

D

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

Statement by Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation,  
before the Subcommittee on Roads, House Public Works  
Committee, on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968,  
May 23, 1968, 10:00 A.M., 2167 Rayburn House Office Bldg.

I am pleased to appear before your Committee this morning to testify on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968. I have with me Mr. Lowell K. Bridwell, Federal Highway Administrator, Mr. Francis C. Turner, Director of the Bureau of Public Roads, Dr. William Haddon, Jr., Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, and Dr. Haddon's Deputy, Dr. Robert Brenner.

Since we last testified before you on authorization legislation two years and one month ago, dramatic changes have taken place in the field of transportation. The Department of Transportation has been created, and in operation for 13 months. This department includes among its modal agencies the Federal Highway Administration, which encompasses the Bureau of Public Roads and the new National Highway Safety Bureau established by the Congress to bring about increased safety on the nation's highways. The Federal Highway Administration and these two of its Bureaus now have the major responsibility within the Department for supervising the development of the finest, most efficient, and safest transportation network attainable, as a basic component of our national transportation system.

Differences from Past

Let me emphasize that the bill this year is significantly different from traditional highway legislation in several important respects.

Overall, it comprises the first comprehensive program for the solution of urban highway problems that has yet been written. It attempts to deal with the vast problems of urban congestion and highway safety now facing our cities and their restless populations. The extent to which the Department of Transportation is involved in these problems is indicated by the transfer to it of the urban mass transit authority of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The biggest part of the authorizations requested in the bill will be used for completion of the Interstate System. But what is of even more significance is the way in which we intend to spend the rest of it, <sup>as</sup> an outgrowth of the closer look that we are taking at the building of highways in cities in view of the millions of people who have to live with those highways. So what we are proposing are new programs -- programs to improve the traffic capacity of existing roadways as an alternative to new construction, to provide Federal funds for fringe parking spaces, to permit States to buy land for highways as long as seven years in advance of need, and to expand the new highway safety programs and <sup>supportive</sup> research. Not in the bill,

but basic to it, is consideration of a new compensation formula for homes and businesses purchased for highway use.

### Progress of Program

Before discussing the details of the legislation before you, I should like to report briefly on the progress of the Federal-aid highway program. The shape of future highway programs is now under active discussion, so it is important that we recognize what already has been accomplished.

At present, work is underway or has been completed on some 40,064 miles of the 41,000-mile Interstate and Defense Highway System, which is about 98 percent of the total. Almost 25,900 miles are now open to traffic, and construction is underway on another 5,678 miles. This means that about 64 percent of the system is now open to traffic, while only two percent has not been advanced beyond the preliminary status.

Of the 25,892 miles of the Interstate system now in use by motorists, 20,325 miles comply with prevailing standards of adequacy for future traffic; 3,262 miles are fully capable of handling current traffic, but will require additional improvement to meet projected needs. Toll roads, bridges, and tunnels incorporated in the system total 2,305 miles. In addition to sections open to traffic, 5,678 miles

were under construction as of March 31, and engineering or right-of-way acquisition was being performed on another 8,494 miles.

Some \$32.6 billion has been put to work on the program since 1956. Work completed since July 1, 1956, has cost \$22.93 billion of which \$18.71 billion was for construction and \$4.22 billion for engineering and right-of-way acquisition.

#### Pending Bills

Turning now to the pending legislation, may I note there are two bills before the Subcommittee. H. R. 17134, introduced by request, comprises the Administration program. (Parenthetically, there are two minor errors in Sections 5 and 11 of the printed bill with which you already are familiar.) H. R. 16994, introduced by you, Mr. Chairman, and the Chairman of the full Committee, embodies portions of the Administration program but omits several sections. My testimony will relate to each section of the Administration bill, H. R. 17134, thereby also covering the provisions of H. R. 16994 as well, though under different section numbers. I will parenthetically identify corresponding sections of H. R. 16994, where they differ with H. R. 17134, as I proceed.

Section 1 of H. R. 17134 provides that the Act shall be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968."

Interstate Authorizations

Section 2 would revise the schedule of authorization of appropriations for the Interstate System by increasing the amounts provided therein for 1970, 1971, and 1972, and by adding authorizations for fiscal years 1973 and 1974. This is necessary in order to provide additional authorizations totaling \$8.340 billion to cover the increased costs of completing the Interstate System as reflected in the 1968 Cost Estimate for the Interstate System (House Doc. 199, 90th Congress, 2d Session).

Funds authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 for 1969 and prior fiscal years have been apportioned to the States in the amounts authorized. The Interstate authorization for fiscal year 1969 was \$3.8 billion, and the apportionment to the States was made on August 29, 1967.

Interstate authorizations of \$4.0 billion annually are proposed for the fiscal years 1970 through 1973, with a balancing authorization of \$2.225 for the fiscal year 1974. These authorizations totaling \$18.225 billion for the fiscal years 1970-1974, together with the apportionments totaling \$32.415 already made for prior years, would provide the total \$50.640 billion needed for completion of the Interstate System according to the 1968 cost estimate.

Apportionment of Funds

Section 3 would authorize the use of the 1968 cost estimate for the purpose of making apportionments of Interstate funds for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971 on the basis of apportionment factors shown in table 5 of that document.

We propose to furnish a revised set of apportionment factors, to replace the factors listed in table 5 of the 1968 cost estimate, in order to take into account the effect of the Howard Amendment (P. L. 90-238) in California and the cost to West Virginia of acquiring the West Virginia Turnpike. The 1968 estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System was submitted to the Congress on January 12. Table 5 in the estimate report included no cost adjustments attributable to the Howard Amendment, nor costs relating to the West Virginia Turnpike which at that time were coded in a Toll Road category.

The major adjustment in Interstate System cost, and in apportionment factor computation, will result in West Virginia as a followup to the Comptroller General's decision on the West Virginia Turnpike and the action by the House and Senate Public Works Committee in this regard. The estimated total cost to complete the West Virginia Turnpike to four-lane Interstate standards, based on the State's 1968 Estimate Report, is \$96.1 million, and the estimated total cost of acquiring the West Virginia Turnpike is \$90.0 million, for a total of \$186.1 million.

We will be submitting a revised table of Interstate apportionment factors to reflect the inclusion of additional costs for these items.

#### Extension of Time

Section 4 would extend the period of Interstate authorizations through the fiscal year 1974, and would change the date for the submission of a final cost estimate from within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1969, to within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1970. This final cost estimate would be for use in making apportionments for fiscal years 1972, 1973, and 1974.

Authorizations

Section 5(1) would authorize the appropriation from the Highway Trust Fund of funds for the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems and extensions thereof within urban areas (the so-called ABC program) for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971. Annual authorizations for the ABC highways were increased considerably under the expanded highway program inaugurated in 1956, and reached a \$1 billion level beginning with the fiscal year 1966. This authorization level was continued for the fiscal years 1967 through 1969, and is further proposed for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971, when the major effort under the Federal-aid highway program will still be directed toward completion of the Interstate System. The sums authorized would continue to be available on the basis of 45 percent for projects on the Federal-aid primary system, 30 percent for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system, and 25 percent for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems in urban areas. Apportionment factors for the ABC funds would continue to be based on area, population, and post road mileage, in accord with present law.

Section 5(2) would authorize the appropriation of funds from the Highway Trust Fund for traffic operation improvement projects in urban areas (the so-called TOPICS program), in the amount of \$250 million

for each of the five fiscal years 1970 through 1974. Our comments concerning this item will be offered later under the discussion of Section 12 of the bill.

Sections 5(3) and (4) would authorize the appropriation for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971 of funds for forest highways and public lands highways in the annual amounts of \$33 million and \$16 million, respectively, as was authorized for prior fiscal years. It is proposed to transfer the financing of the forest and public lands highway programs from the general fund to the Highway Trust Fund, since the highways are similar in character and use to Federal-aid highways and logically should be financed in the same manner as the regular Federal-aid program.

About 88 percent of the Forest Highway System mileage is located on Federal-aid systems, and the remainder may be placed on the Federal-aid systems as desired. The Public Lands Highway projects also are located on the Federal-aid systems or on routes that could be added to the Federal-aid systems.

A separate bill, "The Highway User Act of 1968" has been submitted to the Congress which would provide additional revenues to the Highway Trust Fund and extend the duration of that fund by 28 months to January 31, 1975. Estimated revenues accruing to the Highway Trust Fund from existing sources over the extended period of time, together with the additional revenues from the so-called "equalization" taxes proposed in the bill, will be adequate to support the Interstate authorization schedule proposed in Section 2, the ABC authorizations proposed in Section 5(1), the TOPICS authorizations proposed in Section 5(2), and the forest highways and public lands highways authorizations proposed in Sections 5(3) and (4).

Sections 5(5) through (9) would authorize appropriations of funds from the general fund of the Treasury for certain other highways in Federal domain areas. These programs are administered by other Federal agencies.

State and Community Highway Safety Programs

The Highway Safety Act of 1966 (Section 402) authorized to be appropriated for Federal aid to State and community highway safety programs the sum of \$67 million for fiscal year 1967, and \$100 million for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969. Section 6 of the bill would continue the programs under Section 402 by authorizing the appropriation of \$50 million for fiscal year 1970 and \$75 million for fiscal year 1971.

A cost estimate for the highway safety program has been developed in cooperation with the States and will be submitted shortly.

Mr. Chairman, this is a new activity and there has been some misunderstanding as to its operation. May I therefore provide the Committee with some of the essential background. This is the activity under which, as directed by statute, we have established standards covering driver education, vehicle inspection, alcohol, highway design, and other areas in which States and communities are being assisted in creating or expanding their highway safety programs. Under Section 402, each State is required to be implementing an approved highway safety program under the standards by December 31, 1968. The authorization requests in Section 6, which provides Federal assistance for the State and local programs, should not be viewed as representing a reduction

in such assistance. As I said, Congress has already authorized, in the Act itself, a total of \$267 million for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969. These funds are available for one year in advance of, and two years following, the year for which they are authorized -- so that we now have authorization under the Act to obligate these funds through the end of fiscal year 1971. By June 30, we have obligated only \$27 million, largely because of a limitation of \$25 million placed by the last session of the Congress on that authority for this fiscal year. Therefore, \$240 million is still available for obligation at the beginning of fiscal year 1969. Of this amount, we plan to obligate \$140 million during fiscal year 1969, leaving a balance of \$100 million available for use in fiscal year 1970.

The \$100 million carryover, together with the request to the Congress to add \$50 million in fiscal year 1970 and another \$75 million in fiscal year 1971, or a total of \$225 million, will be available for obligation in fiscal year 1970. Added to the carryover of existing authorizations, therefore, we expect to have the authority to obligate a total of \$225 million in fiscal year 1970.

In all parts of the country, State and local highway safety programs now being planned, developed, or expanded under the Highway Safety Act will lead to greatly accelerated requests for Federal-aid funds. With the resources available up to this point,

States and communities, as well as the National Highway Safety Bureau, have only been able to get started in the direction of developing required programs. We received 87 project applications in the first quarter of fiscal year 1968, 94 in the second quarter, and 165 in the third. This acceleration continues: by April 30, we had received some 474 applications. As of the same date, grant applications had been approved with total costs of \$77.2 million, of which \$13.3 million is from Federal funds.

Our current projections indicate that applications in fiscal year 1968 will request \$32 million, and that we therefore will completely obligate the \$25 million available in the year. The acceleration of applications, as well as their increase in scope, indicates that the planned application level of \$140 million for fiscal year 1969 is very realistic and, in fact, conservative.

Under the \$25 million available in fiscal year 1968, the allocation to each State was too small to cover more important, and often more expensive, projects. These projects -- such as driver education, police services, and traffic records improvement -- have for the most part been delayed by States and communities until fiscal year 1969 in anticipation that sufficient funds will then be available.

We anticipate recommending an apportionment formula to you before January 1, 1969, as required in Section 402. This formula is now in the process of preparation.

Research and Development

An authorization was also included in the Highway Safety Act of 1966 for the highway safety research and development programs provided in Section 307(a) and Section 403 of Title 23. The Act authorized appropriations of \$10 million for fiscal year 1967, \$20 million for fiscal year 1968, and \$25 million for fiscal year 1969. Section 7 of the bill would authorize appropriations for Section 307(a) and Section 403 of \$30 million for fiscal year 1970 and \$40 million for fiscal year 1971.

In order to increase the effectiveness of our  
and highway safety programs, we must continue to invest in research.

This R&D program has three major objectives:

- an improved understanding of how and why highway crashes occur, and how and why people are killed and injured in them;
- the development of effective measures to avert crashes and minimize deaths and injuries;
- improvement of State and community safety programs on the basis of these results.

The authorized funds for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969  
are being used in contracts with universities, foundations, private  
industry groups, and other governmental agencies, for work in four  
key areas: accident and injury analysis; research, development, and  
testing; demonstration projects; and manpower development. This  
program must be accelerated, as provided in the bill, in order to  
support effective highway safety programs at national, State, and  
local levels, and to provide the far more specific scientific information  
we all need to reduce our present highway casualties of 10,000 injured  
each day in the nation.

Highway Beautification

Section 8 of H. R. 17134 (omitted from H. R. 16994) would authorize appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury for the highway beautification program for fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971, thus putting these authorizations on the same fiscal year basis as the biennial ABC highway program authorizations. The contract authority provisions of the Federal-aid highway legislation would apply to the highway beautification program, as provided by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 (79 Stat. 1030, 1032).

Authorization is included for a deduction not to exceed 5 percent for administration. A flat percentage for administrative expenses would provide for the handling of administrative expenses under the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 in the same manner as for the regular Federal-aid highway programs and the State and community highway safety programs.

Section 8(a) would authorize the sum of \$5 million to carry out the provisions of Section 131(m) of Title 23, United States Code, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and like amounts for fiscal years 1970 and 1971.

This section of the code provides for outdoor advertising control along Interstate and Federal-aid primary highways, under Title I of the

Highway Beautification Act of 1965. Last year your Committee held very comprehensive hearings concerning the Highway Beautification Act, with particular emphasis on outdoor advertising control. These hearings served a special purpose in clarifying the issues and removing the uncertainties which had inhibited the implementation of the program up to that time. Since then we have been making steady progress.

About a year ago, I directed the Federal Highway Administrator to proceed as expeditiously as possible to work out agreements with the States for implementation of the Act. Since then, 17 outdoor advertising control agreements have been signed, and we are close to agreement with a number of other States. Thirty-one State Legislatures have enacted laws providing for control of outdoor advertising under Title I of the Highway Beautification Act, and the Legislatures of other States are presently considering such legislation or will do so during their next regular session -- many in early 1969.

This progress has not been brought about, I am pleased to say, by the penalty provision in Section 131(b) of the Act. On June 27, 1967, I stated that we had no expectation of imposing any penalties during the year 1968 or, for that matter, in early 1969 if a State Legislature would not have an opportunity to act during 1968. Almost all of our agreements

were negotiated and executed after my statement. Participating States are, like us, interested in progress, not penalties.

The Committee will recognize that the amounts of money being requested are considerably less than the total needed to completely implement the outdoor advertising control title of the Highway Beautification Act. In the light of the grave responsibilities facing the nation in other areas, this is as it should be.

The passage of control laws by the various States, and the execution of control agreements, has already begun to stem the tide of billboard blight by prohibiting new signs in areas affected by the Act. Most States, moreover, have elected to carry out the control operations envisioned in the Act through the granting of a permit at a nominal fee. This one feature alone will work to remove many of the obsolete or uncared for signs which heretofore have been allowed to rot and decay in full view of the passing motorist.

The initial outdoor advertising control legislation enacted in 1958 (§131 Title 23 U. S. C. ) provided for payment of a bonus of 1/2 of one percent of the construction costs for eligible segments of the Interstate System from a continuing authorization and special appropriation for this specific purpose. Pursuant to that legislation, 25 States entered into bonus agreements with the Secretary. The Highway

Beautification Act of 1965 amended the earlier authorization to require payment of eligible bonus claims out of funds specifically authorized to carry out the provisions of the 1965 Act.

The Federal Government is obligated to provide adequate funding to continue payment of bonus claims submitted by the States in accordance with their bonus agreements. We now have on hand for processing approximately \$280,000 in pending claims, and are continuing to receive additional claims. As of May 13, 1968, we had available only \$60,000 to pay bonus claims. Future bonus payments, after expenditure of the available \$60,000, are required to be made from funds authorized to be appropriated under this section.

Section 8(b) would authorize the sum of \$10 million to carry out the provisions of Section 136(m) of Title 23, U. S. C., during each of the fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971.

Section 136(m) provides for the control of junkyards in accordance with Title II of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. There has been ready acceptance by the States of this program, as evidenced by the fact that 40 States have thus far enacted legislation to conform with its requirements. Although the Federal legislation applies only to junkyards adjacent to the Interstate and Federal-aid primary system, 16 States have extended these provisions to apply to additional roads within

their borders. Other States have imposed stricter limitations upon themselves than required by the Act.

The junkyard control law requires the removal or relocation of affected junkyards which cannot be readily and economically screened. Such removal or relocation need not be undertaken, however, until after June 30, 1970. Although only approximately \$10 million in Federal funds has thus far been made available, the States have screened or removed approximately 1,500 junkyards, contributing 25 percent of the cost. As it was necessary for the States to organize for this endeavor, deferral of funds would cause a loss of impetus and interest.

One of the greatest benefits attained under the Title is the fact that all 40 States have strong control of the location of new junkyards. Most now require licensing, renewable annually, to assure compliance and control; others control the sites on a renewable permit basis. In other words, since existing junkyards are properly screened from view -- or removed -- State legislation will continue the program without cost to the State or Federal Government.

It should be further noted that the program has the support of the auto wreckers association, scrap metal producers and the general public. Many representatives of these directly interested parties

appeared at the Congressional hearings to support the legislation. It is interesting to note that of the 50 States, only Delaware, Florida, and Louisiana did not take advantage of the Federal funds available to them for this part of the program.

Section 8(c) would authorize the sum of \$70 million for each of the fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971 to carry out the provisions of Section 319(b) of Title 23, U. S. C., relating to landscaping and scenic enhancement of Federal-aid highways.

Section 319(a) of Title 23, United States Code, provides Federal funds for landscaping, roadside development, and acquisition and development of publicly owned and controlled rest and recreation areas and sanitary and other facilities necessary to accommodate the traveling public, all within the highway right-of-way. Federal reimbursement is available to the States for such work at the pro-rata share of the cost, depending upon the Federal-aid system to which it has been applied. These costs are payable from the Trust Fund.

Section 319(b) provides 100 percent compensation to the States for the above types of work and permits such expenditure within or adjacent to the Federal-aid highway right-of-way. In addition, costs may be incurred for the acquisition of interests in and improvement of

strips of land necessary for the restoration, preservation, and enhancement of scenic beauty adjacent to the highway. The 319(b) funds are appropriated from the general fund.

Of the three titles in the Highway Beautification Act, the landscaping and scenic enhancement provision has had the most immediate and favorable impact upon the public. All States are participating in the program, and obligations to date total \$120 million in Federal funds, as follows: \$31 million for landscaping; \$29 million for 5,400 scenic easements; and \$60 million for 510 roadside rest areas. The rest areas are especially popular with the public as they provide a safe, comfortable stopping place. They are usually placed at locations where scenic and picnic opportunities are present, and they may also be used as visitor information centers where such tourist services as food, lodging, fuel directories, and scenic route and map information may be made available.

True beauty is a quiet thing -- it is the raw and ugly which shouts. The acquisition of scenic easements and landscaping within the highway right-of-way lines serve to make the highway complete, and removal of outdoor advertising and screening of junkyards are an important part of the beautification effort. But it is obvious that more can be done. Scenic vistas must be controlled to prevent

non-conforming trespass; roadsides must be planted and naturalized to fit into the landscape; rest areas must be developed to make the traveler feel welcome and sheltered during his stay.

Deferral of this program would result in its greater cost at a later date, as land values for rest area sites and scenic easement are constantly appreciating, and materials and construction cost indices for plant material and road and building costs are steadily rising. Added urgency for these activities stems from their promotion of more relaxed driving, and thus of greater safety.

#### Advance Acquisition

Section 9 of H. R. 17134 (Section 8 of H. R. 16994) would authorize the acquisition of rights-of-way on the Federal-aid highway systems in anticipation of construction, and would establish a fund to be used for payments to the States for such advance acquisitions. This implements the objectives of the "Study of Advance Acquisition of Highway Rights-of-Way," sent by us to Congress on June 30, 1967. The study concluded that an advance acquisition program would facilitate the orderly and beneficial relocation of persons, ~~businesses~~, farms, and other users of property acquired for highway development, while at the same time enabling more foresighted planning and minimizing rights-of-way costs.

Advances of funds for this purpose would be made pursuant to agreements between the State highway departments and the Secretary,

to provide for the actual construction of a highway within 7 years following the fiscal year in which a request by a State for such funds is made or by the terminal date of the Highway Trust Fund, whichever occurs first.

The advance acquisition proposal would make available an amount equal to 2 percent of a State's apportionment for advance acquisition of rights-of-way. The State must satisfy the Secretary within 6 months of the date of allocation that it will properly obligate such amount for advance acquisition of rights-of-way. Where a State fails so to demonstrate, the availability of such funds will revert to the Secretary, who may in his discretion make them available to the other States at their request and on the basis of need.

To implement this program, there would be authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund an amount not to exceed \$100,000,000 for the establishment of an advance acquisition fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis. Pending such appropriation, the Secretary would be authorized to advance, from any cash heretofore or hereafter appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund, such sums as are necessary for payments to the States for rights-of-way acquired in advance of construction.

Provisions of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 relating to additional appropriations to and expenditures from the Highway Trust

Fund and to adjustments of appropriations would be applicable to the advance acquisition of rights-of-way program.

Appropriate regulations will be promulgated to insure that, in the administration of the program, no advance right-of-way shall be acquired for a project in an urban area unless the project is deemed to be consistent with the comprehensive transportation plan developed for the metropolitan area as a whole under the provisions of Section 134 of Title 23, and Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities Act (42 U. S. C. 3334).

#### Forest Roads and Trails

Section 10 of H. R. 17134 (Section 9 of H. R. 16994) amends the definition of "forest road or trail" and "forest development roads and trails" in Section 101(a) of Title 23, United States Code, to include areas other than national forest areas under Forest Service administration. This amendment is made at the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture and is a part of their proposed legislative program. The present definition of "forest road or trail" and "forest development roads and trails" associates these two terms with the national forests only, not with the National Grass Lands and other areas administered by the Forest Service. However, 23 U. S. C. 205(a) authorizes use of funds available for forest development roads and trails to pay for

construction and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental and other areas under Forest Service administration. This proposed amendment to 23 U. S. C. 101(a) makes the definition of the two terms consistent with 23 U. S. C. 205(a) and will avoid possible misinterpretation of the intent of both sections.

The Department of Agriculture also recommends amendment of Section 205(c) of Title 23, United States Code, first to clarify the threshold of the limitation on force account construction and, second, to provide an opportunity for more efficient handling of small construction projects. At present, Section 205(c) requires the construction of forest development roads and trails costing \$10,000 or more per mile to be advertised and let to contract.

Section 11 of H. R. 17134 (Section 10 of H. R. 16994) amends Section 205(c) to increase this cost limitation from \$10,000 to \$15,000 per mile and to require advertisement for bids and letting of contracts where construction is estimated to cost \$15,000 or more per project for projects with a length of less than one mile. Section 11 provides that if the estimated cost is less than \$15,000 per mile or \$15,000 per project for projects with a length of less than one mile, the work may be done by the Secretary of Agriculture on his own account.

Considerable uncertainty exists as to whether the present requirement that construction costing \$10,000 or more per mile be

advertised and let to contract applies to projects of less than one mile in length but with a "per mile" estimated cost of \$10,000 or more.

For example, an access road of only .1 mile in length estimated to cost \$1,000 could on a per mile basis cost \$10,000 per mile. Under strict interpretation of 23 U. S. C. 205(c) such a road construction project would have to be advertised and let to contract. As a result, the theoretical advantages of advertising and contracting those small projects over force account construction are offset by the procedures, time, and detailed plans and materials required for advertising and contracting any such project. The size of such projects often results in no bids or bids that are necessarily inflated to cover the costs of bidding, moving in and out, and meeting insurance, bond, and other costs to the contractor associated with such projects. On larger projects these costs can be so spread out as to make up a much smaller percentage of the total or per mile cost.

Past experience in construction of forest roads and trails has shown that \$15,000 is approximately the point at which acceptable bids can be expected to be received in practically every case. Establishing \$15,000 as the minimum estimated construction cost at which advertising and contracting is required will reduce the higher costs and administrative problems resulting from efforts to contract small projects that are generally unattractive to most prospective contractors and which in most

cases can be more efficiently and economically constructed by force account.

### TOPICS

Sections 5(2), 12, and 13 of H. R. 17134 (Sections 11-13 of H. R. 16994) would provide specific authorization for TOPICS, the program to improve traffic operations on the major streets of our urban areas, which I mentioned briefly earlier.

There has been a steady increase over the years in the attention and effort the States and Public Roads have directed toward improving transportation in urban areas. But the problem is still far from adequately met. The number of people living in our urban areas continues to grow at a high rate. Personal income -- already at the highest level in our history -- is also rising rapidly, influencing living patterns in a way that generates a growing amount of travel on the part of the average family unit. Similarly, the trend toward dispersal in the pattern of land use development in urban areas generates additional travel as a way of urban life. The cumulative effect of these trends is that the increase in vehicle miles of travel in many urban areas is increasing at more than double the rate of population growth.

The reconstruction of principal roadways and the betterment of existing streets through application of traffic engineering principles

to improve traffic flow and increase safety are objectives of any urban street and highway program. Federal-aid for urban highways has previously emphasized the improvement of principal urban arterials through construction or reconstruction.

To develop a balanced urban street and highway system, attention must also be directed to other than the principal streets and highways in urban areas -- to those that carry a heavy burden of local traffic and also control the efficiency of trip movements between main highways and ultimate trip destinations.

It was against this background in February 1967 the Bureau of Public Roads initiated, on a pilot basis, a new program designed to raise the efficiency of existing street and highway systems in urban areas. It was termed the Traffic Operations Program to Increase Capacity and Safety (from which derived the acronym "TOPICS"). A copy of guidelines issued at that time is included for the record.

The projects generally are limited to traffic engineering and operational types of improvements on a network of existing streets which are selected as a part of the transportation planning process.

The types of improvements, most of which may be accomplished with existing right-of-way, which are eligible for Federal-aid participation, include the following:

1. Channelization of intersections.

2. Providing additional traffic lanes on approaches to signalized intersections.

3. Construction of pedestrian grade separations or highway grade separations at complex intersections or railway-highway grade crossings, where such an improvement is essential to relieve a crucial bottleneck along streets of otherwise adequate width.

4. Installation of control systems to make traffic signal operation responsive to traffic conditions for diverting traffic from congested areas, for establishing part-time one-way operation, for reversing direction of traffic on selected traffic lanes, or for separate bus lane controls.

5. Addition and upgrading of highway lighting, traffic control signs, pavement markings and signals or other devices required to facilitate traffic movement and increase the safety of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

6. Development of separate traffic lanes for loading, unloading or transferring passengers at surface transit terminals and intermediate transit stops, including platforms and shelters within the street right-of-way.

7. Development of truck loading and unloading facilities where necessary to facilitate traffic movement.

8. Establishment of traffic surveillance systems, including traffic-operation data collection and analysis centers, where traffic flow measurements and accident data are continuously evaluated to identify locations where corrective action is needed.

Streets on which traffic engineering improvements may be made under this new concept include:

1. Arterial highways and major streets (radial, crosstown, and circumferential) not already on either the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems.
2. Most or all of the street grid in the downtown area.
3. A limited street grid in other areas having particularly high concentrations of traffic.

Of course, no additional Federal funds were available for this undertaking. The only Federal funds were those apportioned annually to the State highway departments. Even so, this program concept has evoked widespread interest and we are satisfied with the soundness of this as one of the proper approaches to the urban traffic congestion program.

The officials of the cities, State highway departments, and our own Public Roads are actively engaged in TOPICS programs in some 24 cities located in 19 States. No actual street improvements have

yet been undertaken but preliminary activities are underway and soon will be completed in a few of the cities.

Some of these preliminary activities are far enough along to permit the estimating of benefits which can be expected from these kind of street and highway improvements. They indicate that 20 to 25 percent increases in the traffic carrying capability can be expected with comparable improvement in the accident experience.

As I said, we are satisfied as to the soundness of this approach and Section 12 of H. R. 17134 would add a new Section 135 to Title 23, United States Code, to specifically authorize a program of this nature. The program would be implemented by the authorization of \$250 million from the Highway Trust Fund for each of the fiscal years 1970 through 1974.

The estimated cost of correcting the deficiencies of our major streets to accommodate 1975 traffic is \$2.5 billion. An authorization of \$250 million per year for five years as provided in Section 5(2), matched equally by the States, will meet the need for that total amount. A continued program beyond that time would be necessary to stay abreast of the problem.

The program will be administered in much the same manner as the regular Federal-aid ABC programs, following generally the guidelines previously issued by the Bureau of Public Roads. The program will be administered on a 50-50 matching basis, in much the same manner as the regular Federal-aid ABC programs, following generally the guidelines previously issued by the Bureau of Public Roads, but also taking into account new approaches to traffic engineering as they evolve from research and experience.

Fringe Parking

These TOPICS proposals make possible significant gains in the level of traffic service provided by existing street systems. More emphasis must also be placed on getting more service out of the vehicles, both public and private, that travel these systems, in order to meet growing traffic demands. To help accomplish this objective, Sections 14 and 15 propose to amend Chapter 1 of Title 23, United States Code, to provide Federal assistance for fringe parking in large urban areas. (Omitted from H. R. 16994.)

A truly comprehensive urban transportation system must maintain a balance not only between automobiles and transit, but also between the volumes of traffic that seek to enter a city and the city's capacity to absorb such volumes. This balance cannot be attained until terminal facilities are accepted along with streets and highways as an integral part of the transportation system.

The primary basis for using highway funds for fringe parking is to improve service by reducing the number of vehicles using overloaded highways to the downtown area/ <sup>by encouraging the use of mass transit facilities.</sup> This could in turn reduce the needs for extensive improvements on these facilities. As cities grow larger, increasing numbers of people find it desirable to drive part way to work or shop, park on the street or in other available space, and continue their trip by bus, train, or carpool. Provision of fringe parking spaces in suitable locations will make such a choice even more desirable with

a resultant increase in vehicle occupancy on arterials and a decrease in the number of vehicles on the road. Parked vehicles will also be removed from the streets in outlying areas with a consequent further improvement in street capacity.

Traffic congestion in the central business districts of our major cities is also a pressing problem which can be relieved by the proper application of the fringe parking principle. Since fringe parking is most applicable to the work trip, removal of this long duration parking allows the more efficient use of present downtown parking facilities by persons making short duration business, shopping, and recreation trips. These trips represent the prime economic base of the downtown area.

A significant portion of total downtown parking demand can also be satisfied by fringe facilities. A primary conclusion of most parking studies conducted as a part of the urban transportation planning process is that downtown parking demands have not been met, particularly in the core areas of our major cities. A similar conclusion can be reached by noting the "Sorry-Full" signs at parking facilities in the heart of the city during periods of peak parking demand. By removing some portion of downtown demand, fringe parking will also provide for the more effective use of existing downtown space.

Fringe parking will encourage people to use public transportation.

Parking associated with transit stops and terminals will provide important incentives to improve local and express transit service. Some such incentive will frequently be required to reverse the decline of such services. New facilities provided under this legislation will be operated at no cost, or at most with a minimal fee to cover the cost of maintenance and operation. Improvement of public transportation in this manner will serve to improve the mobility of those people most dependent on transit and least able to afford high transportation costs.

The availability of funds for fringe parking will give added meaning to existing programs to encourage multi-purpose uses of space over or under freeways. Parking is a logical and necessary adjunct to highway improvements in urban areas, and a desirable inclusion in proposals for joint development.

The success of expenditure of funds for fringe parking will be dependent upon its acceptance by individual States and cities in the development of their own parking programs.

Program needs are based on fringe parking demand derived from two sources; work trips downtown, and change of mode trips in large metropolitan areas. Available studies indicate that about 10 percent of total downtown work trip demand may be transferred to fringe parking in cities between 500,000 and 1,000,000 population. Further information

shows that 1-1/2 fringe spaces will be required to remove the demand for one parking space downtown.

Additional need for fringe parking is evident from the number of change of mode trips now taking place in cities. Twenty percent of such trips could be accommodated by fringe parking in cities from 100,000 to 1,000,000 population and 10 percent in cities over 1,000,000 population. The 40,000 existing fringe parking spaces were subtracted from this total to determine the need for new facilities.

There is need for 367,000 fringe spaces by 1975 at a cost of \$387 million. Similarly, needs till 1985 are for 466,000 fringe spaces at a cost of \$483 million.

Availability of funds for fringe parking will provide the opportunity to search out locations for fringe parking and to provide it where desirable. Fringe parking will not be provided by others as it cannot be considered economical except as an integral part of the transportation system. Federal assistance provides a basis for the evaluation of fringe parking as a part of an improved urban transportation system.

#### Relocation Assistance

Though not a part of this bill, the problem of relocation assistance is vitally important in the Federal-aid highway program. There must be

adequate funds provided to relocate large numbers of people, businesses, farms, and organizations dislocated by highway construction.

Mr. Chairman, this completes my discussion of the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968. The shape of the future highway program will depend in large degree on the decisions of the Congress on this legislation. May I respectfully urge this Committee to make these decisions in accord with the provisions of H.R. 17134.

Thank you for permitting me to appear before you. Now my colleagues and I are ready for questions.