |  |
| 18.7 | 5, 248, 400 | 100.0 |  |
| 18. 7 | 5, 983, 300 | 100.0 |  |
| 18.7 | 2, 781, 700 | 100.0 |  |
| 18.7 | 21, 676, 300 | 100.0 |  |
| 18. 7 | $52,484,800$ | 100.0 | 24.3 |

## OTHER IMPOSTS



ALL TAXES AND IMPOSTS

| Rural areas ...... | \$7, 236, 100 | 18.0 | \$10, 758, 500 | 26.7 | \$22, 246, 100 | 55.3 | \$40, 240, 700 | 100.0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Places under 2,500. | 2, 292, 200 | 25. 2 | 2, 667,800 | 29.3 | 4, 142, 200 | 45.5 | 9,102, 200 | 100.0 |  |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 4,487,400 | 24.8 | 5, 680, 000 | 31.4 | 7,902, 800 | 43.8 | 18, 070,200 | 100.0 |  |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 4, 339, 400 | 23.9 | 5, 766, 200 | 31.8 | 8, 024,900 | 44.3 | 18, 130, 500 | 100.0 |  |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 | 4, 867, 500 | 21. 5 | 6, 160,000 | 27. 2 | 11,609,900 | 51.3 | 22, 637, 400 | 100.6 |  |
| Buffalo.-. | 2, 426, 900 | 23.6 | 3, 719, 800 | 36.2 | 4,125, 900 | 40.2 | 10, 272, 660 | 100.0 |  |
| New York City | 14, 083, 500 | 20.5 | $3,532,1 \mathrm{C0}$ | 5.1 | 51, 152, 700 | 74.4 | 68, 768, 300 | 100.0 |  |
| Total ederal aid | 39, 733, 000 | 21.2 | 38, 284, 400 | 20.5 | 109, 204, 500 | 58.3 | 187, 221, 900 | 100.0 | 86.8 |
| Loans and reserve | 11, 401, 700 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  | 11, 401, 700 | 100.0 | 5.3 |
|  | 16, 959,600 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  | 16,959,600 | 100.0 | 7.9 |
| Grand total | 68, 094, 300 | 31.6 | 38,284, 400 | 17.8 | 109, 204, 500 | 50.6 | 215, 583, 200 | 100.0 | 100. 0 |

[^3]to State and county data but also to the taxes levied, expenditures made, and debt incurred by the town governments. Their taxes are generally a levy on the village residents as well as on the residents of the rural areas of the town because villages are a part of the town in which they are located.

In the State as a whole, $\$ 1,362,616,300$, or $\$ 108$ per resident, was spent for all activities of the State, counties, and local rovermments (fig. 3). Of this amount, $\$ 17$ per capita was the cost of highways. Twenty-nine pereent of the highway expenditure was made by the State, 20.4 percent by the counties, and 50.6 percent by the local governments. Expenditures by the State for education were only 3.6 percent of the total for all governmental units, those for public benefit 13.8 percent, and those for government 14.2 percent.

Public benefit costs accounted for over 55 percent of the expenditures for all purposes by all governmental agencies. Nearly 79 percent of these expenditures was made by the local units of government. Educational activities were almost entirely a matter of local concern, with 96.4 percent of the expenditures for this purpose being made by the towns, villages, cities, and school districts. The county expenditures for education were almost negligible, amounting to only 1 cent per capita, while the State spent about $\$ 1$ per capita for these activities.

Table 14 shows that the local units of governmentthe towns, villages, cities, school districts, and special districts--spent more per capita than did the counties and State. The State and counties made most of their expenditures for public benefit and highways. Expenditures by the local units of government for public benefit were also large, but education costs replaced those of highways as second largest in amount.

Most of the highway expenditures by the State and the counties were made in the rural areas. Added to these expenditures were those made by the local units of government in their respective areas, bringing the


Figure 2.-Distribution of Total Expenditures for Highways and Streets, Showing Sources of Funds.
total expenditures for highways in the rural areas to $\$ 112,585,900$, or $\$ 66$ per capita. Highway expenditures in the urban areas were $\$ 102,997,300$, or $\$ 9.47$ per capita.

Practically all of the other expenditures made by the State and the counties were made for the residents of the State in general proportion to the population distribution (table 15). Public benefit and education expenditures in the urban areas were more per capita than in the rural areas. This is true because urban communities maintain more expensive educational equipment and provide more secondary schools than

T ABLE 13.-Funds expended on highways and streets in New York in 1932 and the approximate amounts and percentages of these funds provided by imposts and by loan and reserve funds, as made by the various governmental units

| Highway system | Governmental agency providing funds |  |  |  |  | Percentage of total current tax funds | Percentage of total funds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Federal | state | County | Local | Total |  |  |
| State highways: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans and reserves. |  | 1 \$16, 959, 604 |  |  | \$16, 959, 600 |  |  |
| Current taxes ... | *11, +01, 700 | 34, 100,300 | * ${ }^{5}, 632,700$ |  | 51, 134. 7110 | 25.7 | --- ---- |
| Total | 11, 401. 700 | 51, 059, 400 | 5. 6332, 700 |  | 68,094,300 |  | 31.6 |
| Percentage of total | 16.7 | 75.0 | 8.3 |  | 100.0 |  |  |
| County roads: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans and reserves Current taxes. |  | \$8, 951, 400 | \$29.333, 000 |  | \$38, 284, 400 | 19. 3 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 'Total.... |  | 8,951,400 | 29, 333, 000 |  | $38,284,400$ |  | 17.8 |
| Percentage of total |  | 23.4 | 76.6 |  | 100.0 | -..- |  |
| Local roads and streets:Joans and reserves |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jooans and reserves. Current taxes |  | 2 \$13, 257, 500 |  | \$45, 947, 000 | \$109, 204, 500 | 55.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. |  | 13, 257, 500 |  | 955. 947.000 | 109, 204, 500 |  | 50.11 |
| Percentage of total |  | 12. 1 |  | 87.9 | 100.0 | --.--- | ...- .... |
| All highways and streels: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans and reserves |  | $\$ 16,459,600$ |  |  | $\$ 16.959, \text {, } ;(k)$ |  |  |
| Current taxes..... | \$11, 401, 700 | 56, 309, 200 | \$34.965, 700 | \$95, 947, 000 | $19 x,(223,6(6)$ | 100.0 |  |
| Total | 11, 401, 700 | 73, 268, 800 | 34, 965. 700 | 95, 947, (40) | 215, 5×3, 200 | - | 100. 6 |
| Percentage of total | 5.3 | 34.0 | 16.2 | 44.5 | 100.0 |  |  |

[^4]

Figure 3.-Per-Capita Expenditures for Different Purposes, Distributed by Governmental Units in or for Which Expenditures Were Made.
do rural areas, and also support many institutions not necessary in the rural areas.

The effect that New York City has on the activities of the entire State and the proportion that the expenditures of this one city bear to the total for the State are illustrated by the fact that of all expenditures, 59.5 percent was made in or for the benefit of the residents of New York City.

Table 14.-Expenditures by all units of government in New York for various purposes, in 1932

| Expenditures madeby- | Total expenditures | Percent | Per-capita expenditures for- |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Highways | Edu- cation | Public benefit | Government | Total |
| State | \$186, 429, 300 | 13.7 | \$4.96 | \$0.97 | \$8. 28 | \$0. 60 | \$14.81 |
| Counties | 110, 312, 200 | 8.1 | 3. 49 | . 01 | 4. 64 | 62 | 8. 76 |
| Towns... | 85, 985, 500 | 6. 3 | 13. 16 | 23.84 | 9.82 | 3. 40 | 50.22 |
| Places under 2,500 | 17, 268, 600 | 1.3 | 4.65 | 30. 63 | 9. 00 | 2.13 | 46.41 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999.- | 40, 817, 500 | 3. 0 | 4. 93 | 22. 50 | 17.83 | 2.92 | 48.18 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999- | 57, 470, 400 | 4. 2 | 4. 88 | 22.91 | 26. 72 | 2. 72 | 57. 23 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999. | 84, 816, 700 | 6.2 | 4. 96 | 26. 01 | 38.76 | 4.08 | 73.81 |
| Buffalo... | 42, 074, 100 | 3.1 | 2.75 | 23.51 | 44.81 | 2.35 | 73. 42 |
| New York City | 737, 442, 000 | 54.1 | 9.90 | 27.28 | 66. 29. | 2.94 | 106. 41 |
| Total | 1, $362,616,300$ | 100.0 | 17. 13 | 26.93 | 59.93 | 4.26 | 108. 25 |
| RECAPITULATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| State | \$186, 429, 300 | 13. 7 | \$4. 96 | \$0. 97 | \$8. 28 | \$0.60 | \$14.81 |
| Counties | 110,312, 200 | 8. 1 | 3. 49 | 01 | 4.64 | . 62 | 8. 76 |
| Local governments. | 1, 065, 874, 800 | 78.2 | 8. 68 | 25. 95 | 47.01 | 3.04 | 84.68 |
| Total. | 1, $362,616,300$ | 100.0 | 17. 13 | 26. 93 | 59.93 | 4. 26 | 108. 25 |

Table 15.-Expenditures by State, counties, and local governments for various purposes, showing unit of government in or for which expenditure was made in 1932

| Expenditures made in or for residents of - | Total expenditures | Percent | Per-capita expenditures for - |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ifigh- } \\ & \text { ways } \end{aligned}$ | Education | Public benefit | Government | Total |
| Rural areas <br> Places under 2,500.... <br> Places 2,500 to 14,999. <br> Places 15,000 to 74,999. <br> Places 75,000 to 399.999 <br> Buffalo <br> New York City | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 206,827,400 \\ 29,607,100 \\ 67,266,300 \\ 80,561,000 \\ 114,071,900 \\ 53,952,800 \\ 810,329,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.2 \\ 3.2 \\ 4.9 \\ 5.9 \\ 8.4 \\ 3.9 \\ 39.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 65.76 \\ 11.63 \\ 8.17 \\ 6.18 \\ 8.81 \\ 3.82 \\ 10.57 \end{array}$ | $\$ 24.83$31.6023.4823.3827.0224.5428.25 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 25.92 \\ 30.43 \\ 41.50 \\ 45.26 \\ 57.45 \\ 61.53 \\ 74.56 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 4.30 \\ 5.91 \\ 6.26 \\ 4.90 \\ 5.99 \\ 4.26 \\ 3.54 \end{gathered}$ | $\$ 120.81$ <br> 79.57 <br> 79.41 <br> 80.22 <br> 99.27 <br> 94.15 <br> 116.92 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tot | 1, 362, 616, 300 | 100.0 | 17. 13 | 26.93 | 59.93 | 4. 26 | 108. 25 |
| RECAPITULATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rural areas <br> Urban areas. | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 206,827,400 \\ & 1,155,788,900 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.2 \\ 84.8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 65.76 \\ 9.47 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 24.83 \\ 27.26 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 25.92 \\ 65.28 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 4.30 \\ 4.26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 120.81 \\ 106.27 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 1,362, 616, 300 | 100.0 | 17. 13 | 26.93 | 59.93 | 4. 26 | 108. 25 |



Figure 4.-Imposts as Levied and as Paid by the Several Units of Government of New York in 1932.

LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT LEVIED 74 PERCENT OF ALL IMPOSTS
Tables 16 and 17 and figure 4 give a comparison between the imposts levied by a unit of government and the taxes which its residents must pay. From these tables the proportion that each kind of impost levied-property, motor-vehicle, other taxes, and miscellaneous imposts-bears to the total of all taxes can be seen. Thus, of the total of $\$ 96$ per capita which residents of New York paid to the State, counties, and local units of government in taxes, $\$ 20$ or 20.5 percent was levied by the State and $\$ 6$ or 5.8 percent by the counties, while the local units levied the remainder, $\$ 71$ or 73.7 percent. It is evident that the local units of government created the largest tax bill in the levy of imposts for carrying out of their own local functions. In this respect, New York City was highest with $\$ 86$ per capita.

The State obtained little of its income from the general property tax. The court stenographers' and armory taxes were levies on general property, but the proceeds were distributed to the counties and judicial districts of the State and were not used for State purposes. The greatest share of State imposts came from motor-vehicle and other imposts, such as personal

Table 16.-Total and per-capita amounts of imposts levied by the several units of government in 1932

| Levied by- | Total of all imposts | Percent | Imposts per capita |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Property taxes | Motorvehicle imposts | Other taxes | Mis-cellaneous | Total |
| State | \$248, 519, 600 | 20.5 | \$0.08 | \$6. 46 | \$13. 20 |  | \$19.74 |
| Counties | 70, 952, 400 | 5. 8 | 5. 24 |  |  | \$0. 40 | 5. 64 |
| Towns | 66, 474, 200 | 5. 5 | 37. 26 |  |  | 1.57 | 38.83 |
| Places under 2,500 $\ldots$... | 12,096, 600 | 1. 0 | 30.89 |  |  | 1. 62 | 32.51 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999.- | 37, 424, 700 | 3. 1 | 41.40 |  |  | 2.78 | 44. 18 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999. | 59, 210, 700 | 4. 9 | 56. 36 |  |  | 2. 60 | 58.96 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999. | 83, 210, 700 | 6. 9. | 70.82 |  |  | 1. 60 | 72.42 |
| Buffalo... | 39, 153, 100 | 3.2 | 66. 86 |  |  | 1. 46 | 68. 32 |
| New York City | 595, 529, 800 | 49.1 | 79.97 |  |  | 5. 96 | 85.93 |
| Total | 1,212,571,800 | 100.0 | 72. 13 | 6.46 | 13. 20 | 4.54 | 96. 33 |

RECAPITULATION

| State <br> Counties <br> Local governments | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 248,519,600 \\ 70,952,400 \\ 893,099,800 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.5 \\ 5.8 \\ 73.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 0.08 \\ 5.24 \\ 66.81 \end{gathered}$ | \$6. 46 | \$13. 20 | $\$ 0.40$4.14 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 19.74 \\ 5.64 \\ 70.95 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1, 212, 571, 800 | 100.0 | 72. 13 | 6. 46 | 13. 20 | 4. 54 | 96. 33 |

Table 17.-Total and per-capita amounts of imposts as finally paid by the residents of the several classes of places in 1932


Table 18.-Property tax rates per $\$ 100$ valuation and their relation to the total of all imposts in 1932

| Paid by residents of- | Actual tax rate on property | Tax rate needed to raise all taxes hy property levies | Percentage that property taxes are of all imposts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural areas | \$2. 25 | \$3. 28 | 68.7 |
| Places under 2,500 | 1. 70 | 2. 62 | 64.8 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 2. 24 | 3. 28 | 68.3 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 3. 18 | 4. 23 | 75.3 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 | 3. 33 | 4.19 | 79.5 |
| Buffalo. | 3. 34 | 4. 18 | 80.4 |
| New York City | 2. 52 | 3. 33 | 75.7 |
| Average for State | 2. 59 | 3. 45 | 74.9 |

from a property levy, property would have had to pay $\$ 3.28$ per $\$ 100$ of value.

It is also evident that in the State as a whole the property levies constituted the major source of reve-nue- 74.9 percent. The ratio of property levies to total imposts was highest in Buffalo where 80.4 percent of the revenues was derived from the taves on property

Table 19 and figure 6 show relations between the taxes paid by a community and the expenditures made in or for the benefit of the community by State, county, and local governments. In rural areas, incorporated places under 2,500 , and in New York City, expenditures by and for the community exceeded the taxes paid. In the other incorporated places expenditures ranged from 89 to 97 percent of taxes paid. For the State as a whole expenditures exceeded taxes. This situation was due in a large measure to the financing by borrowings necessitated primarily by heavy expenditures for relief.

Table 19.-Imposts paid by and expenditures made in or for the benefit of residents of the several classes of places in 1932

| Place | Imposts |  |  | Expenditures |  |  | Ratio of ex-penditures to taxes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total amount | Percent | Per capita | Total amount | Percent | Per capita |  |
| Rural areas | \$116, 841, 100 | 9.6 | \$68. 25 | \$206, 827,400 | 15. 2 | \$120. 81 | 1. 77 |
| Places under 2,500 | 27, 556, 300 | 2.3 | 74.06 | 29, 607, 100 | 2. 2 | 79.57 | 1.07 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999.- | 71,019,700 | 5.9 | 83.84 | 67, 266, 300 | 4.9 | 79.41 | 95 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,949 | 90, 381, 400 | 7. 4 | 90.00 | 80,561,000 | 5.9 | 80.22 | 84 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 | 117, 028, 100 | 9.7 | 101.85 | 114, 071,900 | 8.4 | 99.27 | 97 |
| Buffalo. | 56, 991, 500 | 4. 7 | 99. 45 | 53, 952, 800 | 3. 9 | 94. 15 | 95 |
| New York City | 732, 753, 700 | 60.4 | 105.73 | 810, 329, 800 | 59.5 | 116. 92 | 1.11 |
| Total | 1,212,571,800 | 100.0 | 96.33 | 1,362,616,300 | 100.0 | 108. 25 | 1.12 |
| RECAPITULATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rural areas | \$116, 841, 100 | 9. 6 | \$68. 25 | \$206, 827, 400 | 15.2 | \$120.81 | 1.77 |
| Urban areas. | 1,095,730,700 | 90.4 | 100.75 | 1,155,788,900 | 84.8 | 106. 27 | 1.05 |
| Total | 1,212,571,800 | 100.0 | 96. 33 | 1,362,616,300 | 100.0 | 108. 25 | 1.12 |



Figure 5.-Actual Tax Rates on General Property in the Several Classes of Places, and Rates Needed to Raise all Taxes by Property Levies.


Figure 6.-Per-Capita Taxes Paid by and Expenditures Made for Residents of the Several Units of Government by all Governmental Agencies in New York in 1932.

LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT MADE 78 PERCENT OF ALL GOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURES

Tables 20,21 , and 22 give the amounts of taxes levied and expenditures made by the local communities in relation to similar transactions for the community by the State and county. For example, 53 percent of the taxes paid by residents of the rural areas were levied by the local governments and 47 percent by the State and county (table 20). Of the $\$ 206,827,400$ of expenditures made in or for the benefit of rural residents, however, 61.6 percent was by State and county and 38.4 percent by the local unit of government itself.

The primary debt and debt service data for New York in 1932 are summarized in tables 23, 24, and 25. ()f particular importance are the following facts:

1. Over one-half ( 53.5 percent) of the outstanding debt was originally incurred for public benefit purposes.
2. New York City itself had outstanding over onehalf ( 58.4 percent) of the entire debt incurred by all units of government and was liable for the payment of 66.5 percent of all debt.
3. Local debt for public benefit constituted 55.5 percent of the total local debt outstanding.
4. The outstanding debt per capita for all purposes was $\$ 299.94$, of which $\$ 240.71$ was local debt.
5. Rural areas (which incurred 4.4 percent of the outstanding debt) were liable for the payment of 7.7 percent of the total debt.
6. Interest and principal payments on short-term debt constituted 74.1 percent of all debt-service costs.
7. Interest payments were but 12.9 percent of the debt service costs; retirements constituted the remaining 87.1 percent.

The incidence of motor-vehicle imposts was determined by an analysis of over 100,000 registration applications and the replies to as many questionnaires distributed to motor-vehicle owners throughout the State. In the analysis the data from the State motor-vehicle bureau were grouped under the following designations: "Cars" include passenger cars, taxis, and the majority of dealer registrations; "trucks and busses" consist of busses (from the State omnibus classification), commercial vehicles, ambulances, suburban cars, and a small number of vehicles with dealer licenses; trailers and motorcycles are "other" vehicles.
The New York motor-vehicle bureau licensed $2,302,259$ vehicles $^{4}$ in 1932, of which 6,196 vehicles were registered by nonresidents. The residents of New York State, therefore, procured licenses for $2,296,063$ vehicles. Most of the vehicles registered were cars- 84.3 percent (table 26). The proportion of cars to trucks remained fairly constant except in the rural areas where, as would be expected, there were relatively more trucks than in the urban areas. In rural areas a truck is often the only vehicle owned, serving both as pleasure and business vehicle. Or if a passenger car is owned, a truck is usually also necessary.

[^5]Table 20.-Imposts paid by ard expenditures made in or for the benefit of residents of rural areas in 1932 CLASSIFICATION OF TAXES AND GOVERMENTAL UNIT LEVYING THEM


CLASSIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES BY PURPOSE AND BY GOVERMENTAL C'NIT MAKING THEM


Table 21.-Imposts paid by and expenditures made in or for the benefit of residents of urban areas in 1932 CLASSIFICATION OF TAXES AND GOVERNMENTAL UNIT LEVYING THEM


CLASSIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES BY PURPOSE AND BY GOVERNMENTAL UNIT MAKING THEM


TABLE 22.-Imposts paid by and experditures made in or for the benefit of residents of all units of government of New York State in 1982 CLASSIFICATION OF TAXES AND GOVERNMENTAL UNIT LEVYING THEM




TABLE 23.-Total debt outstanding in 1932, showing murpose and unit of government by which incurred

| Tnit of government by which incurred | Purpose for which originally incurred |  |  |  | Tolal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hiohways | Education | Public henefit | Government |  |
| State: |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {A Prount }}$ | \$1122, 1227, 100 | *5, 592, 700 | * $2225,487,800$ | \$164, 843, 6001 | \$497, 451,2001 |
| Percent <br> Per capita | 20.5 $\$ 8.11$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.1 \\ \$ 0.44 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 45.3 \\ \$ 17.91 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.1 \\ \$ 13.10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ \$ 39.56 \end{array}$ |
| Counties: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amount. | 490, 000,400 36.3 | $\underset{(1)}{\$ 5,900}$ | \$114, 427, 100 | \$43, 198, 800 | $\$ 247,632,200$ 100.0 |
| Per capita. | \$7. 15 | (2) | \$9.09 | \$3.43 | \$19.67 |
| Local governments: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amount | \$435, 981, 164 | *565, 810, 400 | \$1, 680, 632, 800 | \$347, 742, 600 | \$3, 030, 146,900 |
| Percent Per capita | $\begin{array}{r} 14.4 \\ \$ 34.63 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.6 \\ \$ 44.95 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 55.5 \\ \$ 133.51 \end{array}$ | 11.5 $\$ 27.62$ | 100.0 $\$ 240.71$ |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amount | \$627.93x, 600 | \$571, 409, 000 | \$2, 020, 547, 700 | \$555, 785, 000 | \$3, 775, 730, 3011 |
| Percent | 16.7 | 15.1 | 53.5 | 14.7 | 100.0 |
| Per capita. | \$49,89 | \$45. 39 | \$160). 51 | \$4.15 | \$299. 94 |

$$
1 \text { Less Ih:m } 0.1 \text { percent. }
$$

$$
{ }^{2} \text { Lees than \$10.01. }
$$

The extent of the influence of New York City registrations on the average for the State is readily apparent. The heavy traffic conditions, inaccessibility to through routes, and large proportion of persons unable to finance an automobile account for the relatively low registration in this area. Registration figures possess more significance when expressed in terms of persons per vehicle (table 26). The following relations are apparent: (1) There were more velicles compared to population in rural than in urban areas; (2) the proportion of trucks registered in rural areas to those in urban places was greater than the proportion of cars in the rural areas to those in the urban areas; (3) the small incorporated communities had relatively more registrations

Table 24.-Liability of residents of rural and urban areas for payment of outstanding debt of State, counties, and local governments in 1932

| Deht liability of residents of- | Total deht liability | Percent | Amount per capita |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural areas. | \$290, 686, 000 | 7.7 | \$169.79 |
| Places under 2,500. | 70, 638, 400 | 1.9 | 189.85 |
| Places 2.500 to 14.999 | 200, 808,300 | 5.3 | 237.05 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 215, 964. 300 | 5.7 | 215. 06 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 | 323, 937, 000 | 8.6 | 281.91 |
| Buffalo | 160, 595, 100 | 4.3 | 280.23 |
| New York City | 2, 513, 158, 300 | 66.5 | 362. 63 |
| Total | 3, 775, 787, 400 | 100.0 | 29995 |
| RECAPITULATION |  |  |  |
| Rural areas | 290. 6866.000 | 7.7 | 169.79 |
| Total | 3, 775, 887.400 | 100.0 | 299.95 |

Table 25.-Total debt service payments by all units of government in 1932

| Item | Total amount | Percent | Percentage of total | Amourt per capita |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bonded debt: |  |  |  |  |
| Interest. <br> Principal. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 134,430,400 \\ 148,703,900 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47.5 \\ & 52.5 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10.6 \mathrm{fx} \\ 11.81 \end{array}$ |
| Total | 283, 134, 300 | 100.0 | 25.9 | 22. 49 |
| Short-term debt: |  |  |  |  |
| Interest | 7, 218, 800 | 9 |  | 57 |
| Principal | 804, 376, 700 | 99.1 |  | 63.90 |
| Total | 811, 595, 500 | 100.0 | 74.1 | 64. 47 |
| All debt: |  |  |  |  |
| Interest. | 141, 649, 200 | 12.9 |  |  |
| Principal | 953, 080, 600 | 87.1 |  | 75.71 |
| Total | 1, 094, 729, 800 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 86. 96 |

Table 26.-Number and types of motor vehicles registered and persons per vehicle in 1932, by place of registration

| Place of registration | Type of vehicles registered |  |  |  |  | Persons per vehicle |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \overleftarrow{\#} \\ \stackrel{3}{0} \end{gathered}$ | \# $\stackrel{\text { H }}{ }$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { 믖 } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & E \end{aligned}\right.$ | 亏 |
|  | Number | Number | Number | Number | Percent |  |  |  |
| Rural areas | 360,531 <br> 127 | 81,581 19,199 | 6, 334 <br> 1,632 | 448,446 148,698 | 19.5 6.5 | 4. 7 | 21.0 19.4 | 3. 8 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999 | 225, 224 | 34, 810 | 2,920 | 262,954 | 11.4 | 3.8 |  | 3. 2 |
| Places 15,000 to 74,999 | 212, 773 | 31, 571 | 2,891 | 247, 235 | 11.8 | 4.7 | 31.8 | 4.1 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,999 | 232, 915 | 29,690 | 3,063 | 265, 668 | 11.6 | 4.9 |  | 4.3 |
| Buffalo.. | 110, 708 | 13, 933 | 1,320 | 125, 961 | 5.5 | 5. 2 | 41.1 | 4.5 |
| New York City | 666, 938 | 121, 234 | 8,929 | 797, 101 | 34.7 | 10.4 | 57.2 | 8.7 |
| Total | 1,936, 956 | 332, 018 | 27, 089 | 2, 296, 063 | 100.0 | 6.5 | 37.9 | 5.5 |
| RECAPITULATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rural areas $\qquad$ <br> Urban areas <br> Total $\qquad$ <br> Percentage of total. | 360, 531 | 81,581 | 6,334 | 448, 446 | 19.5 | 4. 7 | 21.0 | 3.8 |
|  | 1,576, 425 | 250, 437 | 20,755 | 1,847,617 | 80.5 | 6.9 | 43. | 5. 9 |
|  | 1,936, 956 | 332, 018 | 27, 089 | 2, 296, 063 | 100.0 | 6.5 | 37.9 | 5.5 |
|  | 84.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

than any of the other units of government; and (4) exclusive of the incorporated communities under 15,000 , the proportionate number of vehicles decreased as the population increased.

MOTOR-VEHICLE IMPOSTS PROVIDED $\$ 67$ OF EACH $\$ 1,000$ OF TAXES IN 1932
License fees collected for the 1932 registration year amounted to $\$ 37,193,900$. Nonresidents obtained licenses for 6,196 rehicles and paid $\$ 206,900$. New York residents obtained licenses for 2,296,063 vehicles and paid $\$ 36,987,000$ (table 27). Cars comprised 84.3 percent of the vehicle registrations, and 73 percent of the registration fees were paid for them (fig. 7). This difference is caused by the lower fees paid by passenger vehicles. The contrast between rural and urban areas is interesting. Passenger cars in rural areas constituted 80.4 percent of the rural registrations and 73.2 percent of the rural registration fees were paid for them, while cars in urban places comprised 85.3 percent of the urban registrations and only 72.9 percent of the urban registration fees were paid for them. Passenger cars owned by rural residents comprised 18.6 percent of the total State passenger-car registration and 16.9 percent of the passenger-car registration fees were paid for them. The proportionate difference is even greater for trucks.

## HIGHWAY TAXES AND HIGHWAY EXPENDITURES

Expenditures on the State highway system in 1932 were $\$ 68,094,300$; on the county system, $\$ 38,284,400$; and on local roads and streets, $\$ 109,204,500$.

Of the total property taxes expended on all roads and streets, 4.3 percent was expended on State highways; 22.4 percent on county roads; and 73.3 percent on local roads and streets.

Of the total motor-vehicle imposts expended on all roads and streets, 65 percent was expended on the State system, 16.3 percent on county roads, and 18.7 percent on local roads and streets.

Of all taxes and imposts expended on roads and streets, rural property and motor-vehicle owners paid 21.5 percent, and travel by rural owned vehicles made up 18.2 percent of all travel by residents on New York streets and highways; urban property and vehicle owners paid 78.5 percent and urban owned vehicles provided 81.8 percent of the total travel by residents on New York streets and highways.


Figure 7.--Percentage Distribution of all Vehicles by Number Registered and by Registration Fees and Gasoline Taxes Paid.

The explanations for these differences are apparent from table 27, which gives the per-vehicle fees. For both cars and trucks in the rural areas lower registration fees were paid than for vehicles in urban places (fig. 8). This was expected because the registration fee schedule is based on the weight of vehicles, and vehicles owned in rural areas tend to be lighter than those owned in urban areas. The heavy contracthauler and common-carrier trucks are generally registered in the cities or villages. The trucks owned in rural areas, mainly for private use, are light-weight. trucks.

The more expensive passenger cars are usually owned by residents of larger cities and villages. The more valuable car is usually also the heavier vehicle. The general tendency for per-vehicle fees to increase as the place of registration becomes larger in population is evident also for trucks as well as for passenger cars.

No motor-fuel tax was collected in New York State until 1929. During the following 4 years the total revenues from this source increased more than 100 percent and the average tax per vehicle doubled. The motor-fuel tax collected in 1932 totaled $\$ 40,340,900$, of which 74.5 percent was paid for cars and 25.5 percent for trucks and busses. The ratio of the amount contributed by cars to the total amount, for both rural and urban areas, was almost the same.

Residents of rural areas furnished 19.5 percent of the total motor-vehicle registration and paid 15.2 percent of the gasoline tax. The percentages are nearly the same


Figure 8.-Average Registration Fees and Motor-Fuel Taxes Paid by Motor-Vehicle Owners, Distributed by Place of Ownership.

Table 27.-Motor-vehicle registration fees and motor-fuel taxes paid by vehicle owners in rural and urban areas in 1932

MOTOR-VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES

| Paid by vehicle owners of- | Total payments |  |  |  | Per-vehicle payments ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pussenger cars | Trucks and busses | Other | 'Tutal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pas- } \\ & \text { sen- } \\ & \text { ger } \\ & \text { cars } \end{aligned}$ | Trucks and busses | Other | Total |
| Rural areas - | $\$ 4,575,200$ $22,405,800$ | $\$ 1,630,500$ | $\$ 41,000$ | $\$ 6,246,700$ <br> 30,740 | \$12.69 | \$19.99 | 86. 47 | \$13.93 |
| Total | 26, 981, 000 | 9, 742, 200 | 253, 800 | 36, 987, 000 | 13.93 | 29. 34 | 9. 74 | 16. 11 |
| MOTOR-FUEL TAX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rural areas Urban areas | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 4,725,6,600 \\ & 25,333,300 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,418,600 \\ 8,863,400 \end{array}$ |  | \$6. 144, 200 <br> 34, 196, 700 | $\begin{array}{\|} \$ 13.11 \\ 16.07 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 7.3 .9 \\ 35.39 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 13.90 \\ 18.72 \end{array}$ |
| Total | $30,058,900$ | 10.282,000 |  | 40,340.900 | 15. 52 | 30.97 |  | 17.78 |

REGISTRATION FEES AND MOTOR-FUEL TAX

 | Rural areas $\ldots$. | $\$ 9,300,800$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| T'rban areas $-147,739,100$ | $16,975,100$ |

| Total | $\overline{57,039,900}$ | $\overline{20}, 024,200$ | 263,800 | $77,327,900$ | 29.45 | 60.31 | 9.74 | 33.68 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

I other vehicles are not included in motor-fuel tax per vehicle; therefore total pervehicle registration fees and motor-fuel taxes do not equal the sum of per-vehicle payments.
for cars and trucks taken separately. For the average car in rural areas a gasoline tax of $\$ 13.11$ was paid and for the arerage truck and bus $\$ 17.39$ was paid. In contrast, urban residents paid $\$ 16.07$ per car and $\$ 35.39$ per truck and bus. For the State as a whole for each vehicle registered in 1932 a gasoline tax of $\$ 17.78$ was paid.

I tendency similar to that observed in the registration fees may also be pointed out for the gasoline tax; i. c., the average tax increased as the size of the place in which the vehicle was registered increased.

Registration fees and gasoline taxes constitute the major portion of the special imposts on motor-vehicle owners. In addition, however, certain miscellaneous fees amounting to $\$ 3,996,800$ were paid, raising the total contributions by motor-vehicle owners to $\$ 81,324,-$ 700. The imposis included in this rlassifieation were
chauffeurs' and operators' licenses, fees from driving school, and other imposts such as fines, penalties, and reregistrations. These taxes averaged less than $\$ 2$ per vehicle.

Administration of the vehicle and traffic laws and of the motor-fuel tax is performed by the Department of Taxation and Finance. During 1932, \$1,497,200 was the cost of administering the vehicle and traffic law, amounting to 65 cents per vehicle registered or 4 percent of the total collections. The greater share of this cost was for the registration and licensing activities. It cost $\$ 92,300$ to collect the $\$ 40,340,900$ of gasoline tax, an average of 4 cents per vehicle registered in the State and but 0.2 percent of the total tax collected.

Tables 28, 29, 30, and figure 9 summarize pertinent facts determined by the financial survey. The following statements emphasize some of the most important relations determined by this study.

## SUMMARY

1. Rural property owners paid no tax for urban streets.
2. Urban property owners in the villages paid taxes for town highways.
3. Of that portion of the total property tax on rural property expended for highways:
(a) 5.7 percent was expended on State trunk highways.
(b) 29.4 percent was expended on county roads.
(c) 64.9 percent was expended on town highways.

Table 28.--Sources of each $\$ 1,000$ of taxes in New York in 1932

| Residents of- | Pay in- |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (ieneral property taxes | Motorrehicle imposts | Miscellaneous imposts |
| Rural areas | \$65. 89 | \$10. 73 | \$19.52 |
| Places under 2,500 | 14.98 | 3.69 | 4. 24 |
| Places 2,500-14.999 | 40. 4.3 | 7.04 | 11. 611 |
| Places 15,000-74.999 | 56.16 | 6.71 | 11. 611 |
| Places 75,000-399,999 | 76. 37 | 7. 65 | 12. 16 |
| Buffalo. | 37. 44 | 3. 55 | 5. 8 ! |
| New York City | 457. 50 | 27.70 | 119.15 |
| Total | 718.72 | 1i7. 07 | 194. 119 |

Table 29.-Pcrcentage distribution of financial, travel, and other data, for 1932

| Class of place | Population 1 | Area ${ }^{1}$ | Property valuation | Highway mileages | Motorvehicles registered | All taxes paid paid | Motorvehicle imposts paid | All expendi- tures | Highway expenditures | Travel performed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural areas | Percent 13.6 | Percent 96. 5 | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| Places under 2.50 Mr | 3.10 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 6. 5 | 3. 5 | 5. 5 | 3.1 | 2.0 | 7.0 |
| Places 2,500 to 14,999. | 6. 7 | . 8 | 13.2 | 3.7 | 17.1 | 7.9 | 11. 5 | 5. 8 | 3.2 | $1 . .9$ |
| Places 15,000 to 74.999 | s.11 | 6 | f. 1 | 2.4 | 111.5 | 7.7 | 11.11 | 6. 11 | 2.9 | 11.3 |
| Places 75,000 to 399,099 | 9.1 | 3 | 8.0 | 2.11 | 11.16 | 8. 7 | 11.4 | 8.1 | 4.7 | 12.1 |
| Buffalo. | 1.5 | 1 | 3.9 | , ${ }^{\text {i }}$ | 5.5 | 4. 11 | 5. 3 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 6.1 |
| New York City | 55.1 | 7 | 62. 7 | 5. 3 | 34.7 | 55.1 | 41.3 | 39.1 | 34.0 | 33.2 |
| Total. | 100. 01 | 100. 01 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 180.0 | 1001.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10n.0 | 1010.0 |

## RECAPITULATION

| Kural areas C'rban areas | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \\ & 86.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96.5 \\ 3.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.1 \\ 89.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82.7 \\ & 17.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.5 \\ 80.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.1 \\ 86.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16.0 \\ 84.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.2 \\ & \text { 1i5. } 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52.2 \\ & 47.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.2 \\ & 81.8 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | $100.0)$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.11 |

${ }^{1}$ Figures for 1930.

Table 30.-Purposes for which each $\$ 1,000$ of expenditures were made in New York in 193 ?

| Expended for- | Source of funds expended | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State highways. | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Taxes paid in: } \\ \text { Rural areas.... } \\ \text { Vrban areas.... } \\ \text { Federal aid.......... } \\ \text { Loans and reserves. }\end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 5.30 \\ 23.85 \\ 8.40 \\ 12.45 \end{array}$ |
|  | Total | 50.00 |
| County roads . | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { Taxes paid in: } \\ \text { Rurat areas } \\ \text { [rhan areas } \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.31 \\ 20.25 \end{array}$ |
|  | Total | 28.16 |
| Local roads and streets | $\left\{\begin{array}{c} \text { Taxes paid in: } \\ \text { Rural areas } \\ \text { Urban areas } \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.33 \\ & 63.72 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | TTotal | 80.05 |
| Total all highways and streets Education <br> Public benefit |  | 158. 21 |
|  |  | 248.81 |
|  |  | 553.61 |
| Government Grand total. |  | 39.37 |
|  |  | 1,000.00 |

4. Of that portion of the total tax on urban property expended for highways:
(a) 25.7 percent was expended on rural roads.
(b) 74.3 percent was expended on urban streets.
5. Of that portion of the total taxes on urban property expended for highways:
(a) 3.9 percent was expended on State highways. (The counties contribute funds for the State highway system, and such contributions are financed out of general property taxes and the county portion of motor-vehicle imposts.)
(b) 20.2 percent was expended on county roads.
(c) 75.9 percent was expended on local roads and streets. The figure of 75.9 percent for local roads and streets may be divided into 1.6 percent of urban funds which went to town highways and 74.3 percent to city and village strects. The figure of 1.6 percent was the contribution by village taxpayers to town highways.
6. Since, of the total property valuation of $\$ 35,101,205,600, \$ 3,558,877,300$ or 10.1 percent was in rural areas and 89.9 percent was in urban areas:
(a) Expenditures from property taxes for all highways were at the following rates:

Rural- 88.5 cents per $\$ 100$ of full valuation.
Urban--31.5 cents per $\$ 100$ of full valuation
(b) Expenditures from property taxes for the State highvays were at the following rates:


Figure 9.--Percentage Distribution of Motor Vehicles Registered, Contribution to Current Taxes Expended on Highways and Streets, and Travel Performed, Distributed by the Several Classes of Places.

Rural--5 cents per $\$ 100$ of full valuation.
Urban- 1.2 cents per $\$ 100$ of full valuation.
(c) Expenditures from property taxes for county roads were at the following rates:

Rural- 26.1 cents per $\$ 100$ of full valuation.
Trban - 6.4 cents per $\$ 100$ of full valuation.
(d) Expenditures from property taxes for town highways and city and village streets were at the following rates:

Rural-57.4 cents (all for town highways) per $\$ 100$ of full valuation.
Urban- 23.9 cents per $\$ 100$ of full valuation.
7. Of that portion of the total property taxes used for all highways:
(a) 4.3 percent was expended on State highways.
(b) 22.4 percent was expended on the county roads.
(c) 15.6 percent was expended on the town highways.
(d) 57.7 percent was expended on city and village streets.
8. Of the total motor-vehicle imposts expended on all classes of roads and streets:
(a) Rural motor-vehicle owners paid 16 percent and travel by these same rural owners made up 18.2 percent of the total travel on all classes of roads and streets.
(b) Urban motor-vehicle owners paid 84 percent and accounted for 81.8 percent of the total travel.
9. Of the total motor-vehicle imposts:
(a) 65 percent was expended on the State highways.
(b) 16.3 percent was expended on county roads.
(c) 3 percent was expended on town highways.
(d) 15.7 percent was expended on city and village streets.
10. Of all imposts and taxes expended on all highways and streets:
(a) 21.2 percent was expended on State highways.
(b) 20.5 percent was expended on county roads.
(c) 11.9 percent was expended on town highways.
(d) 46.4 percent was expended on city and village streets.
11. Of that portion of the total of all taxes and imposts which was expended on all highways and streets:
(a) Rural property and motor-vehicle owners paid 21.5 percent, and travel by rural vehicles made up 18.2 percent of all New York travel on all New York streets and highways.
(b) Urban property and vehicle owners paid 78.5 percent while urban vehicles provided 81.8 percent of the total travel by residents on all New York streets and highways.
12. Receipts from motor-vehicle imposts, if they had been used solely by the State for highway purposes in 1932, would have been more than adequate to pay for all of the expenditures on the State highway system including the cost of grade crossing eliminations.
13. The State's portion of the motor-vehicle imposts if used solely for highways (approximately 75 percent) plus Federal-aid allotments, also would have been more than adequate to pay for the expenses of the State highway system.
14. In $1932,8.3$ percent of the total expenditures on the State highway system was financed out of county funds as occasioned by snow removal performed, right of way purchased, and maintenance performed by the county on State highways.
15. The counties received $\$ 16,710,800$ as their portion of the motor-vehicle imposts and expended $\$ 5,632,700$ of their funds for State highway purposes.
16. The expenditures for State highways by the State constituted 33.5 percent of the total expenditures by the State, and the total expenditures by the State on the State highways constituted 29 percent of all highway expenditures in the State and 4.6 percent of all expenditures for all purposes by all units of government in 1932.
17. For the average truck in New York an excess of $\$ 30.86$ was paid in motor-vehicle registration fees and motor-fuel taxes over similar taxes paid for the average car. Owners of the 332,018 trucks thus paid $\$ 10,246,100$ more than was paid for the same number of cars. This amount is almost 75 percent of the total State expenditures for the maintenance of State highways in 1932.
18. Local governments-towns, special districts, cities, and villages-are the principal units of government in New York considered on the basis of the amount of expenditures made in the State in 1932 ( 78.2 percent of total for all units of government), the amount of taxes levied (73.7 percent), and the debt incurred ( 80.2 percent).
19. Measured by expenditures, public benefit functions in New York were by far the most extensive activities, constituting 55.4 percent of all expenditures for all purposes and exceeding by 30.5 percent the costs of education and by 39.6 percent the highway expenses.
20. Of each $\$ 1,000$ of taxes, $\$ 748.77$ was paid in general property taxes, $\$ 67.07$ in motor-vehicle imposts, and $\$ 184.16$ in other imposts.

## PUBLIC ROADS TO BE PUBLISHED IN SPANISH

"Carreteras", a Spanish translation of Public Roads is soon to be published in Argentina and will be available for circulation in Spanish-speaking countries. A few months ago Ing. J. Allende Posse, head of the national highway organization of Argentina, while inspecting road construction in the United States, expressed a desire to keep the highway engineers of Argentina informed regarding research and methods of construction in this country. Difference in language has been a serious difficulty which he proposed to overcome by publishing Public Roads in Spanish. Arrangements have been completed and the first issue of "Carreteras", which will contain the report that appeared in the March 1936 issue of Public Roads, will be published in the near future.

A nominal charge will be made for "Carreteras", and subscriptions should be placed with the Jefe De Publicidad, Direccion Nacional de Vialidad, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

## SECOND CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR TESTING MATERIALS TO BE HELD IN LONDON, APRIL 19-24, 1937

For those concerned with concrete, natural stones, and ceramic materials the congress of the International Association for Testing Materials, which is to be held in London next April will be of considerable interest. The subjects to be discussed are divided into four groups: Metals, inorganic materials, organic materials, and subjects of general importance. The second group, which covers concrete, natural stones, and ceramic materials, has Prof. E. Suenson, of Denmark, as president, and an inspection of the preliminary list of papers which are to be presented indicates that the treatment of the different subjects will be most comprehensive, as the papers originate in some 11 different countries. Among the subjects included under "Concrete" are the testing of aluminous cement and plastic mortars, the development of heat by cement, sea-water cements, waterproofing compounds, the creep of concrete under load, vibrated concrete, cement pipes, and the strength of reinforced concrete beams. Natural stones are discussed in Austrian, German, and British papers, while under ceramic materials, the general testing of ceramic materials, the strength and testing of bricks and tiles, refractories, electrical porcelain, and the classification of clays are dealt with.

The last congress for testing materials was held in 1931, and the association says that every effort is being made to insure that the knowledge in this most important field will be brought completely up to date. The papers will be presented in the form of summaries, so that a large amount of information will be made available in easily accessible form. Inquiries should be addressed to the honorary secretary of the congress, Mr. K. Headlam-Morley, at the offices of the British committee, the International Association for Testing Materials, 28 Victoria Street, London, S. W. 1.
STATUS OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROJECTS 1936-1937
AS OF OCTOBER 31, 1936

CURRENT STATUS OF UNITED STATES WORKS PROGRAM HIGHWAY PROJECTS
(AS PROVIDED BY THE EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACT OF 1935)




## PUBLICATIONS of the BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Any of the following publications may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. As his office is not connected with the Department and as the Department does not sell publications, please send no remittance to the United States Department of Agriculture.

## ANNUAL REPORTS

Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1924. 5 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1927. 5 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1928. 5 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1929. 10 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1931. 10 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1933. 5 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1934. 10 cents.
Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, 1935. 5 cents.

## DEPARTMENT BULLETINS

No. 583D . . Reports on Experimental Convict Road Camp, Fulton County, Ga. 25 cents.
No. 1279D . . Rural Highway Mileage, Income, and Expenditures, 1921 and 1922. 15 cents.

## TECHNICAL BULLETINS

No. 55T . . . Highway Bridge Surveys. 20 cents.
No. 265 T . . . Electrical Equipment on Movable Bridges. 35 cents.

## MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS

No. 76MP . . The Results of Physical Tests of Road-Building Rock. 25 cents.

Federal Legislation and Regulations Relating to Highway Construction. 10 cents.
Supplement No. 1 to Federal Legislation and Regulations Relating to Highway Construction. 5 cents.
No. 191 . . . . Roadside Improvement. 10 cents.
The Taxation of Motor Vehicles in 1932. 35 cents.
An Economic and Statistical Analysis of Highway-Construction Expenditures. 15 cents.
Highway Bond Calculations. 10 cents.

Single copies of the following publications may be obtained from the Bureau of Public Roads upon request. They cannot be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents.
SEPARATE REPRINT FROM THE YEARBOOK
No. 1036Y . . Road Work on Farm Outlets Needs Skill and Right Equipment.

## TRANSPORTATION SURVEY REPORTS

Report of a Survey of Transportation on the State Highway System of Ohio (1927).
Report of a Survey of Transportation on the State Highways of Vermont (1927).
Report of a Survey of Transportation on the State Highways of New Hampshire (1927).
Report of a Plan of Highway Improvement in the Regional Area of Cleveland, Ohio (1928).
Report of a Survey of Transportation on the State Highways of Pennsylvania (1928).
Report of a Survey of Traffic on the Federal-Aid Highway Systems of Eleven Western States (1930).

A complete list of the publications of the Bureau of Public Roads, classified according to subject and including the more important articles in Public Roads, may be obtained upon request addre sed to the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads, Willard Building, Washington, D. C.
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|  |  | ～ | $\underline{\square}$ | ¢¢ | ® | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | － | $\because$ |  | 6 | かisi | ～${ }^{\text {a }}$ | －${ }_{\text {－}}^{\text {¢ }}$ | inm | ¢0m | $\cdots$ |  | \＃ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{\bar{\sim}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \approx=0 \\ & \stackrel{2}{2} \\ & \stackrel{0}{=}= \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 宮 |
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|  |  |  | $\frac{\infty}{\hat{n}}$ | 等 | $\mathrm{n}_{0}^{\infty}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 㧛 } \\ & \text { wit } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{\tilde{n}}{\underset{\sim}{n}}_{\substack{n}} \end{gathered}$ |  | ¢ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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[^0]:    ${ }_{1}$ The full report has been published by the State of New York as Legislative Document (1936) No. 115, vols. I and II. The Bureau of Public Roads does not have copies of the full report for distribution.
    ${ }_{2}$ Report of the New York State Highway Survey Committee, Legislative Document (1936) No. 89, p. 5.
    ${ }_{3}$ These financial surveys have been made under the immediate direction of Dr. Henry R. Trumbower, professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin and economist for the Bureau of Public Roads, and H. R. Briggs, field investigator and statistician. For results of the Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, and New Hampshire surveys, see the April 1933, May 1933, June 1933, March 1936, and April 1936 issues of PUBLIC ROADS, respectively.

[^1]:    At State rate of equalization

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Less than 0.1 percent

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Arises from county participation in financing right-of-way and certain other costs in connection with State roads

[^4]:     rrossing elimination funds used as of June 30,1933 .
    

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ This registration figure differs from a previous figure released by the Bureau because of inaccuracies in the figures originally reported by the State.

