

# Building the Interstate

W. L. Mertz and Joyce Ritter

## FOREWORD

What follows is the documentation of the critical events during the building of the Interstate System. The record begins with the passage of the 1956 Highway Act, which kicked off the Interstate construction program. It ends in 1974 just after the passage of the 1973 Highway Act, which was landmark legislation for the Interstate System and the highway program in general. We made several attempts to interpret the 1973 Act for the reader but abandoned it in favor of relying on quotations from those involved at the time who said what they thought it was.

An earlier document named "Origins of the Interstate" explored the critical years in the conceptualization of the Interstate System culminating in the 1956 Highway Act.

Both documents rely heavily on quoted excerpts of speeches made by people who were influential in charting the course of the highway program during those years. We have found that no paraphrasing expresses the essence of the issues of the times as well as the words of those who were involved and spoke them.

By far the richest source of material has been *American Highways*, the quarterly journal of the American Association of State Highway Officials. It faithfully recorded the views of its own members, Congressmen, Federal officials and indeed, the adversaries of the highway program. The reasons for stopping the record in 1974 are several. First, our scheduled time allotted for this task was running out. Second, the events following the 1973 Highway Act are recent history. We have been involved in that history and so are too close to it to make unbiased judgments about what should be highlighted.

---

Although the Interstate was authorized by the Congress in 1944 and most of the system was officially designated in 1947, construction did not begin in earnest until the passage of the 1956 Highway Act. Part One, "The Origins of the Interstate", documents the events leading to the 1956 Act. This Part Two begins there.

The record begins with the AASHO annual meeting in November of 1956 at Atlantic City N.J., just five months after passage of the Act.

### **Excerpts from the January 1957 Issue of American Highways.**

**REX WHITTON**, Outgoing President, Missouri.

## **THE DEATH OF GENERAL MERRILL**

He expressed great regret for the untimely death of General Frank Merrill two days after he was elected President of AASHO. It was on this occasion that Whitton, the Vice President succeeded to the Presidency.

(There is a story connected with that. General Merrill was the leader of the famous Merrill's Marauder's in World War II, and was a great friend and comrade of General Eisenhower. After World War II, he was highly placed in the military occupation of the Philippines where Frank Turner was putting the roads back together. They had daily interactions. After military retirement, Merrill was appointed to head the New Hampshire highway department by Governor Sherman Adams, soon to become the White House chief of staff under President Eisenhower. One of the reasons he was elected President of AASHO, so the story goes, was, it was perceived, that he would have access to the Oval Office

and influence with Ike, which, it was thought, was needed for the passage of the 1956 Act.)

### **PASSAGE OF THE 56 ACT**

Whitton thanked everyone involved in the 1956 Act. He noted that the passage of that monumental legislation was due largely to good public relations and encouraged all to pay more attention to that critical function in the future. He noted that Congress had asked the highway departments for four studies. Their performance on those was critical to the future of the highway program. The studies were; a new Interstate cost estimate, maximum sizes and weights, a study of a policy for the reimbursement for highways already on the Interstate System and a study on the costs of different classes of highways.

**NOTE:** The reimbursement issue was very controversial and AASHO's recommendation for it did not survive in the 1956 Act.

He appealed to the members to update their procedures to modern methods using computers, photogrammetry and efficiency procedures.

**JOHN VOLPE**, Federal Highway Administrator.

### **GENERAL MERRILL AND FRANCIS du PONT**

Volpe gave great credit to deceased General Merrill and to Francis du Pont for getting the 1956 Act started.

He emphasized the great importance of the events during the crucial two years between Ike's famous speech kicking off the campaign for an expanded highway program and passage of the 56 Act.

### **DON'T COMPROMISE ON INTERSTATE PROJECTS**

He warned the members to not compromise when faced with local opposition to a segment of Interstate because of the special National importance of the program. He warned them of the temptation to overbuild since the Federal Government would be picking up 90% of the cost.

### **BEGIN THE INTERSTATE IN URBAN AREAS**

"We have been asked whether it is a good policy for a State to concentrate in early stages of the Interstate program on projects in urban areas, on the grounds that it is in those areas that the need for traffic relief is the greatest. Our answer is that we strongly favor such a policy provided, first, that urgent rural needs are not overlooked and, second, that firm agreement has been reached with officials of the urban areas on the location and design of the proposed improvements."

"The second condition is especially important. Highway improvement in urban areas is probably the most critical feature of the program. Over half the Interstate funds will be spent there, and the extremely high cost per mile of the urban facilities makes it essential that they be properly located to insure wise expenditure of State and Federal funds. Correct location can be of even more importance to the cities themselves, however, for these freeways will become

integral links in the urban transportation network, often serving transit as well as private vehicles. Properly located they can encourage good urban development, aid urban renewal, and be of great over-all benefit to the community. Improperly located they can impair or even prevent desirable growth and community life. So we must be assured that, as required by the 1956 Act, local needs be given serious and proper consideration. I urge State Highway officials to seek and to utilize the cooperation of city officials in locating these urban expressways."

"Much needs to be done by the cities to insure their ability to cooperate with the States in planning these facilities. It is most gratifying that a Joint Committee of this Association and the American Municipal Association is at work on this problem. The group held its first meeting only last Friday. It is fortunate also that the National Committee on Urban Transportation, composed largely of city officials and on which the Bureau is represented, has long been at work preparing manuals for the collection of highway planning data for cities comparable to those obtained in our 20-year program of Statewide Highway Planning Surveys. These manuals are now being tested in eight pilot cities in as many States. This Committee's work will be invaluable to the Joint AMA and AASHO Committee and to all States. Both Committees deserve, and I am sure will receive, the full support of all States."

#### **THERE WILL BE OPPOSITION TO CONTROL-OF-ACCESS**

He noted that the concept of controlled access was new and the Interstate was the first time the concept was required for an entire system. He warned that the concept was not well understood and opposition would develop but the 2/3 reduction in accidents was well worth it. He noted the growing number of "before and after" studies that were documenting the economic advantages of controlled access. He noted particularly Rt. 128 in Boston. He called their attention to the requirements for a new cost estimate for the Interstate and periodic updates through 1968. He urged cooperation and compliance with the new labor provisions of the 1956 Act. He said that delegations of authority to BPR field offices were necessary to keep pace with the expanded program. Approval of Secondary program projects had already been delegated from Washington to the Division Offices (now Regions). Fifteen additional Supergrade positions were given to BPR as part of the reorganization. \$200 million of Interstate projects had been obligated.

**SEN. DENNIS CHAVES**, N.M., Chairman Senate Public Works Committee.

#### **THE CONGRESS WILL TAKE ANOTHER LOOK IN THREE YEARS**

He described the Highway program as being a 13-year program with a 3-year space to start with through 1959, after which the Congress would look the matter over and make decisions about the future.

He noted that prior to the Reorganization Act (The Monroney-Mansfield Act), roads were authorized through the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He warned the members not to forget the views of the citizens. That was the reason that the Act called for public hearings. He worried about the affect bypasses would have on businesses.

**SEN. EDWARD MARTIN**, Penn.

## **COMPROMISE AND POLITICS COULD UNDERMINE THE INTERSTATE PROGRAM**

He stressed the importance of the Interstate in economic growth, national unity, etc. He placed great emphasis on the studies required, i.e, ICE, 210 study, etc. He stressed the importance of keeping politics and compromise from undermining the functional attributes of the Interstate System. One of the problems that he saw was the number of governmental units dealing with highways-46,000 by his count. He saw this as a threat to the program.

**REP. GORDON H. SCHERRER**, Ohio, House Subcommittee on Roads.

## **WORRY ABOUT FRAUD**

He extolled the virtues of the Interstate Program and worried aloud about the many attempts there would be for graft, fraud, inefficiency, and chicanery in a program so large. He appealed to the members to hold the line.

**BERTRAM D. TALLAMY**, Administrator Designate, N.Y. Thruway Auth.

He cheered them on and told them how good they were and that they would face great adversity in the great task ahead, but they would do it and achieve mightily.

## **FIRST INTERSTATE PROJECT COMPLETED IN KANSAS**

A section of U.S. 40 West of Topeka was opened to Traffic Nov. 14, 1956.

**NOTE:** This was probably the first section of Interstate opened to traffic after the passage of the 1956 Highway Act. Obviously, Interstate segments had been built and opened to traffic before this date.

**C.D. CURTISS**, Commissioner of Public Roads, BPR.

## **THEY WERE ALL DOWNCAST THE YEAR BEFORE**

The President signed the 56 Act on June 29, 1956. He contrasted the mood of the convention to that of the year before when they were all downcast by the defeat of highway legislation. He said that more money would be made available to the Highway departments in four years than in the 40 years before. He emphasized the need for the use of computers and photogrammetry and modern management practices and standard designs in order to efficiently implement such a large program.

He quoted at length many of the provisions of the Act and called attention to five studies required by the Congress from Interstate cost estimates to the 210 cost allocation study.

## **Excerpts from the April 1957 Issue of American Highways.**

### **THE DEATH OF THOMAS H. MacDONALD**

The cover was a portrait of MacDonald edged in black. He died on Sunday, April 7, 1957 at Texas A&M., College Station. He was carried back to Washington on the National Limited to be buried at Cedar Hill Cemetery.

Pyke Johnson wrote the eulogy which spelled out 10 points that were most important to MacDonald just before his death:

### **MacDONALD'S TEN PRINCIPLES**

1. Recognition of the essential fact that transportation is not simply a service agency. It is a force which can and does affect our whole way of living or making a living.
2. The highway program must rest upon the essential premise that we are dealing with the lives of people and in the end they will make the final choices. No government can dictate.
3. The Highway partnership has proved its durability and is a model that should be applied to other programs here and abroad.
4. The extension of the highway program into urban areas is simply an extension of the same principles that have operated in the past.
5. If the States are to carry forward successfully the provisions of the 56 Act, they must reorganize and provide centralized policy for the urban and secondary programs.
6. Every urban area should have a comprehensive transportation plan geared to the total future needs of the area. This work should go forward immediately in order to limit the costs of rights-of-way, relieve congestion and to find locations for the Interstate.
7. The scenic beauty of the Interstate highways should be preserved by laws preventing the encroachment of ugly structures.
8. It is idle to attempt to estimate the final cost of the Interstate or its date of completion. The important thing is the existing rate of construction and does it meet existing needs.
9. Everything possible should be done to keep the people fully informed as to what is being done and why. In the end, the public interest will prevail.
10. Research in all aspects of highway construction, management and operation should go forward unremittingly.

The Chief was born in Leadville, Colorado July, 23, 1881.

### **WILLIAM A. BUGGE**, President of AASHO

This was a reprint of a speech he gave in March of 1957 to the Mississippi Valley Association.

### **LIMITED ACCESS IS A RADICAL CONCEPT**

He spelled out what he considered to be the real issues facing the highway departments. The dimensions of the new program were so staggering that considerable skepticism that the States could do the job had been expressed. He cited an article in the American Road Builder Newsletter that predicted that the concept of limited access and by-passes was so radical that State legislatures would not pass enabling legislation and so many States would have to pass up the 90% and use their 10% on regular 50-50 programs at least for the time being.

### **LOOK AHEAD TO WHAT IS NEEDED**

He stressed the need for all highway departments to reevaluate their organizational structure and to provide career stability to attract sufficient

engineers to do the job. He noted the feeling in some quarters that the Interstate program was a Federal takeover. He saw no grounds for that.

He saw the use of new techniques in management, computers, photogrammetry, design, finance, law, construction equipment, public relations, etc., as necessary.

He felt that the highway departments must depart from traditional procedures and employ consulting engineers to help level off the peaks in the design load. Bonding would certainly have to be judiciously used and many legislatures would have to provide increased highway funding.

**A.E. (ALF) JOHNSON**, Executive Secretary , AASHO

This was a reprint of a speech he made at the Mississippi Valley Conference in Chicago, Ill., March 7, 1957. He made several observations:

**ELEVEN OBSERVATIONS**

1. "Congress has listened and given this 'Federal-State partnership' the first chance at doing the job (building the Interstate). If the partnership falters and fails, someone else will do it for us, of that you can be sure...."
2. "If we have differences between States or with the Bureau of Public Roads, let us keep our differences to ourselves and resolve them within our own group and not air them before the public and in the press..."
3. "Public hearings required by the Act of 1956 will require the finest in public relations. Hearings must be sincere formalized, and the Department must be fully prepared to explain and support their proposals with factual data and logical reasons."

"If a hearing should force a change in project location, the public and political reaction can be so powerful as to effectively block a subsequent location and placing the project under construction."

"The (above) experience should be avoided if possible. Be properly prepared before holding hearings. If you cannot marshal support for a proposed plan at a hearing, you should probably withdraw it and take another look."

4. "Pick your most critically needed projects first, for if the need is apparent, public support is more certain. Do not force construction on routes where the need is less apparent..."
5. "The highway official must furnish definite assurances that the other highways under his jurisdiction will not be neglected while he is expediting the construction of the Interstate..."
6. "With the large number of right of way parcels that must be acquired, the number of persons involved, and amounts of money expended, the official should be constantly aware of its importance and insist on all right of way transactions being thoroughly documented and properly handled."
7. "The official must assure himself that he is not overdesigning nor underdesigning as both are a gross waste of public funds entrusted to him for spending."
8. He advocated an "assembly line" approach to project development as opposed to prior practices of undertaking planning and design only after the money was in hand.

9. "There are still charges made that control of access must be eliminated or undergo serious dilution..." He went on to say that how commercial development was handled was crucial to the retention of the limited access concept. "Highway officials must prove the worth of controlled access or the beneficial effect upon local business of taking through traffic around the town on a traffic relief route by referring to research and economic studies that have been made on the subject, generally by some other State."
10. He noted that uniform standards for Interstate signing were then under development.
11. "...There are still those who oppose various features of the highway program for selfish reasons. The program can be terminated in several ways. Any reason within our control must never be a cause. We must remain vigilant."

#### **Excerpts from the July 1957 Issue of American Highways.**

**W.A. BUGGE**, President

This was a reprint of a speech that Mr. Bugge made to the Western Assn. of State Highway Officials in Houston, Texas, June 11, 1957.

#### **WHAT HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS SHOULD DO**

He first touched on the dimensions of the 1956 Act and then turned to the responsibilities of the highway departments. He worried that because of the greatly increased problems brought on by the new program that the States might have a tendency to buck the problems back to Washington and he felt that that would be a sure way of insuring the downfall of State sovereignty in highways. He reminded them that the Federal government was not capable of running a vast highway program even if it wanted to. He stressed that the States must take a more active role in planning and research than they had been inclined to do in the past. They must be more active in the development of standards not only for construction but uniformity of State laws on traffic control and regulation.

He emphasized that the 90-10 matching rate did not alter at all the traditional prerogative of State initiation of all projects. He felt that every State should review its legislated authority and seek necessary changes and also to review their user revenue situation in order to insure adequate matching and to take care of non Federal-aid responsibilities. Each should review its management structure and salary schedules and seek changes in order to obtain and hold engineering talent. Greater efficiencies should be sought through computers, photogrammetry, and innovative construction equipment and techniques.

He felt that new personnel relations were required in order to instill trust and confidence in employees. Public relations was also extremely important and an area that highway engineers had traditionally shunned but success or failure might well hinge on their abilities in that area.

He also felt that all departments needed to strengthen their abilities in the area of accounting not only for showing accountability for public funds but from the standpoint of evaluating economic payoffs of projects and methods for planning and programming purposes.

**F.C. TURNER**, Deputy Commissioner & Chief Engineer, BPR.

This is a speech given at the Third Annual Seminar, American Right of Way Association, Chicago, May 16, 1957. It was titled "Federal Highway Program and Procedures."

He reminded them that the 1956 Act was not new at all but was the 49th amendment to the 1916 Act.

### **THE IMPORTANCE OF PLANNING**

He spelled out the history of the highway program and emphasized the importance of planning in influencing the course of events over the years. He cited the reports Toll Roads and Free Roads and Interregional Highways as being crucial to the establishment of the Interstate program. He also cited President Eisenhower's speech in 1954 calling for a "Grand Plan" for highways as another critical milestone.

He pointed out that the requirement of the 1956 Act that the Interstate be designed and built for traffic requirements many years in advance, was the first time in history that the program was required to be forward looking and not just reactive to already existing congestion (This was indeed contrary to the principle upon which the program was built through the twenties, i.e., that only projects be built that had the demonstrated ability to return more revenue than they cost. Doing otherwise was considered to have been the error of the counties and townships, thus squandering their resources on small projects with insignificant travel. MacDonald had been quite critical of Germany for building the Autobahnen when the traffic wasn't already there).

The control of access was also radically new and of direct concern to the audience. He cited statistics to show the safety and capacity implications.

### **THE SYSTEM CONCEPT**

He noted the recent development of the "System" concept in highways which was greatly accelerated by the 1944 Highway Act which required the development of multiple Federal aid systems and thus required the revision of State laws to permit that function to take place. He cited this as a great step ahead in planning for priorities in highway improvements and the allocation of resources to where they were most needed.

**CLIFTON W. ENFIELD**, General Counsel, BPR

This was given to the Third Annual National Seminar of the American Right-of-way Association, May 16, 1957, Chicago. It was titled "Acquisition of Right-of-way for Federal-aid Highways."

### **NEWNESS OF RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION**

He noted that right-of-way acquisitions during the next 13 years would exceed the total such actions for highways in history partially because 75% of the Interstate would be constructed on new alignment.

He stressed that since the function was so new, whole new disciplines and concepts would have to be developed. New legislation would have to be enacted,



standards developed, appraisers hired and trained etc., and it would all have to be done quickly.

The very nature of right-of-way acquisition by eminent domain would result in litigation, a field new to the departments and they must prepare for it.

### **THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL ACQUIRE IN SOME CASES**

He cited the issuance of PPM 21-4 having to do with acquisition of right-of-way by the Federal government on the State's behalf. This was a new feature of the 1956 Act available to those States that did not have the legal authority for access control and other features such as utility relocation. He described the process in some detail noting that the Department of Justice would do the acquisition through the local office of the United States Attorney.

The speech was quite technical and comprehensive in an area that has received little public attention.

**A.E. JOHNSON**, Executive Secretary, AASHO.

This was an address given to the American Right-of-way Association on May 16, 1957.

### **THE COMPLEXITY OF R.O.W. ACQUISITION**

He noted that the 1956 Act had spurred r.o.w. legislation in more than a dozen States. He said the expanded highway program was under scrutiny by Congress because of the vast sums involved and the feature that the Federal government would acquire r.o.w on request. He said that a Congressional hearing on the subject had begun the day before.

### **THE POTENTIAL FOR SCANDAL**

He said that 44 departments had indicated that they would have no need to have the Federal government do the acquisition. He discussed the details of how various departments were organized. He said proposals were before Congress to allow payments to displaced tenants. He urged extreme care and diligence in the acquisition process to avoid scandal.

**JOSEPH C. HAZEN**, Managing Editor, The Architectural Forum.

This Speech was delivered to the 43rd. Annual Road School, Purdue University, April 24, 1957.

### **THE AUTOMOBILE IS ON THE WAY OUT-THE INTERSTATE IS TOO LATE**

"To dispel immediately any friendliness that may be lurking in some dark corner of this room, let me tell you of the thought that kept my mind off the road I travelled this morning between Indianapolis and Lafayette: I kept wondering if this conference on road building in 1957 didn't make about as much sense as the last annual convention of carriage makers back in 1909. Why? Did you know that General Motors has announced the formation of a new division, prophetically named 'the electronic highway department!' And did you know that the Rotor-

Craft Corp. of Glendale, Calif. has announced the production of a jet-powered helicopter for civilians-as simple to operate as an outboard and priced at half the cost of our cheapest automobile-less than \$1000! Who needs roads?"

"...I suggest 'The Metropolitan Transportation Problem' by Wilfred Owen of MIT and any articles you can find written by his MIT colleague, John T. Howard."

"Maybe I will have trouble convincing you that the outlook for highway building is a gloomy one, for I know and you know that \$100 billion of federal, state and local funds will go into highway building in the next 10 to 15 years. But in one major respect the outlook for highway building is gloomy: unless we are very careful, the program will completely fail its purpose."

### **DEFINITION OF THE HIGHWAY FUNCTION**

"Most people will say that the purpose of a highway is to move traffic. Not so. That is its function. Its purpose, like that of any public facility, is to serve the community. Unless the new highways serve the community, regardless of how well built they are, how smooth, how fast, how heavy an axle load they will carry or how attractive they are-regardless of how well they meet all these tests, if our new highways do not serve the community, they fail."

"First, what do we mean by 'Community?'..." He went on to define it as the metro areas where 60% of the population lives.

"Our metropolitan areas are growing in acreage as well as in population, consuming rural land at a gluttonous rate...These land-eating metropolitan areas of our country comprise the community of which we speak-the community which the new highways must serve."

### **THE CITIES ARE OUT OF CONTROL NOW**

"...The auto can break cities as well as make them. The auto's speed and turning radius long ago made the city's horse and buggy street pattern quite obsolete; the auto's quantity production long ago made the city impossibly congested; and then the auto provided the means by which the upper and middle income groups could escape from the city...and the means by which the city's slums and blight are now being transplanted into the suburbs and into the country."

"Out of control, as it is today, this city smashing chain reaction will end only when we run out of unspoiled land as one metropolis sprawls into another."

He described urban sprawl in detail and dimensioned it and quoted Catherine Bauer, a leading Geographer in the Forum Magazine: "The challenge of tomorrow-the shaping of the metropolitan community that must provide for these 46 million more Americans outside our central cities-is going unheeded by and large. Most new development continues to take place outside the jurisdiction of responsible local government or of well-staffed planning agencies. Growth in the hinterland just happens-shaped in the main, by fate, the ad hoc decisions of individual developers, and the narrow financial concerns of the Federal Housing Administration and the lending agencies."

## **THE NEED FOR HIGHWAYS TO BE DERIVATIVE TO COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING**

"Fortunately, the auto and the highway which have contributed to the growth and congestion crisis now confronting our cities can also be their salvation. But will they? Will the new 41,000 mile highway program, about 6,000 miles of which will be built within urban areas, relieve the traffic congestion which is choking our cities? Not unless it helps solve the fundamental problems that cause this urban congestion."

He went on to point out that if the highways were planned to implement other public works that the urban areas had planned or were underway, the highways could help, but if they weren't, they would compound the problems.

"You say there is no question about this cooperation between the highway planners and the community leaders. I say there is..." He cited a particular highway in New Jersey where its construction was sprung on the local officials as a complete surprise.

"Of course, it would be ideal if every community not only had a master plan of future development but also had it published for all to know. Better yet, the downtown renewal program and the access highway program should be planned simultaneously, as it has been in several of our more wide-awake communities."

He pointed out that a new radial freeway would extend suburban sprawl further out and create housing that would become eventual slums and that such developments would overload the highway.

"These and similar questions indicate that the transportation problem is not simply a matter of providing more and bigger highways and parking lots. As Wilfred Owen says, the metropolitan transportation problem is really only partly a transportation problem. 'Half is building additional transport facilities. The other half,' he says, 'is creating an environment in which the transportation system can work.' By 'creating an environment,' he means imposing restraints to avoid the creation of transport demands beyond the capacity of the transportation system. In other words, to make sure that the problem a highway is designed to solve doesn't change as soon as the concrete has set."

## **COMPREHENSIVE PLANS MUST PRECEDE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION**

"I can hear you say that often the city has no plans for the highway designers to tie into. All too often this is true. But most large cities and many smaller communities do have plans and planners. For you to ignore or disregard them is inexcusable. If they do not exist, then it behooves the highway builders to urge the cities to find out-or to find out for themselves-how a proposed highway can best serve the true interests of the community."

"Highway planning today involves so much more than technology and design that few engineers are qualified to handle the job alone. Their work today involves land use plus planning, industrial development, land economics, urban renewal, city planning and a host of other specialties. If they are intelligent enough to see this, they are also intelligent enough to see that they cannot do the full job alone. They must work closely with city planners and, where cities do not employ planners, perhaps they should hire planners themselves as consultants. Surely

we want our highways in a hurry and at minimum cost consistent with sound design. But speed of construction and low cost may be far less important than the long range benefits and economies that may be had by devoting a little extra time and money on integrating the highways into other city plans."

### **COORDINATION AND COOPERATION A MUST**

"Without such thoughtful coordination of the highway program with city planning and urban renewal, the proposed \$100 billion of highway spending will buy as much chaos as concrete, and years from now we will be little better off than we are today."

"...Smarter men than I have prophesied that during the next few years you and your colleagues, in planning the highways under the new Federal Aid program, will have more effect on the pattern of growth and the character of our metropolitan areas, than all of the planning done by all of our city planners since the war."

"That, gentlemen, is an awful responsibility. I beseech you to handle it carefully."

### **Excerpts from the October 1957 Issue of American Highways: INTERSTATE ROUTE MARKER SELECTED AND NUMEROLOGY MAP APPROVED**

The article documented approval of the Interstate numbering sign at a meeting of the Committee on Administration held at the AASHO Road Test on August 14, 1957. Over 100 designs were considered. The policy and procedure governing the use of the signs was also presented.

### **WILLIAM A. BUGGE, President of AASHO**

The title of the speech was "Cooperation, The Password To Success". It was delivered at the 16th annual meeting of the Southeastern Association of State Highway Officials.

"...We are now in the big time. There are disciplines and interests that have never been interested in the highway program before that are now becoming interested. These new interests can give us many problems not before encountered."

### **WE CAN'T WAIT IF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS DON'T EXIST**

"We hear allegations now that the men who have developed procedures and planning and who have located and designed the nation's foremost urban motor facilities are not entirely capable of doing so, and may need some expert assistance from outsiders. I say that the highway engineer, going about his location, development and design, as he does, follows proper and established procedures of planning. He determines what the traffic is, where it wants to go, what it will be within a given time in the future, and the existing and probable land uses within the city. He determines where the cheapest right of way may be available, and he combines all these factors and makes a recommendation. As long as he bases and supports proposals on such procedure, he is doing a good engineering and planning job and is performing as he should if competent and adequate professional planning has not already been done or is underway."

"If an urban area has some advance planning as to land use development and the like, any highway department would be most happy to have this information and consider it. If such planning has not already taken place, it is doubtful that time can be afforded in an urban area to develop such plans, and the highway departments will have to go about their job and do the best planning, location design that is possible."

### **CAN'T TOLERATE A TWO YEAR MORATORIUM TO WAIT FOR URBAN PLANNING**

"We should bear in mind that the urban part of the Interstate program, and the allocation for the urban extensions of the primary Federal-aid system are not large enough nor designed to take care of all of the urban transportation problems. The recent Hartford meeting of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company on highway planning in metropolitan areas has brought some of the attitudes that exist into the open and identified them. Some are constructive, some serve as warnings that we must heed. There one proposal was made that we have a two-year moratorium on the highway program to give the planners an opportunity to prepare for the program. The economic penalties for delaying already vitally needed facilities for another two years would be tremendous. A two-year moratorium is a bit ridiculous. We note that the American Municipal Association official in attendance denounced the proposal. We know that there are constructive planners who can help us and some others that dwell in the realm of untried theories."

He noted that \$1 billion had already been obligated on the Interstate. He estimated that the Interstate would require about 2 million acres of right of way but 1.5 of that would be from unproductive land.

### **CONSIDER LOCAL PLANS**

He listed 8 different meanings of "cooperation" ranging from the departments cooperating with each other to cooperation within highway departments. No. 5 was cooperation with the local officials. "Local officials-Urban and County have an intense interest and responsibility in the highway programs, and we should make them feel they have a part in the successful execution of the program...By considering any plans and proposals that these local governments may have for highways is most helpful and establishes good relationships..."

No.6 was cooperation with civic groups and other organizations. "By cooperating with this type of group, we can gain support for our proposed projects especially if we are able to show the reasons for our proposals and explain how we arrived at those proposals as we should in every case..."

No. 7 was cooperation with the public. "Here I refer to dislocated persons, who are having to move because of right of way acquisition."

### **CONGRESS IS BEGINNING TO HEAR COMPLAINTS**

"We are right now in the stage of the program when there is a period of dissatisfaction. Many individuals are disgruntled-the housewife whose home is being filled with dust, the merchant or innkeeper who is being left on an old road, the farmer whose farm is being cut in two, the dislocated apartment dweller, the property owner, and others, are dissatisfied and will be until the highway project

in question is completed, handling traffic, and a period of stabilization and readjustment has elapsed."

"In the past, these dissatisfied individuals have usually carried their complaints to the highway departments, the highway commission and the Governor. There has been so much publicity, however, about the big national highway program that a great volume of mail now goes to the Congress."

### **AASHO MUST HAVE A LEGISLATIVE POLICY**

"...During the past year the highway officials have not had a legislative policy. Our thinking was in line with the Chairman of the House Public Works Committee. We must, however, have a strong legislative policy this coming year or lose prestige. We cannot and should not neglect our responsibilities and leave certain important items to the good judgement of the Congress, even on controversial matters..."

### **TRANSIT CAN MEAN TROUBLE**

"Other things that can complicate our picture can be the rapid transit problem, wherein those interests are looking longingly towards our road funds, and the actions of organized groups, and business interests that are being affected by the relocation of the highways or by the control of access..."

He closed by admonishing his audience to keep the word "cooperation" uppermost in their minds.

### **C.D. CURTISS, Comm. Public Roads, to SASHO**

The Commissioner gave a status report on the program, complimented certain Interstate highway projects, especially in the South, and discussed the importance of the AASHO Road Test as an element in the Congressional requirement for a uniform size and weight study and also its importance in the Section 210 Cost Allocation Study.

### **F.A. DAVIS, President of SASHO-Welcome.**

### **THE PUBLIC IS DEMANDING RESULTS**

"...Getting the big new highway program rolling has been the toughest job and the greatest challenge that the highway engineer has had to face until now. The big program has been a reality for a little more than a year. Some of our people expected immediate results but in most instances the public has been considerate and understanding. It is generally realized that a construction program of this magnitude cannot be put under way immediately. However, we have now had our breathing spell. After more than a year, the public wants to see results in the form of work under way, and the public has a right to expect results. We must now deliver the goods in the form of completed projects. The obstacles that stand in the way must be overcome..."

### **GOOD PUBLIC RELATIONS A MUST**

"...The location of the Interstate routes and the hearings on them give new emphasis to the problem of public relations. The motel owner on the existing road bitterly resents being left to wither on the vine-or so he thinks-while the big new super-highway that is to be the Interstate route is relocated over the hill from him. The farmer doesn't want to go down to the next interchange to get across the road to visit his neighbor on the other side. They all think that controlled access is fine for the other fellow but it should not apply to him. We shall have to get our story across to the public, and get it presented in its best light, if we are going to have support for this program. The Interstate System will, I think, sell itself when substantial mileage of it is in use, but in the early stages there are many misconceptions and much local opposition. The hearings now required on all Federal aid projects brings us in much closer touch with the local people than ever before. If we use it properly, it is a wonderful opportunity..."

**NOTE:** This may have led to the AASHO Committee on Public Information being directed at the 1957 annual meeting to assemble all information on the economic impact of limited access highways. The resulting report, dated December 1958, entitled Expressways Benefit You, though identified as preliminary, yielded considerable information. A polling of States' public relations activities in 1954 showed only a few States had public information programs.

### **COMPLETION HAS ALREADY SLIPPED THREE YEARS**

"...No one can say what the future holds. The Congress, this year enacted no new legislation. But the coming year will bring up many questions of vital interest to all of us. Congress will have before it the revised cost estimate of the Interstate System. According to all reports, this is considerably in excess of the original estimate, and will require much more than the 27 billion dollars contemplated by the 1956 Act. What will Congress do? The 13-year period of construction has already been extended to 16. Will it be further extended or will additional funds be provided?"

"Congress will also have before it the report on toll and free roads previously constructed and now made a part of the Interstate System. It will be interesting to see how this controversial question is resolved. Likewise, the question of control of billboards along the Interstate System is going to come in for a lot of attention."

"Unquestionably, Congress is going to insist on progress on the Interstate System. We shall have to demonstrate the fact that we are capable of carrying out this highway program as designed, and on schedule. Otherwise, we can expect drastic action."

### **DON'T EXPAND THE INTERSTATE**

"There has been much pressure to expand the Interstate System beyond the 41,000-mile limit now set on it. I understand that the Bureau of Public Roads has requests for about 14,000 miles additional. They have the unenviable task of selecting 1,000 miles out of this. Many of us feel that the Interstate program will be a continuing one. As the System is developed, the public will demand that it be expanded. But we also feel that it would not be wise to expand it until we are at least well on the way with the present system..."

**Excerpts from the January 1958 Issue of American Highways.**  
**WM. A BUGGE**, The President's Annual Address

"...I want to mention Thomas H. MacDonald. He is no longer with us, but the monument he built with his heart, his intelligence and his tireless devotion to duty stands on. He designed this relationship between the Federal and State governments in highway matters. He saw it grow into one of the finest instruments ever developed. He saw it flourish and he saw it build a highway system which is the finest ever achieved by man..."

### **WORRIED ABOUT FEDERAL DOMINANCE**

"Of course, there is a danger that the Federal-State relationship he built may be changed. For the Federal government is pouring large sums of money into a highway program. If the States can't spend that money effectively, the Federal government will spend it and that means a subordination of the role of the State highway departments. The State highway departments may become mere messengers of the Federal government..."

"The manner in which the States discharge their obligations in this large-scale highway program will determine largely just what role the State highway departments play over the years ahead."

### **PUBLIC SUPPORT ESSENTIAL**

Certainly the legislation we can expect at this next session of the Congress will reflect the public support the State Highway departments have. If the people support their State highway departments, highway policy will continue to be determined at the State level. But if we haven't earned the public support through effective and vigorous action there is grave danger that highway policy will be transferred piece by piece to the Federal government. That would be fatal to the success of our highway program."

### **THE NEEDS STUDY**

"Now I come to the subject which Congress will deal with which is of overwhelming importance to the success of the program. That's the consideration of the "Needs Studies" the States have made. This will set the score of the highway program. It will determine just how much money a (each) State gets for improvement of its portion of the Interstate system."

### **THE COST OF THE INTERSTATE WILL BE MORE**

"These totals are going to be more than the total in the 1955 "Needs Study." But there are valid reasons for this. It is assumed there will be a modest increase in the estimated cost of the Interstate System over the 1954 figure, however, the increase can accurately be explained as follows: One half is caused by the increase in construction and right of way costs since 1954, the other half by a better realization of the design and construction requirements of the traffic needs of 1975. Nevertheless, this association will be called upon to defend those cost figures and to defend the policy which would allocate the money among the States on the basis of the relationship of need. This must continue to be of concern to us during the next session of Congress..."

The rest of the speech was routine reports of status.



**SEN. ALBERT GORE**, Address to the Annual Meeting

His speech was largely historical in nature.

"My distinguished predecessor in the Senate, the late Senator Kenneth D. McKellar, was among those in Congress who was instrumental in the passage of the 1916 Act. It has been said that he became interested in a Federal highway program when he found it necessary to ship his automobile from Tennessee to Washington by rail because there was no adequate road over which it could be driven..."

**CONCERNED ABOUT THE EARMARKING OF FUNDS**

"...A...major policy change contained in the 1956 Act was the provision earmarking certain highway user taxes for use solely in highway construction. I want to be quite frank in saying that I have some reservations about the earmarking of tax funds. If carried too far, there is no question but that such earmarking can completely hamstring a legislative body by denying it effective control over the appropriation of funds. I can assure you that Congress will watch most carefully and jealously the operation of the highway trust fund. We will certainly seek to insure that the funds are used strictly for the purposes for which they are earmarked..."

"...The program has not gotten off to as fast a start as many of us would like to see..."

"...In his announcement of October 18, the Secretary of Commerce approved not only an additional thousand miles specifically provided for in the Act, but also yet another 1,102 miles said to have become available as a result of estimated savings in mileage by the use of new locations with more direct connections between control points on the System..."

**CONCERNED ABOUT THE DESIGNATION OF THE LAST 2000 MILES**

"...I say to you quite frankly, that I was and am somewhat concerned about the action of the Department of Commerce in approving for designation new additions to the Interstate System which had not been sought by the States and, at least in some instances, without even having consulted the Highway Department in the States in which they were to be located. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 which established the Interstate System provided that the routes to make up the System should be "selected by joint action of the State Highway Departments of each State and the adjoining States, as provided for by the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, for the selection of the Federal Aid System..."

"So far as I have been able to ascertain, up until last month, the Bureau of Public Roads had invariably adhered to a policy of considering only those requests for additions to or changes in the System for which one or more of the States had made formal application...We can't have a partnership if we don't even have consultation..."

**FREE OF FRAUD**

"...We shall insist that this great highway program be clean of fraud, free of partisan politics, and conducted in true cooperation and mutual respect by both Federal and State officials."

**BERTRAM D. TALLAMY**, Administrator's Annual Address.

### **DECENTRALIZATION OF BPR**

"...I thought I would talk to you about such things as our progress, the status of the trust fund-that must be of interest to you-the fact that we have decentralized our operations a great deal now in an effort to expedite the highway program. I would like to tell you about some of the problems of the future and the pitfalls as I see them in this program, including the need for overall planning in connection with the development of our metropolitan plans for highway development. I think I ought to talk to you a little bit about the thousand mile addition of the Interstate System. (Laughter-this was what Senator Gore earlier accused the Administration of designating without consulting the highway departments.) And another thing that is very important, I think, is the matter of public hearings."

He gave the status of program obligations and the condition of the Trust Fund which included a discussion of the strategy to avoid a deficit in the Fund. He noted that all program authority except final location approval had been delegated to the field offices. He spoke of the shortage of trained engineers and encouraged the use of electronic computers and photogrammetry wherever possible and offered technical assistance in both of those areas. He stressed the tremendous amount of work being done in the cities:

### **METROPOLITAN PLANNING**

"...We are not getting credit, neither the Federal government nor the State highway departments, for this particular work that we are doing (metropolitan planning), and doing properly. And let me stress the vital importance of proceeding in accordance with a good overall basic plan when you undertake the construction of urban arterial highways or sections of the Interstate system in metropolitan areas."

"I said you were doing it right and you are. The law requires, and you would do it any way, that we design these highways for 1975 traffic. Now, before you do that, you have to know what the traffic is today. You have to know where it starts and where it wants to go in the metropolitan area, and then you have to find out the peak loads of traffic, where it comes from and where it wants to go at rush hours. Then you have to know the same information for 1975 before you can properly design a highway to carry 1975 traffic."

"Now it is perfectly obvious that you cannot forecast traffic of the future in any metropolitan area unless you know how that area is going to function in 1975, how it is going to develop between now and 1975, what vacant areas today are going to be industrial, what single dwelling unit areas today are going to be multiple dwelling units. Is your commercial area going to expand into a downtown section or are other areas going to be opened up for commercial development? Is urban redevelopment in the picture?"

"Those are the things that the State highway engineer has to know before he can forecast what the traffic flows are going to be in 1975, and he has to know that

before he can design his highways for 1975. Obviously, so if the city doesn't have a good urban program planned today, one that the State highway engineer can use to facilitate his designs he must go through the same basic steps that the city has to go through to develop its own master plan for transportation. That hard fact ought to be recognized by everybody and if, by chance you are ignoring it I certainly urge that you immediately review your procedures for urban arterial development to make certain that this basic method is being followed. It is the only sound approach and it is the only way you can be sure that these wonderful highways which you are developing will actually stimulate metropolitan development as it should be stimulated..."

## **INTERSTATE DESIGNATIONS**

"...Now as to the Interstate System expansion which we announced recently. If there was ever a problem and a headache that was given to the Bureau of Public Roads, it was to be the Solomon to distribute the newly authorized 1,000 miles plus some 1,102 miles in saving when there were 13,775 miles of requests. It was done analytically."

He described how the elimination of stubs, discontinuities etc., brought the candidate mileage down to 5,285 from 13,775. Those remaining were carefully considered from the standpoint of Defense, system integration, population served and economic importance. Rating weights were assigned to each factor and then to each route and the evaluations continued until those remaining were within the mileage to be allocated.

"We would like to have called in all of the States where new routes appeared during the latter part of this analysis looming up as very important. It would have been very desirable to have called you in and said, 'This looks good and we would like to have you initiate it,' but to do so would have involved joint action of a number of States all over the United States which would have surely delayed the decision many months, and would, in turn, have delayed the advancement of other routes for which you have already made application."

"I think we did it right, but certainly there was no intent on the part of the Bureau of Public Roads or the Department of Commerce to indicate any beginning at all of the Bureau of Public Roads dominating this highway picture..."

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

"...This new legislation required that we-you, rather, -hold public hearings...it has been necessary during the initiation of this program to go to the public hearings with nearly completed plans, and in a few places completed plans, because you had them already finished at the time this legislation requiring public hearings was adopted so there was no other alternative, but that time is gone now and we should hold our public hearings ...when you have decided on the best location, you know where the interchanges are going to be...and you know that it is physically possible to build the route there...but no further." He went on to describe that if information was developed at the hearing that required a change in location, a lot of money would have been wasted in the development of final plans.

He indicated that costs would be up in the revised Interstate Cost Estimate about to be submitted. He noted the difficulty of estimating costs 15 years in advance

but he felt that the program would put so much work under construction that costs could come down.

**SEN. FRANCIS CASE, S.D.,** Address to the Annual Meeting.

#### **EVENTS LEADING TO THE 56 ACT**

"...We were told by your representatives and by the Bureau of Public Roads that we were not keeping pace with the growing highway needs of the country, so in the 1954 Act we attempted to provide a Federal aid program which would roughly approximate the dollars being collected on these taxes I have mentioned, so we stepped up the total amount for the ABC Roads from 550 to 700 million dollars per year. We stepped up the interstate program from 25 million to 175 million. Percentage wise that was a much larger increase, but as it was indicated this morning, the interstate system had been in the doldrums. Authorized in 1944, designated in 1947, we had been spending only about 25 million dollars a year."

"One reason for the position of the interstate system was not merely the small amount of dollars provided for it but it was the fact that the standards for the interstate system were properly higher than for the other parts of the primary system and the states confronted with the necessity of getting the most road miles for their dollars were reluctant to match too much on a 50-50 basis. They had to put in more to meet the standards and yet could not get as much for their dollars."

"...So in the 1954 Act we proposed that the percentage matched by the Federal Government be increased. I do not recall whether it was a 75-25 basis or 66 2/3 and 33 1/3 basis. In the conference it was settled at 60-40. We established a principle that if we were going to build an interstate system to a higher standard at the interest of the Federal government then it would be appropriate that the Federal Government should make a larger contribution toward the cost of meeting that high standard."

"Then we did some other things in the 1954 Act which laid the foundation for the 1956 Act which were epochal in character. We had had some discussion about a joint Congressional study of the needs for bringing our several highway systems up to date, not merely the interstate but the primary, secondary and urban."

"So we wrote into the Highway Act Section 13 which directed the Bureau of Public Roads to make a study in cooperation with the several state highway authorities of the needs of the several systems to see what was needed to bring the system up to the standard necessary to meet our traffic requirements. That Section 13 study became the basis for the work of the Governors Committee and the Clay Committee which followed a year or two later."

"In 1954 when we were working on the step-up of the rate of aid for the agency roads some of the brethren in the Senate and the House were a little skeptical as to whether or not the President would approve and provide that large an increase. In fact, we were told in the conference that some members of the Congress felt quite confident the President would not agree with it if we followed the recommendations of the Senate bill in that respect."

#### **EISENHOWER'S URGING**

"I have never forgotten when we went to the White House at the time the President signed the 1954 Act that he had a fist-full of pens there and he signed a few letters with each pen and passed them out to us. He said, "That gets us started, but we must do more," and he went on to talk to us about other public needs, too."

"That was followed by the message he sent to the Conference of Governors, delivered by Vice President Nixon, in which he threw out the bold challenge for the greatly stepped-up building of the interstate highway system. The President appointed a committee headed by General Lucius Clay and in 1955 those recommendation came to the Congress."

"...We had the Constitutional problem (in 1955) that you cannot originate revenue measures; they can only start in the House. In fact, the bill itself must carry a House Number, if it included tax features."

### **FAILURE IN 55**

"Some of us thought it might be possible to develop a use fee or a license system for cars that travel on the interstate road and use that as a method of financing. Be that as it may, the thing could not be worked out satisfactorily in 1955 when we originally passed the version of the stepped-up program which was the basis of the Senate action. In the House of Representatives they ran into the same hard stubborn rock to get across and the bill failed in the 1955 session of the House, but in 1956 Congressman George Fallon and his associates Harry McGregor and others, came forward with the taxes that were worked out by the Ways and Means Committee to finance the program."

"...The second thing that ought to be considered and must be considered in the work on the 1958 Act will be the evaluation of the cost estimates for completing the interstate system. I think many of you are familiar with the fact that one of our greatest problems in both the Senate and House and also in the Conference was the method of apportionment that should be used for the interstate funds. In the 1954 Act we had met the problem halfway, you might say, by providing for the allocation of 50 percent of the funds on population alone and then the other 50 per cent on the one third-one third-one third familiar ratio which, when added together, gave us two-thirds on the basis of population one-sixth on area and one-sixth on mileage."

### **HOW TO APPORTION?**

"Because of the great spread of different yardsticks that must have been used in the cost estimates that were available to us at the time of the conference on the 1956 Act we finally arrived at a compromise of continuing to ride on the old formula for the first three years and then for the last ten years the new estimate of costs on which you have been working and to which Mr. Tallamy referred this morning. But there is nothing automatic about that. The 1956 Act could not bind and does not pretend to bind the Congress that will be in session in 1958. We could go through all of this again, this matter of determining the apportionment."

"...If the cost estimates stand up, then they will be basic and we will start out apportioning the states one-tenth of the cost estimated for the cost of completing the miles in that state designated under the original 40,000 miles designation."

"Those of you familiar with the language on the additional 1,000 miles remember that the addition of that 1,000 miles did not automatically increase the amount of money going to the state..."

### **THE TOLL ROAD PROBLEM**

"A third thing which the committees are almost certain to take up is the determination of whether or not states that have had toll roads incorporated into the interstate system will be reimbursed for the cost of the same. Some 2100 miles of toll roads or turnpikes are incorporated into the interstate system now. Congress could turn a deaf ear to the pleas of those states for reimbursement on the grounds that those roads are already built, but I think that there will be a feeling that there should be some reimbursement to the states if the roads are made free before the tolls have completed retirement of the bonds outstanding. This will be a vexing problem and a difficult problem because the natural temptation will be to say 'Let's not pay for them right away. They are being used, they are in operation, the states are collecting the money for them.'"

The rest of the speech was about things that might possibly come up in the next highway hearings.

**REP. GEORGE FALLON**, Md., House Public Works Committee-Address to the Annual Meeting.

He indicated that the Congress would be reviewing the progress of the Interstate and that it was looking forward to receiving the new cost estimate and the other studies being done by BPR.

### **COMPLAINTS**

"...I think I hear practically all of the complaints that you officials live with all the time. There are those who claim the program is bogging down and want it speeded up and those who in cities would like to declare a moratorium for two or three years to provide time for urban planning; those who insist on a community bypass and those who resist the bypass; those who can never agree with those who consider the interstate ugly or "phony" as to defense importance; those who see opportunity in doing strange and wondrous things with the Trust Fund money..."

### **CODIFICATION OF HIGHWAY LAW**

"...Another legislative job facing our Committee is the codification and modernization of Federal highway laws, now largely a hodge-podge and in many respects obsolete. I am sure that this is of extreme importance to the Bureau of Public Roads and to you in the State highway departments. I will introduce legislation to accomplish this and hope it will move along rapidly..."

"...Speaking of modernization and moving this program forward, its very size and newness has generated the need for expanded and improved public relations between highway departments and the people who are affected. I mentioned some of the typical complaints and charges that I hear; actually the immensity of the program and its long-term benefits have not yet really come home to the public."

## **THE NEED FOR GOOD PUBLIC RELATIONS**

"As highway engineers and administrators, you have an enormous responsibility in your contacts with the public to spell out the value of the new highways and to deal, in every case, with tact and diplomacy."

"...An enlightened and understanding public is not only essential to the success of your local highway programs but of immense help to Members of Congress in their efforts to shape acceptable legislation. We need the support of the folks back home."

He touched on the need for more attention to highway safety and congratulated AASHO on the great job it was doing.

### **C.D. CURTISS, Commissioner, BPR to the Annual meeting, Nov. 18, 1957**

Curtiss urged the use of all forms of media, including the public hearings, to disseminate knowledge about the new program. He felt that the immediate future would be difficult until sufficient mileage was open for traffic at which point, the program would sell itself.

## **URBAN PLANNING**

"Perhaps the greatest challenge...is in the urban areas. Here, as you all know, careful cooperative planning is a basic requirement, and such work has been carried out in a number of States. Where up-to-date master plans providing for different types of land use were available, work on urban sections of the Interstate was initiated without delay...Where up-to-date plans are not available, further surveys and studies are necessary to properly locate the Interstate..."

"As experience has shown, this is an undertaking which requires the full cooperation of all levels of government. Fortunately we are not strangers to this kind of cooperation. It has been going on for some time-long enough to demonstrate that our State highway departments are well qualified to carry out the necessary planning surveys in cooperation with municipal officials of the areas under study."

He cited several studies around the country as models of good cooperation and practice..."The joint AMA-AASHO Committee and the Urban Transportation Committee are making a most useful contribution to a better understanding of urban transportation problems and the need for full and prompt cooperation at all levels of government. Leadership of the individual State highway departments is necessary to make this cooperation effective."

The rest of the speech was quite comprehensive. The topics were the same as those covered by the other speakers at the meeting.

### **H.S. FAIRBANK Received first MacDonald Award, Nov. 18, 1957**

D.C. Greer presented the first Thomas H. MacDonald Award to Herbert S. Fairbank. Fairbank graduated from Cornell in 1910 and joined BPR that year. His first job was editor of the Public Roads Magazine. He was credited with co-

authorship of Toll Roads and Free Roads, Interregional Highways and Highways for National Defense.

An interesting sidelight was Mr. Greer's description of Mr. MacDonald's death: "As you know, approximately seven months ago on April 7, 1957, Thomas H. MacDonald down at Texas A. & M. College at College Station, Tex., walked over to the cigar counter after a very pleasant dinner with his family and friends and bought a cigar, sat down on a comfortable divan and passed away."

### **The July 1958 Issue of American Highways.**

**WM. E. WILLY**, Pres. WASHO, at Salt Lake City, June 3, 1958.

Mr. Willy noted that the new Interstate Cost Estimate had increased the cost from \$27 billion to \$37 billion. Considering the extra 1000 miles that were not in the estimate, he speculated that \$40 billion was not unreasonable. He felt that with the time stretch outs caused by limiting the apportionments to avoid deficits in the Trust Fund that 20 years to complete the System was not unreasonable. He had the following to say about planning:

#### **LONG RANGE PLANNING**

"Long-range planning is a wonderful thing, but with the rapidly changing national and world situation I wonder if it is wise and the most economical thing to do, to try and outguess them for perhaps more than three years at a time. I feel that if a State has a three-year construction program, where annually you drop off a year and add another, then you are pretty well ahead of the situation. There is a great need to have a flexible type organization where you can shift with the tide and accept overnight changes as a regular thing rather than as an emergency. If there is an active plan where you are working at least one year ahead of the current fiscal year, you will be in a better position to accept these sudden changes than if you have everything keyed to a beautiful but impractical long-range schedule. One overnight development could knock the whole thing out of kilter if you attempt to plan too far ahead. I know we are all hoping for the day when we have the stability to do real long-range planning, by which we can give the motorist and taxpayer and everyday citizen the most for his money. I don't know when this happy day will arrive but I am personally looking forward to it with a great deal of anticipation."

#### **OPPOSITION TO BY-PASSES**

He spoke of the problems they were encountering with the Interstate Program: "Number one is probably the by-passing problem. Try as we might, we have not been able to halt the loud outcry of the motel, restaurant and service station people. Most of the public are on our side, but they make up the great silent majority, so the public hearings are inevitably crowded with the anti-by-pass element. We can only hope that as the Interstate program pushes ahead, in spite of this opposition, the benefits will come to be so gratifying that the tide will automatically turn in the right direction."

#### **PROBLEMS WITH LIMITED ACCESS**

"Another problem is concerned with control of access. The big change in thinking as outlined in the 1956 Highway Act that now we are building highways for the benefit of the motorist and the property owner has little or nothing to say in the



matter. After doing things one way for 40 years, since the passage of the first Federal-aid Highway Act, we now have to do a complete about face in our philosophy of road building. Here in the West this concept is proving highly unpalatable to our ranches and farmers, who have long been accustomed to almost totally unrestricted freedom, of movement. Until recently an unforeseen factor was the dividing of large range holdings as the Interstate System was routed, sometimes diagonally, through grazing or crop lands. Perhaps the water hole would be on one side and the grazing land on the other; round-up time without adequate cattle passes would be something to behold."

"...Now that the 1958 Act provides for hearings in rural as well as urban areas, we will do our best to lay some good-will groundwork for future negotiations with farmers and ranchers..."

**A.E. JOHNSON**, Executive Secretary AASHO at WASHO, Salt Lake City.

### **PROBLEMS WITH THE FIRST COST ESTIMATE**

The rest of the title was "Voluntarily Established or Federally Imposed-The Decision is Ours." He described himself as the "Official Worrier from Washington." and worried that unless the States exhibited more progress in establishing voluntarily more uniform standards of practice and construction, the Federal Government would have to do it for them: "This fact is forcibly brought to our attention by the scheduled hearings starting July 7 before the Senate Public Works Committee on the General Accounting Office Report on the results of its checking the new Interstate cost estimates in eleven selected States. It is pointed out that non-uniformity in practice and variance from the controlling estimating manual and official design standards apparently exist, but that agency is not qualified to pass on the engineering reasoning involved. The Bureau of Public Roads has defended the estimating procedures and results..."

"...I do not believe that States have done anything that is wrong, or for which they must apologize, and engineering-wise they have produced the best comprehensive highway preliminary estimate that has ever been made, but they must aggressively explain what they have done and why, and explain estimating procedures and their inherent and expected accuracy. The law clearly stated that the estimates would be made on a uniform basis, and the official who is not an engineer, but must appraise the adequacy and adherence of the estimates to the law, must have his questions answered to his complete satisfaction, or he will want to write the law so tightly as to include engineering standards."

"Personally, I am disappointed that some minor variations from the official procedures manuals and official design standards apparently occurred at a time when cost estimates were to be used for the apportioning of federal road funds for the first time on a needs basis and allowed an element of suspicion and question to arise in official quarters. I deplore the carelessness and plain arithmetical errors that apparently crept into some of the estimates. You made a "B" in your Highway Engineering Course, but "FLUNKED" Arithmetic because of carelessness..."

### **STRESSES AND STRAINS ON THE OLD WAYS**

He urged better cooperation and development of uniform procedures in a wide range of categories including signing, size and weight, etc.:

"The invisible wall around a State is falling down, and any "prima donna" official, who insists on imposing his own personal preferences instead of cooperatively working with others to develop the best possible uniform practice, is passing out of existence, and that started when the Highway Act of 1956 was signed..."

"...Many highway departments for the past generation have been basically rural highway agencies. We hear allegations that the average highway department is incapable of planning and building urban highway facilities. Unless the highway official is able to prove that he is fully cognizant of his increasing urban responsibilities and is capable of discharging them, this is another area in which we are threatened with federal legislation..."

"...The Interstate program is a blessing in many ways but creates new problems of serious proportions. It will give impetus to improved highway designs, techniques and operations but also spotlights many practices that must be improved and made more uniform. Through AASHO and the Highway Research Board we already have the proper organizations and facilities to develop technological advances, research and uniformity in the highway field as the need arises and do so in a minimum of time."

**Excerpts From the January 1959 Issue of American Highways.**

**CLAUDE R. McMILLAN, S.C., AASHO President.**

**IN DEFENSE OF THE FIRST COST ESTIMATE**

"...We have just gone through our first apportionment of Interstate System funds on the basis of cost estimates. It was to be expected that our first estimates would not be so accurate as later ones. Therefore, we had not expected the criticism that came from Congress. Admitting that some of the criticism may have been justified, we feel, nevertheless, that the estimates were prepared by the most competent engineers in the country and, with few exceptions, no one could have done better. The estimates were a sound basis for apportioning the interstate funds, bearing in mind that such errors as there were would be corrected by future estimates as construction progressed. I caution all members of highway departments, however, to profit by our experience of last year and to exert every effort possible to see that future estimates be prepared with such care and accuracy that they will not only look right but will also be right."

**TRUST FUND RUNNING A DEFICIT**

"...The Highway Trust Fund is now running a deficit, due to a provision in the 1956 Federal-aid Highway Act which limits apportionments of Interstate funds to the States to estimated amounts in the Trust Fund. This provision-the so-called Byrd amendment should be suspended, or even better, repealed."

"Because of the condition of the Trust Fund, Director Maurice Stans of the Bureau of the Budget has warned that a choice must be made soon between increasing the Federal gasoline tax or using general funds to meet the deficit."

"The Congress can correct this situation simply by applying all of the special motor vehicle taxes to the Trust Fund. The total revenue from all special Federal excise taxes of \$3.5 billion annually is more than sufficient for all authorizations from the Trust Fund. Under the present law 100 per cent of the tax on gasoline and diesel fuel, and the use tax on certain vehicles go into the Trust Fund, but

not all of the special taxes on tires, trucks, buses and certain other items go in the Fund. All of these special excise taxes on vehicles should go into the Fund, and also, if there should then be a deficit, the deficit should be met from general revenues. If necessary, bonds could be sold against future revenues similar to the method proposed by the Clay Committee. Because of the national defense and general welfare value of the Interstate System highways, there is an inherent obligation on the part of the Federal Government to bear a part of the cost of the system from general funds."

"Congress should NOT increase the Federal gasoline tax. (They did.) Any such action would further add to the already heavy burden on highway users. Motor vehicle owners, as a class, are now paying more than their share of taxes. Furthermore, we must face up to the possibility, be it ever so remote, that the Federal-State motor fuel tax combination may be approaching the point of diminishing returns."

"I do not believe the American people want the program cut back..."

**SEN. ALBERT GORE**, Tenn. Address to the annual Meeting.

#### **RESERVATIONS ABOUT THE INTERSTATE PROGRAM**

He had some real question as to whether the entire highway program should be dependent on highway user taxes. He did not agree that the cost estimate was the best way to apportion Interstate funds but he hadn't been able to think of an alternative. He noted dissatisfaction in the Congress with the preoccupation of beginning the Interstate in the urban areas. He wanted to see more intercity pavement. He noted that he had been an opponent of the limited access concept but that he had finally been won over. He deplored the burgeoning idea of a time stretch-out of Interstate completion. He felt that we should keep on schedule.

**SEN. FRANCIS CASE**, S.D., Senate Public Works- Address to the Annual Meeting.

#### **CODIFICATION OF TITLE 23**

He stressed the importance of the General Highway Act of 1968 which codified all highway law into one statute called Title 23. This was separate from the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958.

#### **THE 1958 HIGHWAY ACT**

He cited the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958 as being significant in the following ways:

1. Acceptance of the new cost estimates as the basis for making apportionments for the Interstate. He felt that that was a milestone.
2. Establishment of bill-board regulation on new right-of-way on the Interstate.
3. Establishment of \$400 million in "D" funds to meet emergency needs to be matched by "L" funds advanced by the Government and to be paid back from future apportionments.
4. Provision for hearings for rural people on highway locations giving them the same rights as by-passed towns and cities had.

## **BORROWING FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

He said that the issues facing the Congress in the coming session were:

1. Adequate financing of the Trust Fund. He noted that Congress had waived the Byrd Amendment the year before thus allowing the full authorizations to be apportioned even though there was a deficit with the condition that the necessary funds be borrowed from the general fund. The result was that repayments were going to have to be made to the general fund before the next apportionments could be made, thereby leaving nothing to apportion for 1961 and that 1962 could not exceed \$600 million thus throwing the program way off schedule. Even after 62, the maximum amounts expected were in the range of \$1.3 to \$1.5 billion. He spelled out the alternatives:
  - a. Place the burden of making the Trust Fund whole on the general funds of the Treasury. He felt that there was absolutely no hope of passage of such an initiative.
  - b. Increase the highway user revenues and/or adopt new ones. This meant an increase in the gas tax and perhaps other user taxes, all of which would meet with strong resistance. He speculated on the feasibility of a "Use" stamp costing \$5.00 and to be bought at the Post office.
  - c. Authorize a bond issue to cover the anticipated shortage and stretch out the time that the existing levies were authorized. He noted that this solution had considerable support on the Hill but it would increase the National debt and the timing was poor for that.
  - d. Modify the scope and/or standards of the Interstate. He noted that this might be the likely outcome. Simply stretching out the program as long as it took. He didn't feel that there would be much support for modifying the standards for the Interstate downward.
2. A demand for greater highway safety. He said that there were more than 30 bills in Congress on the subject. Something was going to pass. The public would no longer put up with the carnage and the initiatives were going to have to go into all aspects of the road, the driver and the automobile.

## **REIMBURSEMENT FOR INTERSTATE TOLL ROADS**

3. Requests by States for recognition of money they have put into free roads and toll roads that are on the Interstate System. He said that he had become more aware of how important this issue was after travelling in those States that had significant such mileage. He said that BPR reported that it would take \$4.83 billion to reimburse them and that BPR was due to report on the subject to the Congress. He felt that the sheer size of the total and the current problems of avoiding deficits in the Trust Fund made it mandatory that the subject be put off till a future time.

**REP. GEORGE FALLON**, Md., Public Works Committee-Address to the Annual Meeting.

## **A FISCAL CRISIS APPROACHING**

He reminded the audience that the 1956 act authorized \$27 billion through 1969. The new cost estimate just completed raised the cost by 37% and that was only for 38,549 miles. He advocated readjusting the authorizations automatically when new estimates come in rather than having to legislate every time. He also recalled that the 56 act used a formula based on population and miles of road for apportioning Interstate funds until the new cost estimate could be completed. The Congress decided on using the 1958 cost estimate to apportion 1960 and 1961. Rep. Fallon felt that 1962 should also be apportioned using the same estimate in order to keep the apportionments far enough ahead but that the prospects of having no funds to apportion, as Sen. Case had described, made the raising of revenues urgent and this had to be done by Ways and Means. (Actually the Congress raised the gas tax by one cent and raised some other user taxes in 1959).

### **OTHER ISSUES**

He noted that there was a technical glych in Title 23, just passed which altered a section of Highway law that had just been passed. This had to do with the maximum time of r.o.w. acquisition before construction. He said that that would have to be fixed by the new Congress just elected.

He hoped that Congress would deal with the reimbursement of toll roads question in the next session.

He stressed the need for careful advanced planning to keep the highway program progressing smoothly. He was fearful that the Congress might resort to making ad hoc decisions not well thought out.

**REP. GORDON H. SCHERRER**, Ohio, Public Works Committee- Address to the Annual Meeting.

### **POSSIBILITIES OF SCANDAL**

He warned of the possibilities of scandal with such large sums at stake. His speech was quite routine and laudatory.

**BERTRAM D. TALLAMY**, Federal Highway Administrator-Address to the Annual Meeting.

### **THE FISCAL CRISIS**

He stressed the need for solution to the fiscal crisis brought about by the suspension of the Byrd Amendment for FY 58 and 59. He warned against frills and unnecessary items creeping into the Interstate cost estimates. He said they must hold the line against too many interchanges.

### **URBAN PLANNING**

He devoted considerable attention to the growing urban problem. He noted that several highway departments had set up special organizational units to deal with urban planning. He said that BPR had set up a special unit in the Office of Engineering to coordinate urban highway and Interstate System development with urban master transportation and land use planning:

"We must all realize that the time is rapidly approaching when it will be necessary to have an approved master plan of arterial highway routes in metropolitan areas, showing reasonably long-range extensions to the System. In our rapidly changing metropolitan areas such planning and programming is becoming increasingly imperative to assure the maximum benefit from our highway work and to avoid waste...I trust that in the immediate months to come all States will cooperate with appropriate metropolitan officials in the establishment of a basic State arterial construction program and to accomplish those objectives within the time which may be reasonably required for their establishment..."

The rest of the speech was a rather routine progress report.

#### **Excerpts From the April 1959 Issue of American Highways.**

**A.E. JOHNSON**, Executive Secretary of AASHO-Address to American Society of Public Administration.

The assigned topic of his talk was "Work Load Valleys and Peaks-Highways". He cited the many peaks and valleys that the program had experienced over the years and how devastating they were:

#### **PROSPECT OF A SHUTDOWN OF THE INTERSTATE PROGRAM**

"Unless there is legislation in the Congress this year to provide additional funds for the enlarged road program, there will be no apportionment of federal-aid funds to the State highway departments for the 1962 fiscal year for the very important Interstate highway program. There will be no interruption in the primary, secondary and urban Federal-aid programs as these systems have prior call on the highway trust fund with the balance going to the important Interstate highway system. To give you some idea of the effect of an interruption in the Interstate program assuming that the States do not get their 1961 apportionment of Interstate funds this coming July or August, thirty-two States by July 1960, a year from now, will have had to have stopped awarding contracts for construction on the Interstate network and the present rate of construction work in the Interstate system is over \$2.5 billion annually."

"Thirty-two States will have to release engineering and technical help that they have recruited and trained for the enlarged program which, according to the Statement of Intent of the Congress, was to be a continuous program until the system, as contemplated, is completed."

"The State highway departments also advise that if the program is interrupted and then resumed later, it would take a full year just to get wheels rolling again after the resumption."

**RESOLUTION:** Association of Highway Officials of North Atlantic States.

#### **PLEAS TO CONGRESS TO AVOID SHUTDOWN**

"Resolved, That the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States, assembled in convention in Atlantic City, New Jersey, on March 18, 19 and 20, 1959, respectfully reiterates its previous recommendation to the Congress of the United States, to provide funds to retain the original schedule established by the 1956 Highway Act for the completion of the National Interstate Highway Program without impediment or delay;..."

**RESOLUTION:** Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments.

"Resolved, That the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments in Annual Meeting assembled in Chicago, Illinois, March 19- 21, 1959, urges and petitions the Congress to provide adequate financing for continuation of the ABC highway system; and for the Interstate System in accordance with the intent of the 1956 Act;..."

Excerpts From the July 1959 Issue of American Highways.

**RESOLUTION: WASHO**

"Resolved, That the Western Association of State Highway Officials assembled in annual meeting in Billings, Montana, June 22-26, 1959, petitions the Federal government to give financial substance to the expressed intent of the Congress to build the Interstate system as nearly as practicable in a sixteen-year period and without interruption in order that the program can proceed;..."

Excerpts From the October 1959 Issue of American Highways.

**SEN. ALBERT GORE**, Tenn.-Address to the Governor's Conference, Oct. 5, 1959.

**EXPLAINS CONTRACT AUTHORITY**

"...Because of the necessary time required to plan highway construction, Congress has always proceeded to authorize expenditures for highways in advance of the fiscal year in which construction was expected to be completed and payment therefore made..."

"...The apportionment of highway funds has always been regarded as granting to the States authority to proceed to plan for highways and obligate such funds for highways and to obligate such funds immediately with assurance that the Federal Government's proportionate share of the cost will be reimbursed to them promptly upon completion of the work at any time beginning with the first day of the fiscal year for which the funds were apportioned..."

"...The Act of 1956 created a Highway Trust Fund to which revenue from certain highway user excise taxes were earmarked and from which payments to the States were to be made. It did not, however, alter or modify...or detract from the validity of an apportionment of highway funds to the States."

"The highway program is now in grave danger. Proposals are under consideration in high government circles, not only to curtail drastically the scope of the program, but also to undermine the legal effect of an apportionment of Federal funds and to engage in planned default on the part of the Federal Government in its obligation to reimburse the States promptly the Federal Government's share of the cost of highway construction on which the States have proceeded in reliance upon solemn commitments of the Federal Government."

**CRITICAL OF THE ADMINISTRATION**

"...By 1958, it was obvious that the revenues earmarked to the Trust Fund were inadequate to defray expenditures which would result from apportionments of

funds if these apportionments were made in the full amounts authorized. The Administration initially proposed a slowdown of the program with future apportionments to be made at reduced levels. Many of us in Congress disagreed, urging that a slowdown would be harmful to the nation's economy, then in recession, and that such a slowdown would prevent the timely completion of the minimum program considered necessary and as authorized in the Act of 1956. The Administration subsequently agreed and recommended the suspension for 3 years of the so-called Byrd Amendment which would have restricted the apportionments made last year to a level which the Trust Fund would support. Congress agreed and passed the Act of 1958 which suspended the Byrd Amendment for two years rather than the three suggested by the Administration..."

"...Basic law authorizes appropriations from the General Fund to the Trust Fund as 'repayable advances' whenever funds in the Trust Fund are inadequate to defray expenditures arising from apportionments, which such 'repayable advances' to be repaid to the General Fund when they are no longer needed in the Trust Fund for that purpose."

"In its budget for fiscal 1960 the Administration did not request the appropriation of such a repayable advance. Instead, it recommended augmenting the Trust Fund by a 1 1/2 cent per gallon increase. I was one of those that opposed this increase..."

"...the Congress passed a bill, later signed by the President, levying an additional one cent tax on gasoline for 21 months and providing for earmarking additional highway user tax revenue in fiscal 1962, 1963 and 1964...It was said that the bill would permit the apportionment of...\$1.8 billion in lieu of the \$2.5 billion authorized for the Interstate System..."

"...The Federal Highway Administrator, Mr. Tallamy, testified before the Senate Finance Committee that even with the additional one cent gas tax, there would be a deficit in the Highway Trust Fund by June 30, 1960, in the amount of \$157 million. It was proposed to handle this deficit simply by defaulting on the obligation of the Federal Government to pay the States promptly upon submission of vouchers."

"Mr. Tallamy testified further that even with the revenue provided under the bill, it was proposed to impose on the States 'contract controls' which would restrict and limit the right of the States to use funds already apportioned or which would subsequently be apportioned to them..."

"Subsequently the Administration submitted to Congress a supplemental appropriation request for an appropriation from the General Fund to the Trust Fund as a 'repayable advance' in the amount of \$359 million. Included in the requested language, however, was a restrictive proviso which would require repayment to the General Fund of the entire \$359 million on or before June 30, 1960. As submitted, the request was designed only to permit the Trust fund to honor vouchers promptly during the first half of the fiscal year. If the entire sum is repaid prior to June 30, 1960, there will be no way to avoid the default to the extent of \$157 million to which I have referred."

"...I moved successfully to strike the proviso requiring repayment this fiscal year...This leaves applicable the existing law which requires repayment, not by



any specific date, but when the Secretary of the Treasury makes a determination that the money is available in the Trust Fund for that purpose."

"Notwithstanding elimination of this language from the bill, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget revealed at a press conference on September 24 that the Administration proposed to require the Trust Fund to repay the entire \$359 million prior to June 30, 1960. If this is done, as I have said, there will be a deliberate default to the States in the amount of \$157 million this fiscal year, with the prospect of still further default during the next fiscal year."

### **MORE CONTRACT CONTROLS COMING**

"I am not advised concerning the specific details or the form of contract controls under consideration. Apparently, however, a ceiling will be imposed on the amount of funds a State may obligate, by category of highway, during a given fiscal year, and even within a portion of a year. Under such a program, the amount of unobligated apportionments a State may have to its credit will be meaningless, except to the extent that the use thereof may be permitted within the ceilings established by Administrative action. The purpose of the so-called controls apparently is to limit obligations so that the amounts which the Federal Government will later be called upon to reimburse to the States will not exceed the revenues in the Trust Fund derived from earmarked taxes. Such a program would contemplate no appropriations from the General Fund as repayable advances other than those of a temporary nature which would have to be repaid within the same fiscal year in which appropriated."

"There is no statutory authority whatever for the imposition of such controls...The applicable provisions of law indicate clearly that the only legal restriction upon a State's use of its apportioned funds is its ability to provide its own share of funds and to plan for and construct highways to meet the engineering standards prescribed in the law."

He went on to review and spell out in detail Federal-aid project development and the review and approval process.

"...If the proposed controls are implemented, such action will mean that the Administration has no intention of requesting appropriations to provide funds to honor the obligation of the Federal Government which is implicit in the apportionment of highway funds. This obligation has never heretofore been repudiated, nor has such repudiation ever before, to my knowledge, been suggested."

"I am convinced that this attitude is not shared by the Congress..."

### **THE BRAGDON COMMITTEE**

"...I should like to refer to another development which may have a far reaching effect on the Highway Program. When he signed the bill which increased the gas tax by one cent, the President announced that a complete review and restudy of the entire Highway Program had been ordered. I am informed that this study is being conducted under the supervision of Major General Bragdon, special Presidential Assistant for Public Works matters. This study is now in progress. I am genuinely concerned about reports relative to some of the recommendations which may be made as a result of this study. I have heard, although such is

admittedly unverified, that the tenor of the report which will be issued upon completion of this study will be such as to negate completely the concept of the Interstate Highway Program which was recommended by a Presidential Commission headed by General Lucius D. Clay and which was endorsed by President Eisenhower and enacted into law by the action of the Congress and the President as the Highway Act of 1956."

**BEN WEST**, Mayor of Nashville-Address to the Annual Meeting, Oct. 15, 1959.

He reviewed the beginnings of the highway program and the 1939 report Toll Roads and Free Roads as evidence of the Government's early awareness of the urban traffic problem:

"...Twenty years ago the Bureau and the State Highway Departments were cognizant of the needs of urban and municipal areas, and, in all probability, more so, than municipal officials themselves at that time."

He traced the deliberations of the Interregional Highway Committee leading to the passage of the 1944 Act with its emphasis on urban areas. He then remembered Eisenhower's 1954 speech to the Governors calling for a "grand" highway plan:

#### **THE BRAGDON COMMITTEE**

"On September 22, 1959, an article appeared in the 'New York Times' in which President Eisenhower was quoted as saying that he was concerned that too much money was being spent for highway improvements in and around cities, instead of inter-city roads. The President disclosed that a comprehensive review of the Interstate Highway program's current policies, practices, methods, and standards has been under way since July under the direction of General John S. Bragdon, his Special Assistant for Public Works Planning."

"I am reliably informed that the Bragdon study is seeking to question the use of federal aid highway money to build the Interstate System through urban areas. The reason for the study, the 'Times' article stated, was the President's concern that the program might be departing from its original objectives and costing more than necessary."

"The Bragdon study might possibly seek to justify a policy of by-passing cities with feeder traffic using existing street patterns."

"I hope and pray the present Administration has not lost confidence in its own fine Bureau of Public Roads and in the respective State Highway Departments. I sometimes wonder if the Administration has faith in the statistical facts concerning urban population, its projections, and the number of vehicles expected in urban areas by 1975."

**NOTE:** Since the Bragdon Committee is referred to frequently during this period, a special report on that subject is appended.

"The President himself set the pattern and the goals in 1954 when he called for 'a grand plan for a properly articulated highway system that solves the problems of speedy, safe, transcontinental travel-inter-city transportation- limited access

highways- and farm-to-farm movement- metropolitan area congestion- bottlenecks-and parking."

"His own Advisory Committee, the so-called Clay Committee,.. recommended a balanced program for a network of modern highways federal, state, and local. The Committee recommended that 'the Federal Government assume primary responsibility for the Interstate network.. to include the most essential urban arterial connections.'"

### **CRITICAL OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER**

"The President should know fully what the problems of urban America are. They have been demonstrated, forcefully illustrated, and discussed with him many times. I have personally participated in some of these conferences. Our Chief Executive knows that two out of three Americans live in urban areas, and there is sound reason to believe that the ratio will soon jump to four out of five....yet, in public policies, and in public acts, there seems to exist a definite current of deliberate disregard and discrimination against this great majority of our people, and the rumored objective of the Bragdon study is but one example."

### **DEFENDS AND SUPPORTS THE URBAN INTERSTATE**

"...Let us not forget that roughly one half of Highway Trust Fund revenues comes from cities and urban areas. This fact alone is sufficient to justify the allocation of roughly one-half of the Trust Fund money in urban areas and cities, where, incidentally, the cost of construction per vehicle mile is much less than in rural sections."

"I simply cannot understand a philosophy of government which would install a military study group in one the most efficient and conscientious Bureaus in the structure of the Federal Government- the Bureau of Public Roads-with the apparent purpose of seeking to justify a policy of by- passing cities, to treat them as beggars at the back door, so to speak...The Mayors of this country, including myself, have already had all doubt removed that these funds would not be administered by the Bureau and the Highway Departments wisely and soundly."

He speculated that General Bragdon might have been chosen for the job because of the importance of National Defense but pointed out that, if that were the case, he was studying the wrong things.

"I have had the pleasure of serving both as Vice-Chairman and Chairman of the National Committee on Urban Transportation...I have also been Co-Chairman of the Joint Committee on Highways of the American Municipal Association and the American Association of State Highway Officials..."

"The National Conference on Highways and Urban Development brought together 55 top highway officials, mayors, public works directors, city planners, traffic engineers, business and civic leaders, and transit officials for a five day meeting a little over a year ago at the Sagamore Center of Syracuse University, under the general chairmanship of AASHO's incomparable Alf Johnson...It is my fond hope that someone on the Bragdon group will find the time to read the report of the Conference. I am confident that it will be a revelation to the reader."

"...The American people want this National System of Interstate and Defense Highways as you, their State Highway officials, designed and located it. The users of these highways are willing to pay for it, judging from the uproar back home last summer during the financial dilemma between Congress and the White House."

"Congress wants these highways built according to their expressed intentions, and not according to the dictates of special military study groups appointed from the ranks of Administrative staffs..."

## **MEMORANDUM OF LAW RELATING TO EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS APPORTIONED**

### **THE ADMINISTRATION'S BASIS FOR FISCAL CONTROL**

The October 1959 issue published a summary of the newly codified highway law Title 23 relating to the apportionment and project approval process. The article stated that: "There is no statutory authority for restricting expenditures to a level below that authorized by apportionments duly made. Counsel for the Bureau apparently relies upon 'inherent authority' as a legal basis for proposed contract control procedures. The following responses made by Mr. Enfield, Bureau counsel, to questions by Senator Kerr during hearings before the Finance Committee summarize the Bureau's position on the legal question involved:"

SENATOR KERR: "Mr. Enfield, the question which Senator Gore is trying to determine, and in which I am equally interested, is the basis in law of the proposal the director made a while ago or the policy being announced of contract control after an apportionment has been made, and of amounts of money within the apportionment as made..."

MR. ENFIELD: "The provisions in the law, that in my opinion give him that authority are found in sections 105, 106 and 110...Under the approval provisions of 106, which sets up the approval of the project, when that approval is given it creates under the law a contractual obligation to the Government to pay, to pay the Federal share of that contract."

"Now, I believe there is inherent in the approval which must be exercised under the statute by the Secretary, discretionary authority in the Secretary, to assure that when he constitutes that contractual obligation by approval that there will be moneys available to make payment."

The article goes on: "Prior to the creation of the Highway Trust Fund no control has been exercised over the obligation of apportioned funds except the limits imposed by the apportionment itself. No attempt was made to limit award of contracts to such amount as the Congress might have appropriated in its regular appropriations bill. On the contrary, States proceeded within the limits of apportioned funds available to them, and if the sum appropriated in the regular appropriation bill was insufficient, a supplemental appropriation was provided to make up the deficiency. The law setting up the Highway Trust Fund contains no provision modifying in any way the validity of an apportionment or limiting the availability for expenditure of the amounts so apportioned."

## **COMMITTEE NAMED TO INVESTIGATE THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM**

### **THE BLATNIK COMMITTEE**

"Under the chairmanship of the Honorable John A. Blatnik, member of Congress from Minnesota and a member of the House Committee on Public Works, a special 18-man subcommittee was named September 4, 1959, by Congressman Charles A. Buckley of New York, Chairman of the House Committee on Public Works."

The names of all 18 were listed:

"Chairman Blatnik announced...'Our main objective is to obtain solid facts about every phase of the Federal highway program and after preliminary investigations hold open hearings."

"Congressman Buckley stated, in naming Blatnik Chairman of the subcommittee, that he was confident the committee would conduct a hard-hitting, thorough but fair investigation."

"Buckley said the investigation was 'necessary and desirable in light of numerous serious complaints from many sources, especially members of Congress who expressed their irritation and exasperation during committee hearings and floor debate on the bill providing an additional increase in the Federal gasoline tax. Members of the Committee on Ways and Means were particularly critical of the highway program and questioned the cause of substantial increases in program cost estimates over original estimates. Charges of inefficiency, extravagance and waste were also leveled against the program. This is especially serious in light of the fact that the Federal government is assuming 90 percent of the cost of the gigantic Interstate Highway Program, and while some Federal supervision exists, the actual construction and administration of the program is carried out by State highway agencies."

#### **THE MILLS COMMITTEE**

"Another committee to be known as the 'Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws' headed by the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills, Congressman from Arkansas and Chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means is composed of 7 members of the House Ways and Means Committee..."

The members of the Subcommittee were named.

"It is understood this Committee will deal with a study of the financial requirements of the program and its administration from the monetary viewpoint."

#### **THE BRAGDON COMMITTEE**

"Still another investigative group headed by Maj. Gen. John S. Bragdon, President Eisenhower's special assistant for public works planning, will study and review the Nation's federal-aid road building program to determine if it is still within its original concepts and objectives and will include a complete study of the policies and administration of the federal-aid highway program by the Bureau of Public Roads and an evaluation of urban needs on the Interstate System."

"Among those assisting Gen. Bragdon will be Brig. Gen. Lacey V. Murrow (USAF, Ret.) former Director of Highways for the State of Washington, now a consultant in Washington, D.C., Commander Charles M. Noble (USN, Ret.)

former Chief Engineer of the New Jersey Turnpike and more recently the Director of Highways of Ohio, now a consultant in Princeton, New Jersey, and Newman E. Argraves, former State Highway Commissioner for Connecticut, now a consultant in Hartford, Connecticut, as well as people from the Department of Defense, and others."

## **REIMBURSEMENT PLANNING**

### **BPR'S PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING THE FISCAL CRISIS**

"In Circular Memorandum No. 21-00, dated October 6, 1959, directed to Bureau of Public Roads Regional and Division Engineers, Commissioner Ellis L. Armstrong presented the 'Reimbursement Planning' or 'Contract Control' as it has previously been referred to. The memorandum and charts which accompanied it are as follows:"

"The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959 (P.L. 86-342, approved September 21, 1959), provides additional revenue to the Highway Trust Fund for fiscal years 1960 through 1964. Provided that there is orderly use of existing authorizations, it is expected that the total revenues to be available during this period will support Interstate apportionments of \$1.8 and \$2.0 billion for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962, respectively, in addition to the apportionment of \$925 million of ABC funds for the fiscal year 1961 and a similar amount assumed for the fiscal year 1962 but which has not yet been authorized."

"In signing the Act the President stated in part:

"Because the bill does not provide the level of revenues required for continuing the highway program on the schedule contemplated under existing authorizations, it will be necessary to make orderly use of these authorizations so that spending can be held within limits that will avoid future disruption of the program. This action will be required if the Federal Government is to meet promptly its obligations to the States and at the same time adhere to the self-financing principle upon which the highway program has been established."

"To provide prompt payment of vouchers on existing project agreements, legislation has been approved to appropriate a total of \$359 million as a repayable advance from the general funds of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund. This will be available as an advance during the fiscal year 1960 for the purpose of avoiding temporary deficits that would otherwise occur in the Trust Fund beginning in October and reaching a peak in January."

"It is necessary to provide for an orderly scheduling of obligations and contracts in order to assure that the anticipated revenues that will be available to meet anticipated reimbursement requirements during the current and next fiscal years are not exceeded. Our objective, in cooperation with the States, is to establish the amounts which each State may expect to receive in Federal reimbursement from the Trust Fund for fiscal year 1961 and perhaps for two or more subsequent years."

The memo went on to describe in some detail the limitations on obligations to remain within the income of the Trust Fund:

"The obligation schedule is designed to keep the demands on the Highway Trust Fund during the current and next fiscal year to the amount of the tax revenues accruing to the Fund which will be available to meet estimated reimbursement requirements promptly....States desiring to proceed at a rate faster than can be supported from available Trust Fund revenues may elect to do so but with the clear written understanding that vouchers cannot be paid until and unless funds are available for reimbursement. Under current estimates of revenue and expenditures this cannot be expected to occur before late in the fiscal year 1963. Separate identification obviously will be required for any project advanced on such basis, and the letters of authorization and the project agreements shall specify that the Federal Government will not be expected to pay reimbursement vouchers on account of such project until funds become available..."

**Excerpts From the January, 1960 Issue of American Highways. -The Record of the 45th AASHO Annual Meeting, Boston-Oct. 12-16, 1959.**  
**R.R. BARTELSMEYER, III.- The President's Annual Address.**

### **EXPLANATION OF THE FISCAL CRISIS**

"...We have all been keenly aware that for the past three or four years, everyone has been talking about accelerating and stepping up the activities in the State Highway Departments in order to gear-up to the level demanded by the greatly enlarged highway program. Early during 1959 the high plateau of activity aspired to had generally been reached and the leveling-off started. However, at about the same time, instead of remaining sure that the program would continue at the anticipated pace, just about the exact opposite occurred and until very recently there was no definite assurance that the program would not be drastically curtailed..."

"...Suggestions were made that the highway program should be turned off and on, in accordance with funds made available for short periods, or in accordance with the general economic situation..."

### **ACCUSATIONS OF CORRUPTION**

"...We have seen a great increase in the attacks and criticism of the program. It must be realized that when any individual public financed endeavor gets as big as the highway program, such things are sure to occur. That is the very normal way we do things in this country. You hear accusations made that the program is beset with scandal and corruption. You hear that the highway departments are gold-plating the work on the Interstate System and are going completely overboard on planning and designing..."

"Special Sub-Committees of the House Public Works and Ways and Means Committees have been established to investigate the Highway program We welcome this move and should do all within our abilities to assist and furnish information to these committees, as they check into all phases of our highway activities."

### **MORE FEDERAL CONTROL?**

"I would be remiss in my remarks if I did not call your attention to still another trend of thinking that is being advanced-to impose more Federal controls in the building and the operation of the Interstate System. The line of reasoning behind

all this, I presume, is that because the large percentage of cost to construct is financed with Federal funds, complete controls should be imposed at the Federal level. The thing they forget is that it is the taxpayer at home who provides the Federal funds."

"...Two of my immediate predecessors as President, William A. Bugge and Claude R. McMillan in 1957 and 1958, both gave warnings of this trend toward greater Federal control in their annual meeting remarks. It is still receiving much support and should be watched very closely."

"...This does not infer criticism of the Bureau of Public Roads. The relationship between this arm of the Federal Government and the State Highway Departments has worked out very successfully for many years..."

"...We did not take a position (with the Congress) for or against an increase in the gasoline tax. We emphasized and asked that Congress and the Executive branch develop and enact a solution to prevent an interruption in the program. This was accomplished before Congress adjourned last month."

### **CONTRACT AUTHORITY**

"A problem still with us is the Contract Authority and Reimbursement Assurance concept that the States have enjoyed and taken for granted for the past 45 years of Federal Aid highway apportionments. Until now the States have been free to move apportionments to obligation at any time desired, during the effective period, with the firm assurance of receiving reimbursements promptly. Now we have been informed a change in this procedure has been made. We trust there may still be some action taken by the Congress early next year if that is necessary, to keep this Federal-State relationship as it has been in the past."

### **URBAN PLANNING**

"Great strides were made in connection with urban highway problems by the Joint AASHO-American Municipal Association Committee. A very concise and complete report of the Sagamore Conference held in late 1958 was released. The recommendations contained in this report should serve a very useful purpose in advancing the cooperative effort of all governmental agencies responsible for urban highway work. Following a directive of the Executive Committee a number of seminars were planned where highway planners and engineers would gain a better understanding of city and urban planning techniques. These meetings were cancelled on short notice when the assurance of continued Federal aid at the present level seemed doubtful. We hope these meetings can be reactivated in the future."

### **DEFENDS THE URBAN INTERSTATE**

"It is rather alarming to note the considerations being given to a curtailment of the Interstate Highway Program in urban areas. Since some of the greatest and most acute needs for adequate modern highways exist in the urban areas, it is inconceivable that a sound and well balanced Interstate Highway System should not include extensions into these areas. For a public works project as comprehensive as the Interstate Highway Program, involving the large expenditure of public funds anticipated, it seems important to provide for some of the needs and spend a substantial amount of the money in the urban areas, if the



program is to receive the fullest public acceptance. Our efforts should be to prevent this part of the program from being weakened or reduced in any manner..."

**SEN. PAT MacNAMARA**, Mich., Chairman Sub-committee on Roads.

### **HOW CONGRESS DEALT WITH THE HIGHWAY FISCAL CRISIS**

"...We have just squeaked through another highway crisis in Washington, trying to make sure that the 41,000-mile program authorized by law proceeds somewhat according to schedule."

"I say we squeaked through because right up until the last moment we weren't sure that the program would continue at all much less go forward on schedule."

"As you know there were two aspects to this year's highway crisis, separate in the manner of handling, but both of them dealing with financing."

"One part was the financing of the entire Interstate program over the next two fiscal years, 1961 and 1962, and the apportionment of funds during each of these years."

"This was accomplished by imposing a new 1-cent a gallon tax on gasoline, on top of the present 3-cent tax, for a 21-month period which began October 1."

"The 1959 law also transfers half of the 10-percent excise tax on automobiles to the Highway Trust Fund for a three-year period beginning July 1, 1961..."

"...I opposed, in principle, both of these measures."

"In the first place, I do not like to see the imposition of increased consumer taxes on the Federal level. This is another unfair burden that is in no way based on the principle of taxation according to the ability to pay."

"Further, as a Senator from the State which is the home of the automobile industry, I have long recognized the inequity of excise taxes on automobiles..."

"...Even so, despite the new gas tax revenue, actual revenues to the Highway Trust Fund are still expected to be below need for fiscal 1961."

"This results in apportionment for fiscal year 1961 of only \$1.8 billion, instead of the previously authorized \$2.5 billion."

"...The second crisis developed when we tried to make sure that commitments already made to the States for the present fiscal year, 1960, would be fulfilled."

"This called for a repayable appropriation of \$359 million from the Treasury's general fund to the Highway Trust Fund..."

"...The money was appropriated in a rider to the Mutual Security Appropriations bill, a rather unorthodox maneuver, but expedient."

## **CAUSES OF THE CRISIS**

"...When the Highway Act was written in 1956 we thought we had provided such a plan, one that would carry the program to completion in 1972."

"...I suppose that it was inevitable that with such a tremendous undertaking all would not go according to plan."

"In the first place, the 40,000 miles when actually measured turned out to be 38,548 miles."

"This left 1,452 'saved' miles available for allocation, but the saving was more imaginary than real since the new allocation boosted the Government's \$25 billion estimate by about \$1.5 billion."

"Then there was a 15-percent increase resulting from local traffic needs, 3 percent from utility relocation costs, 12 percent from general price increases."

"Altogether these new costs have raised the original \$25 billion Federal estimate to \$36 billion..."

"Still another factor...was...the action taken by Congress last year...Primarily as an anti- recession measure the apportionment for fiscal year 1959 was increased by \$200 million and for fiscal 1960 by \$900 million...This... created an immediate drain on the Trust Fund amounting to an estimated \$1.6 billion."

"At this point you may ask whatever happened to that extra thousand miles that makes this a 41,000-mile interstate program."

"That has been designated too, but no financing provisions are included in current legislation..."

## **THE ANOMALY OF THE BYRD AMENDMENT**

"...The Byrd Amendment requires the Secretary of Commerce to limit actual apportionments to the States to the available revenue in the Highway Trust Fund."

"...The presence of this provision is thoroughly inconsistent with the financing plan contained in the 1956 Highway Act."

"The broad outline of that plan anticipated that there would be an interim period when expenditures outran receipts by the Trust Fund."

"It was expected that excess revenues in the fund in the early and latter years of the program would balance out the higher expenditures in the middle years. This would include repayment to the Treasury of advances to make up the interim deficit."

"However, this plan got a rude jolt with the adoption of the Byrd Amendment."

"...Last year, when Congress boosted the fiscal 1959 and 1960 apportionments, the Byrd Amendment was suspended for these two fiscal years."

"This insured fulfillment of the authorized apportionments for these two fiscal years with the \$359 million appropriation from the general fund completing the 1960 commitment."

"However, while suspension of the Byrd amendment last year was necessary, the net effect was robbing Peter to pay Paul."

"Had we not enacted the new revenue raising measures this year, application of the Byrd Amendment would have meant no interstate apportionment for fiscal year 1961."

"And the apportionment for fiscal 1962 would have been only about \$500 million instead of the planned \$2.2 billion..."

### **THE ADMINISTRATION RELUCTANT TO BORROW**

"...The present Administration refuses to consider more advances from the general fund even though it knows they would be repaid with interest."

"They refuse to consider this solution, a solution which was intended under the 1956 Act because it causes a temporary dislocation in the sacred budget."

"While it is called the Byrd Amendment it is actually Administration inspired. My own feeling is that it should be repealed, if we expect to carry out the intent of the 1956 Act."

"I cannot predict..our..next cliff-hanging adventure, but undoubtedly it will occur."

### **MURKY FISCAL FUTURE**

"Further increased construction costs could certainly upset the precarious balance we have achieved."

"And we have got to decide how our two new States, Alaska and Hawaii, can share in this program as they rightfully should."

"Financing of the additional 1,000 miles must be worked out."

"The Byrd Amendment will continue to plague the program and the consumer faces the risk of the new gas tax becoming 'temporarily permanent' and the auto excise tax continuing despite the legal requirement to reduce it..."

### **REP. GORDON H. SCHERRER, Ohio, Subcommittee on Roads.**

"...During the last six months, Congress and some other people dawdled and politicized so long with the highway financial crisis that we barely missed detouring the whole construction program up a blind alley."

"...It would be funny if it were not so serious, but I checked the record and found those who were crying the loudest about the program being too big were the very same people who just a year ago had panicked during the recession and voted to expand and accelerate highway construction by \$1.6 billion, without providing the money for the trust fund to do the job. Less than 12 months later they had thrown their crying towels away and were urging that the program be cut in half."

## **CHARGES OF WASTE**

"Some of our other friends made the Bureau of Public Roads and the state highway departments the chief whipping boys. In the short space of a few weeks we developed an amazing number of sidewalk highway engineers and experts on road legislation."

"The country was led to believe from the way some people talked that the depleted condition of the trust fund was due to the fact that the highway engineers had gone hog-wild with the people's money. It was charged that there were too many fancy, costly, and overly complex cloverleaves and interchanges; that rights-of-way were much too wide; that you fellows were deliberately picking out the highest priced real estate through which and over which to run the new roads."

"Charges of waste, inefficiency, and even fraud in the administration of the highway program were hurled about with some abandon. State highway departments were repeatedly accused of squandering money on the interstate system because the federal government was paying 90 per cent of the cost. It was argued that by raising the state's contribution to the interstate system, this waste could be stopped."

"...Irreparable harm can be done to a really fine highway program by ballooning up and unduly publicizing the mistakes and deficiencies and failing to point out how few they are in proportion to the thousands of fine and successful projects. It must be kept in mind that the political headline-hunters realize that incidents of wrongdoing make good press copy."

## **REASONS FOR THE FISCAL CRISIS**

"Above all the record should show that none of the derelictions charged, true or untrue, were responsible for the financial crisis in the highway program. Let me give you the six factors that got us into this box or financial crisis."

1. "The trust fund absorbed, as was not contemplated, approximately \$1.5 billion of highway obligations due and owing on the effective date of the 1956 act."
2. "In 1958 Congress, particularly the Senate, got the recession jitters, as I have said, and provided in the 1958 act for an acceleration of the road program by \$1.6 billion. This was done without providing the revenue for the trust fund to meet this increased cost."
3. "The Senate also added 1,000 miles to the 40,000 mile interstate system. These are often called 'political miles.' Again, no revenues were provided for the trust fund to pay for this additional mileage."
4. "Highway standards and requirements were increased to take care of some local needs. Standards had to be increased because, like our population, there was an unexpected and unforeseen increase in motor

vehicles. Even since 1956 motor vehicle use on our highways has increased at a far greater rate than was predicted by the experts just three years ago."

5. "The original estimates of cost on which the 1956 act was based were made rather hurriedly by the state highway departments in 1954. There were some miscalculations. From 1954 to 1958 construction costs and right-of-way acquisitions increased by about 12 per cent because of inflation."
6. "Even if all of these things which I have just mentioned had not happened, the successful operation of the trust fund was doomed at the very outset when the Senate added the Byrd Amendment. The 1956 House-passed bill contemplated that in the first years of the program expenditures would exceed trust fund receipts while in later years receipts would exceed disbursements. Therefore, in the early years there could be borrowings from the surplus near the end of the program. With the tremendously increased cost of the program, of course there will be no such surplus. Even if there had been a surplus, no borrowings could have been made because the Byrd Amendment provided that apportionments to the states could be made only to the extent that the trust fund could support the expenditures."

"...Why then did Congress only pass a temporary measure, and not provide the funds necessary to complete the entire program? Why did Congress not cut the program or change the distribution formulas or state contributions?"

#### **CONGRESS WAITING FOR THE SPECIAL REPORTS**

"Congress did not act simply because it did not have before it the evidence on which to act intelligently. If it had attempted to move in any direction these various controversial matters, it would have done so in the dark. It realized that 16 months from now it can act intelligently on all of the issues, because Congress will then have before it two reports resulting from extensive and exhaustive scientific studies and surveys that are now being made."

"These reports will enable us to determine the following highly controversial questions:

1. Should the tax base for the trust fund be broadened to include other than highway users who may receive benefits from our modern highways, such as adjoining landowners, Department of Defense, and so forth?
2. What effect do various vehicles have on the highways and the life thereof, and what standards and costs of construction are made necessary to carry and support the different sizes and weights of vehicles?
3. What is the fair and equitable share of the taxes or charges that each class of highway users should pay?
4. What will be the actual cost of completing the interstate system?
5. Are highway users paying too much or too little of the cost of building and maintaining highways?
6. Are commercial vehicles paying too much or too little compared to passenger cars?
7. Should standards of construction, right-of-way widths, etc. be increased or decreased?
8. Is the interstate or ABC system being discriminated against?

9. Should the formula of sharing costs between the states and the federal government be changed?"

"It is now crystal clear that no one can decide or properly act on these numerous highly controversial issues, involving both financing and construction, until these 1961 reports are available."

#### **THE BRAGDON COMMITTEE**

"In spite of this, I learned to my amazement two weeks ago, first through the press and then from other reputable sources, that since June a special committee appointed by the White House (this was the so-called Bragdon Committee) has been busily engaged in preparing recommendations on many of the issues which will be the subject of the 1961 reports. As I have pointed out, I cannot possibly understand how any intelligent or sound recommendations can be made without the benefit of the '61 reports."

"Let me give you an example of one of the decisions that has already been made and which this White House committee is now in the process of trying to justify."

"These portions of the interstate system within industrial areas are to be substantially de-emphasized, if not completely eliminated. This special committee will try to find justification for eliminating the interstate system within industrial areas but, if it cannot do this, then it will definitely recommend substantial curtailment of this part of the highway program. Such a policy would be a rape of the very heart of the original Clay Report and the 1956 highway act."

"...The density of traffic on the industrial and urban parts of the interstate system is more than a hundred times greater than the average density of traffic on the remaining 99-plus per cent of America's highways. While those portions of the interstate system connecting industrial centers need rebuilding and improvement, the density of traffic on that portion of the interstate system is infinitesimal compared to that adjacent to and through the industrial and urban areas of this nation."

#### **CRITICAL OF THE ADMINISTRATION**

"...It should be apparent now that, if this new policy of eliminating or de-emphasizing the urban sections of the interstate system had been known, the 1 cent increase in the federal gas tax would never have passed the Congress. I was asked by the President, as the ranking Republican on the Roads subcommittee, to introduce the legislation to increase the federal gas tax 1 1/2 cents. I did so to save the highway program-to avoid more deficit spending which would accelerate the inflationary spiral. I didn't introduce the measure to continue a program out of which they were planning at the time to cut the heart."

"...I understand this new White House committee...plans some cutbacks in standards. I am sure, however, there is one member of that committee who will stick to his guns. Charlie Noble was Ohio's outstanding Highway Director..."

"In the Wall Street Journal of October 1, we find a quote which pretty well answers the question as to what constitutes real waste:

"Some of these plans may look too big for their britches in 1959 but they'll fit just right in 1979. It doesn't make sense to build something new and then have to rebuild it in ten years. That's real waste."

### **REIMBURSEMENT FOR TOLL ROADS**

"...Ever since I came to the Congress seven years ago I have had the privilege of serving on the Roads Subcommittee with George Fallon, its able and conscientious chairman...A few weeks ago, because he did not succumb to politics to the detriment of the road program-because he did not support the pet project of the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, he was for all practical purposes kicked out."

"His chief sin was opposing legislation that would have added another \$4 billion price tag to the highway program. George Fallon, like I, believes in the policy of some form of reimbursement for toll roads and freeways built by forward looking states. However, he, like I, in these days of financial crisis, when we need all available money to build new highways to meet the critical traffic needs of this country, could not support reimbursement payments at this time. We could not support this legislation which would have jeopardized the passage of the financing bill."

### **CRITICAL OF THE BLATNIK COMMITTEE**

"So the Chairman of the Public Works Committee (this was Buckley, New York who wanted the New York Thruway paid for by the Trust Fund) appointed a new special roads subcommittee (chaired by Rep. Blatnik) to investigate the charges to which I referred in the beginning of my speech. Of course, the regular standing subcommittee could and should have done whatever investigating is needed. It should be noted that this new investigating roads subcommittee, with three exceptions, has the identical membership of the Subcommittee on Roads. Of course George Fallon is not its chairman."

"It is obvious that the new committee was created to get rid of George Fallon so that the gentleman from New York could control and dominate it..."

"...Now why do I wash the Committee linens in public? First, this sub-committee is going to investigate among other things waste, inefficiency, and fraud. I was taught in law school many years ago that one must go into court with clean hands. I think you members of the state highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads who are to be scrutinized should know all of the facts surrounding your investigators. I think the public may better evaluate the findings and reports of this committee, particularly in an election year when it is obvious to the least informed that the Bureau of Public Roads particularly is to be under attack..."

**B.D. TALLAMY**, Federal Highway Administrator, BPR-Address to AASHO.

His speech was very laudatory of the highway departments and he gave a status report on progress of the highway program.

### **DEALING WITH THE FISCAL CRISIS**

"...However, some new concepts regarding the program have been advanced this year. The philosophy of acceleration enunciated in the 1956 Act and spelled out in the 1958 Act was in serious jeopardy. The whistles began blowing from several directions and it was nip and tuck during the recent session of Congress as to whether we would have a highway financing bill at all this year. Everyone here is familiar with the legislative history of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1959. I won't go into it now nor will I talk about its provisions. The important point is that we do have legislation that will permit the Interstate and ABC Programs to advance with prompt reimbursement to the states at a reasonably satisfactory rate. Furthermore, the reduction in the Interstate apportionments for fiscal 1961 and 1962 is not too serious. We can live with it pending the establishment of an equitable and adequate long range financing plan. This, we hope, will be accomplished in 1961. In the meantime we have advised the States of the schedule of obligations or contracts which can be entered into with assurance of prompt reimbursement within the limitations of the Trust Fund."

"This is something new in Federal-aid history and something that is obviously not designed to make everyone happy at the outset. But, it is a step which must be taken in recognition of the stern realities of Trust Fund yields, and Section 209(g) of the Act of 1956 (The Byrd Amendment). It is obviously necessary for everyone to know what contracts can be liquidated within the present revenues available to the Trust Fund. The procedure to be followed has been outlined in a Circular Memorandum from Commissioner Armstrong. If the details are not yet familiar to all of you, I'm sure they will be before this 45th meeting is concluded."

#### **THE PROGRAM UNDER ATTACK**

"...In these general remarks I am touching only lightly on subjects which will be thoroughly discussed during the Committee sessions. I believe I should dwell momentarily, however, on a matter which will assume a great deal of importance to all of us. It is no secret that the Federal-aid Highway program is now under review by various agencies and Committees. This scrutiny involves both the Bureau and the State highway departments. It extends not only to the conduct of the program but to its underlying concepts and the legislative intent behind the successive Federal-aid acts. These various reviews are exhaustive and thorough. One of their announced aims is to reduce the cost of the Interstate System. Well, I'm sure any of us would welcome suggestions for cutting costs while still maintaining the major aims and purposes of the Interstate System. Several heads are always better than one in these matters and I trust that you will cooperate to the fullest in these inquiries into our activities. I'm confident that we have nothing to conceal or to fear and that the reviews may give public officials and the people generally a better understanding of our problems. The end result may well add stature to the highway official through public recognition of the importance of this job."

"In conclusion, it would seem that we can learn at least two lessons from recent events."

#### **THE NEED FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS**

"First, it is obvious to me that greater public information efforts must be devoted to the highway program-to its aims and purposes, to the problems confronting us, to the activities of the highway departments, including the what, why, where, when and how. Despite the efforts of the highway departments the Bureau and the many organizations involved in better roads movements, the general public is



not well acquainted with what we are doing and why...I'm afraid all of us may have been guilty of hiding our light under a bushel at times when a little more illumination might have helped our cause."

### **THE PROGRAM UNDER SCRUTINY**

"The second lesson, related somewhat to the first, is that every action of a highway official or agency-State or Federal-will be subject during the months ahead to the most careful scrutiny. I have no quarrel with that. Any of our acts, policies or decisions should be capable of standing on their own merits in the light of official inquiries. The point is that we must be able to substantiate them fully as to adherence to law and regulations and, where judgment is the dominant factor, to justify the decisions we have made. The highway official will find himself more than ever a man of many roles-administrator, engineer, accountant, efficiency expert, attorney and public relations man..."

### **RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY AASHO- the 45th Annual Meeting.**

#### **URBAN PLANNING**

Resolution No. 1 "...That the urban sections of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways be constructed as planned under the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and that the State Highway Departments which have the responsibility of initiating such projects cooperate with the local government and planning officials, to the end that land use and urban development features will be given proper consideration."

#### **CONTRACT AUTHORITY**

Resolution No. 2 "...That the American Association of State Highway Officials in Annual Meeting assembled in Boston, Mass, October 12-16, 1959, urges that necessary action be taken at the Federal level to reestablish the long-standing principle of full Contract Authority and prompt reimbursement of all funds apportioned, in accordance with the Federal aid highway laws."

There were four more resolutions of routine nature.

### **A.E. JOHNSON, Executive Secretary of AASHO-"Better Transportation for Your City"**

This speech was given to the American Municipal Congress in Denver, Nov. 30, 1959.

He reviewed Thomas H. MacDonald's forecasts and views of urban development and transportation going back many years and labeled him as one of the greatest transportation authorities the world has ever known.

#### **AN URBAN PLANNING PRIMER**

"With the enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the first ray of hope was apparent to many of the cities for taking care of some of the more critical traffic needs, but it came about with such suddenness and with a sense of urgency that it found many cities poorly prepared to help in planning portions of the new program in their areas."

"...As far as the first freeway in a city is concerned, if it follows a logical compromise between the desire lines developed from origin and destination studies and where right-of-way and construction costs are reasonable, there is little opportunity for an error in location, but the job is not that simple. There are, however, other problems than determining the routing of the facility that do require detailed planning."

"It is necessary to study the proper location of grade separations to prevent severance of communities and services. It is desirable to know how the highway will affect the city and how proper urban development affects highway needs and locations. It is necessary to know where interchanges should be located to integrate the freeway with the street pattern and best feed traffic to and from the facility. The construction of additional connecting freeway developments makes a comprehensive area-wide transportation plan essential."

He reviewed his role as Chairman of the Sagamore Conference on urban transportation planning and presented a summary of the resulting report "Guidelines for Action."

### **DEFENDS THE URBAN INTERSTATE**

"A certain amount of hysteria surrounded the initiation of the big Interstate program. Since it is so big, many new groups and individuals were taking an interest in the highway program for the first time. Many were ill-advised. A program that historically had been primarily rural had suddenly taken on unprecedented urban characteristics and new problems."

"Insinuations were heard that State highway departments were incapable of handling the urban portion of the program. Also, that city planners wanted to great a part in the program and actually had little to offer that would be helpful."

"The Sagamore Conference proved these charges false and that each group had a place on the team. The highway engineer has designed and built most all the urban freeways in existence. They are the best qualified people in the world to handle the big assignment, but they need the help of the city administrator, the city planner, the city traffic engineer, the city engineer, and the civic leader if the maximum benefits for the urban area results."

"...I would not go so far as to suggest all Interstate highway improvements in an urban area should be delayed until a transportation plan is initiated and completed, but the planning process should be started as soon as possible, if not already done, so that the maximum local benefit can be derived from the big highway program."

"Recently, there have been several disturbing rumors circulating that proposals to drastically reduce or eliminate the urban sections of the Interstate System, as a means of cutting the cost of the big federal-aid program, are being weighed..."

"We also know that many in Congress think that the urban part of the Interstate System is too expensive to build, and the Interstate system should skirt the cities and that it should be up to the cities then to provide such highway facilities as might be needed to connect the urban area with the rural Interstate routes."

### **ACCUSATIONS OF GOLD PLATING**

"...We have also heard a term, '90-itis', bandied about. The connotation placed on this alleges that the highway official has succumbed to a hysteria of 'gold plating' and overdesigning the Interstate System, especially the urban sections, just because 90 per cent of the construction is from the Federal till. Nothing could be further from the truth, and nothing is so pitifully inadequate as yesterday's alleged overdesigned facilities that are faced with the realities of today's traffic requirements..."

### **THE URBAN CUT-BACK A HOT POTATO**

"It is my understanding that since it has become public knowledge that consideration was being given to reducing the urban parts of the Interstate highway program, as a means of reducing the cost of the program, it has become such a 'hot potato' that less emphasis is being given the proposal at least for the time being."

"No one should be lulled into complacency by this turn of events. I think my advice can be best illustrated by the story of the hunter and the bear that startled each other in the forest early one morning. The bear said to the hunter: 'Let's don't lose our heads and do something we will regret, let's talk this over. Exactly what do you want?' The hunter replied: 'I'm out for a bear skin coat.' The bear replied 'I'm out to find my breakfast-let us retire to the warmth of my den to discuss our problems.' A little later, a wood cutter saw the bear emerging from the den with a belch from his full stomach resounding throughout the silence of the forest. The woodcutter asked: 'I saw a hunter go into the den with you-What happened?' The bear replied: 'Well, we both got what we wanted. He is inside of a bear coat and I have had my breakfast.'"

"The keynote, in my words, that I would like to leave with you is: Plan your city's total transportation for the present and future on fact and need; it's too vital and too expensive to be done any other way or left to solve itself."

#### **Excerpts From the April 1960 Issue of American Highways.**

**DAVID H. STEVENS**, Maine, President of AASHO-March 30, 1960

This speech was given to the annual meeting of the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States, March 30, 1960. He reviewed the history of AASHO and the Federal-aid program.

### **THE PARTNERSHIP UNDER ATTACK**

"...A review of events which have taken place during the year 1959 and looking forward to what is indicated in 1960 it would appear that despite the accomplishments which have been brought about by cooperation of the states and the federal government in the field of highway construction we are now being challenged to prove that the states cooperating with the federal government can carry on the federal aid highway program for the construction of highways in the future. It is being said that the program has now reached such proportions that the states are no longer capable of providing competent personnel to provide for the design and construction of these highways planned for the future. Some have said that the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has failed to adjust its procedures and policies to the expanded program. Charges have been made that state highway officials are not capable of determining locations of routes of highways, particularly in urban areas, and in some instances in rural areas. It has been said

that this function should be taken over by others who, while they have come into this field only recently, nevertheless claim to be much more capable than highway officials. There have been statements to the effect that highway officials have become warped in their judgement by reason of the 90 per cent contribution by the federal government in connection with the Interstate program and that as a result highways are now being constructed which are overdesigned for traffic they will be required to carry in the future. There have been others who have indicated that the expanded highway program has now reached such proportions that questions as to financing and policy decisions must be decided at a higher level than that provided by the partnership between the state highway departments and the Federal Bureau of Public roads. There have been indications that we should have a national system of highways, probably administered by some federal agency. All of these things are apparently the result of those who have not had the benefit of the 45 years of experience in the highway field which is the result of federal and state cooperation as originally provided in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1916."

### **THE NEED FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS**

He went on to say that even though these events may shock highway officials, that is not the point or the remedy. They must remember that the Congress, State legislators, the public and other interested groups have every right to state opinions and to conduct investigations. In response, the highway officials must show competence in the stewardship of the program and they must educate by the presentation of facts so that the truth will emerge in the long run.

### **FLORIDA ROAD DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS AND NEWSMEN TOUR THE STATE An Editorial in American Highways.**

"Apathy shown by the general public last summer during the torrid fight in Congress over the future of the Interstate highway program proved to officials of the Florida State Road Department that citizens were not nearly as aware of the impact and importance of this new program as they should be."

### **FLORIDA INFORMS THE PRESS**

"Realizing that nearly 85 percent of Interstate construction is on new location and not readily visible to the average citizen, these officials decided to conduct some type of program to inform the people of recent highway developments in Florida, particularly on the Interstate."

"...Since it was not feasible to take more than a small group on such a comprehensive tour, it was decided that a cross section of the State's newsmen would be invited so they-after looking over many of the major construction projects-could interpret the highway program for their readers, listeners and viewers."

"...The Florida Road Builders Association furnished an air-conditioned speaker equipped bus."

Various highway interest groups paid for meals and social hours for the members of the press for the tour of the entire state.

**A.E. JOHNSON**, Executive Secretary of AASHO

## **AASHO CITY PLANNING SEMINARS RE-SCHEDULED**

"At the time the Sagamore Conference on Highways and Urban Development was held...the suggestion was made that State highway department personnel should learn some of the terminology and techniques used by city planners, in order to understand the effect of city plans on highway requirements and the effect on highway transportation on land use and economics in urban areas."

"...Early in 1960, contacts were made with three universities with outstanding city planning staffs and arrangements were made to hold seminars."

"Immediately thereafter, confusion and indecision developed in the road program at the national level, which threatened for a time to interrupt the Interstate program, at least for a year. With retrenchment possible and at least curtailed at the State highway department level a distinct possibility, these scheduled seminars were cancelled."

"At the Executive Committee Meeting at the Boston Annual Convention...the special Subcommittee...was instructed to proceed with a pilot seminar..."

"Consequently, the committee approached Mr. Harmer E. Davis, Professor of Civil Engineering and Director of the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, and the California Division of Highways, to plan and to hold a pilot seminar."

"...There are new techniques and theories in various stages of development to help the highway planner determine present and future highway needs in metropolitan areas. These techniques involve so many assumptions, values and variables that the use of the electronic computer is essential. ...You can look for outstanding developments in this area coming from the highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads."

"...It is indicated that the highway departments will probably have to develop and keep current a continuing total transportation plan, areawide in extent, in order to know where and how to build a highway facility to serve the need."

A listing of the staff of the Conference, the papers presented and the attendees was given.

### **Excerpts from the July, 1960 Issue of American Highways.**

**LLOYD A. RIVARD**, D.C. Highways-Traffic Assignment.

Lloyd Rivard presented a paper "Electronic Traffic Projection and Assignment". He reported the pioneering development of the traffic forecasting and traffic assignment computer process developed by the District of Columbia under contract with the General Electric Company in Phoenix, Arizona and supervised by Lee Mertz, Bureau of Public Roads.

**A.E. JOHNSON**, Executive Secretary of AASHO

The title of his speech to the WASHO Conference, June 21, 1960 was "The Responsibilities of State Highway Administrations."

"...The enlarged Federal-aid highway program is under severe attack. The sponsors of the program have seriously proposed cutbacks. There have been charges that the program was ill-conceived, is extravagant in its concept, and is grossly mismanaged, and that the basic legislation must undergo considerable change to cure the faults of a crash program."

"...The basic reports for this program started in 1922 (the first cooperative Transport Survey) and have continued in 1939 and 1943 and many hearings, concerned with the Interstate program have been held at various times; in fact, in 1953, hearings were held for nearly a year on highway needs in the House Public Works Committee. In 1954, the Clay Committee held extensive hearings on the need for an Interstate System and in 1955 extensive hearings were held both in the House and Senate sides of the Congress."

### **THE PROGRAM UNDER ATTACK**

"The program is being attacked by transportation interests that are competitive to highways and the program is being criticized by interests that selfishly would like to have a greater role in a program as big as this. The program is big enough and important enough that we are in the big league, and we are having big league headaches. These things were known risks at the time the State highway departments endorsed the enlarged, accelerated Federal-aid road program."

"The interest in the program is more widespread than ever before, and there are some neophytes, as far as highways are concerned, that occupy high positions of authority that are causing some concern in highway circles by their utterances on highway policies and attitudes."

"We are seeing a familiar set of cynical and vicious charges based on partial truths, many of which have been discredited, paraded in the press over and over again. There can only be one objective in such a program and that is to undermine the confidence of the public in the highway program."

"We hear charges that highways are ugly ducklings creating far more problems in urban areas than they solve and that rail transit programs should be expanded and subsidized instead of highways being built, or at least, the highway program should be postponed to see whether or not transit will be accepted by the public and will prove satisfactory. This attack seems to have the help of a large industry (presumably an electric company) interested in furnishing rail transit equipment. This same industry, for a while, showed considerable interest in trying to light the Interstate highway system."

### **ALLEGATIONS OF SCANDAL**

"The Program is being investigated and the press, unable to break from their Roman holiday instincts, continue to speak of the widespread scandal that is to be disclosed in the highway program."

"All of these things, combined with the natural effects of the 90-10 matching ratio on the thinking of our Congressmen and Senators, together with the increased cost as reflected in the estimate of completing the Interstate System as reflected in the estimate of 1958, and the fact that we had a financial crisis in the road program in 1959, requiring more tax money to make up a deficit in the Highway Trust Fund, have all had their effects. Also the layman began to see the

complicated geometrics of controlled access taking shape, and since he was unfamiliar with these things, he alleged gold plating was taking place. The environment was created for an investigation."

### **SOME IMPROPRIETIES**

"With investigating processes under way and some improprieties already disclosed and the possibility that a certain amount of additional ones will be exposed, the Bureau of Public Roads has been subjected to a very natural human instinct and some real official pressures to exert more and more control over the program and to tighten up on its regulations..."

### **FEDERAL DOMINANCE AND RED TAPE**

"...There seems to be some evidence that the Bureau of Public Roads, under some of the current stresses and strains, is yielding, in some measure, to the primitive instincts of self-preservation, and more and more are attempting to plug up all the holes that future investigations might find in the dyke with more and more paper work tied up in little bundles of red tape. To the States I am sure that this looks like an unconscious attempt to appear as pure as Caesar's wife if and when future criticisms might be directed at the program, which would leave the highway departments to stand the brunt of the criticisms. There seem to be indications of unconsciously forgetting the partnership relationship and of the Bureau becoming the Great White Father protecting the States from their own potential transgressions, which takes on more of the master-servant relationship instead of the partnership. I refer to some of the recent reissues of old policies that are tightened up a 'little' for the good of the States."

"Some of these releases, coming as a complete surprise to the States, have created minor crises which could have been avoided if there had been some arrangement made to cooperatively review the drafts of these regulations while they were being developed. A partnership means mutual development, responsibility, trust and respect and not a unilateral operation."

"There is no legal requirement that the Bureau of Public Roads discuss with the States any regulations or policies that it might be developing, but I think it would be of great assistance to both parties if such a procedure were followed as one cannot long exist without the other as far as the Federal-aid road program is concerned if they do not mutually work out the many problems."

"If each and every future investigation results in more tightening up on the part of the Bureau, the result will be a crippling paralysis that will finally immobilize the States as far as any highway prerogatives may be concerned, and the States will finally end up in the menial role of 'hired help,' and State highway administration may decline to a foreman's role."

"It is hoped that the Bureau of Public Roads will take action against a single State that is at fault instead of applying blanket restrictions affecting all States to cover each and every condition that might arise. There is currently adequate authorization and legislation to require proper restitution from a State or to apply the necessary disciplinary action for any improper act."

### **CRITICISM OF BPR**

"...Recently the Bureau of Public Roads was criticized for not looking beyond the certifications of a Sovereign State in its administration and handling of a highway project. I agree that the Bureau of Public Roads was right in accepting these certifications, and I am of the opinion that for the Bureau of Public Roads to go further with any substantial type of inspection and checking would increase the Federal responsibility in the final product and would require an unjustifiable increase in personnel above the some 3,000 people now working for the Bureau of Public Roads for there are some 10,000 Federal-aid projects currently underway."

"...Actually, if a State is responsible for inferior construction, the effect is a self disciplinary action for that State is taking on the responsibility of maintaining and operating, at its own expense, an inferior facility."

He went on to lecture the highway departments on the characteristics of good management.

"...Neither should you underestimate the challenge of competitive interests of the various classes nor sell short the continuing repetitive press stories on our 'highway bungle', as the Reader's Digest terms it. It seems to be the instinct of a large section of the press to always picture a story in its most sensational manner and if it continues the public forms its opinions from the repetitive exposure. In fact the attack on the highway program appears to be taking on a form of a well planned and executed attack that may well come out into the open next year when highway hearings are under way on Capitol Hill."

"...Under the circumstances, there seems to be very little praise for the overwhelming majority of the dedicated capable public servants in the highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads. All of the publicity will be given to the extremely small percentage of those that are found to be out of line. If such criticisms continue, the Bureau of Public Roads will be unable to resist applying more and more pressures on the States with the corresponding loss of latitudes at the State levels and the assumption of more and more responsibilities at the federal level."

#### **MORE FEDERAL CONTROL?**

"...Leading highway spokesmen on Capitol Hill have been influenced by charges and inferences that the highway program is mismanaged and they warn that highway legislation will undergo drastic changes next year. These changes can only go in one direction and that is for more federal control."

"Many of the attacks in the press play the same record of well-worn semi-truth charges over and over again, and eventually public opinion will react against this campaign, but before that time the States position in the program can be seriously damaged."

"...The major responsibility of the highway administrator right now is to keep the federal-aid road program under State control. It is at that level where the experience exists and where the public interests can best be served. Your work is being cut out for you, for you are being seriously challenged."



"The big highway program will go ahead. If there are any changes made the same reservoir of trained people will do the job, only the administration will change."

**Excerpts from the October Issue of American Highways, 1960.**  
**J.W. McDONALD-"Freeways-a Modern Mass Transportation System"**

Mr. McDonald was Manager of the Engineering Department of the Automobile Club of Southern California.

He labeled Los Angeles as the "most freewayed" city in the world and went on to give the statistical dimensions of the Los Angeles area and its transportation. He then defined a set of terms mostly dealing with transit, rapid transit, exclusive right-of-way transit. He had the most trouble defining "balanced transportation":

**WHAT IS BALANCED TRANSPORTATION?**

"While still considering definitions let's return for a moment to the 'middle course' mentioned earlier which is often referred to as a 'balanced' transportation system. 'Balanced' is a good word-who will argue for an 'unbalanced' transportation system? But support of 'balance' is too often twisted to imply that present transportation is badly out of balance. Is it out of balance because Los Angeles has a relatively small transit system and a complete lack of or, some might say, freedom from rail rapid transit? Certainly these are not measures of 'transportation balance'."

"Transportation balance should be defined as the matching of transportation modes and systems to the real transportation needs of the community."

"On the basis of these definitions then, I think it's safe to say we're all in favor of a balanced transportation system, we're all in favor of public transportation, we're probably all in favor of mass transit. I think the need for mass transit is evident. Also, we can see that the freeways are presently serving as a mass transportation system. One popular feeling, however, that remains to be proven is that this area has an immediate need for rail rapid transit."

"If it can be shown that rail-rapid transit could serve even part of our widespread population more conveniently, more efficiently and more economically than other modes of transportation then we should have it. To date, however, convincing evidence to support this case has not been produced, while many factors indicate that rail-rapid transit has, if anything, an extremely limited potential here."

"...In 1953 the Los Angeles motorist could make no freeway trip longer than 7 miles. Today, uninterrupted trips of 90 to 100 miles are available from the San Fernando Valley to El Toro in Orange County, or to San Bernadino and on to Barstow..."

He described in some detail the status of the freeway system and its performance in peak and off peak times:

"...Although doing an amazingly good job, freeways are neither perfect nor the complete answer to our transportation problems. Driving them as we do, either regularly or occasionally, we become familiar with the freeway's capabilities and

their limitations. However, we must remember that the system is incomplete and that the few, existing freeways are called upon to carry a tremendous overload of traffic which eventually will be distributed on new links of the system. Forgetting this point leads to unfair exaggeration of freeway problems."

## **HOW BEST TO PROVIDE MASS TRANSIT**

"On the other hand, what chance has the average Los Angeles citizen to fairly evaluate the potential of rapid transit-particularly in this area? Some may be intrigued by the imaginative picture of a shiny monorail train, gliding smoothly and noiselessly along at 70 MPH, others by the thought of how much more pleasant the freeway might be if the man in the car ahead and the one behind had left their cars at home and been able to ride the monorail instead. But our evaluation must be better than this."

He then described the need for an orderly survey and analysis process to develop the evaluations needed for the further development of the freeway system and the transit system. He felt that a study of the Boston MTA could provide some answers but he had reservations:

"...However, in contrast with the glowing phrases contained in the national magazines let me quote from the October 11th. edition of the Boston Herald:

'Substantial financial losses by the MTA's highly touted Highland Branch linking Boston, Brookline and Newton, threaten to add upward of \$300,000 to the line's already staggering deficit...'

'The biggest disappointment has been the failure of the Riverside Terminal with its tremendous parking facility and its nearness to...the Massachusetts Turnpike to generate the patronage the MTA counted on.'

'The argument was that commuters and shoppers alike would respond to the offer of clean, safe, speedy, and regular service to Boston for a bargain 20 cent fare.'"

"The facts show that the commuters and shoppers just didn't respond. So in Boston we see a rapid transit operation which appeared to have every reason for success, failing to make the grade. What then are the chances of success here?"

## **LOS ANGELES A UNIQUE LABORATORY**

"This example serves two purposes-first, it proves that the prediction of success for a rapid transit venture can be entirely wrong, even under relatively favorable conditions. Equally important to us in Los Angeles, it raises the question of just how much pro-rapid transit material can be accepted after finding such an obvious case of misleading information."

"By way of summary perhaps I can boil down a few brief statements:

1. Los Angeles, in its period of tremendous growth, has been served largely by rubber-tired transportation.

2. The freeways which have become the primary key to mobility of our rubber-tired transportation system are presently doing an amazingly good job of moving tremendous volumes of people and goods.
3. Future growth of this area can, and should, be considered calmly, rationally, and optimistically. There is no reason for hysteria, 'scare' tactics, or radical changes in emphasis regarding transportation.
4. Almost all are in favor of a balanced transportation system-an atmosphere should be created within which public transportation potential may be optimized. It does not, however, follow that this means we presently have a badly unbalanced system.

#### **RAIL TRANSIT QUESTIONED**

5. The assertion that every large urban area must ultimately turn to rail rapid transit for the solution of its public transportation problems is certainly subject to question. A very good case can be made supporting the concept of flexible rubber-tired public transportation, utilizing the freeways for express runs.
6. Finally, and most important-intelligent decisions regarding our transportation problems can be made only on the basis of an honest appraisal of our present situation, coupled with equally objective analysis and comparison of the alternate courses which we might follow in the future."

#### **Excerpts from the January 1961 Issue of American Highways-the Record of the 1960 Annual Meeting of AASHO.**

**DAVID H. STEVENS**, Maine, President.

"Much has been said and written in the past year in regard to the national highway program-some of it complimentary and in some instances of a critical nature..."

"It is my purpose to talk to you in regard to the future of the national highway program..."

#### **THE FUTURE OF THE INTERSTATE PROGRAM**

"In attempting to predict future events relating to the national highway program there would appear to be three questions which must be answered, (1) Does need for the program still exist? (2) Will financing of the program be authorized? and (3) How and by what agency or agencies will the program be carried on? In other words, what will be the mechanics of government that will be utilized to complete the Interstate System and to continue construction of the ABC Systems? Will the traditional Federal-State relationship continue or will it be limited or modified?

To answer the first question, he reviewed at some length the studies and debates leading to the passage of the 56 Act and concluded that the evidence was still there that the Interstate System was needed and he observed that the program's harshest critics did not question the need.

"Will financing of the program be authorized? In considering any governmental program it is almost inevitable that those who are sponsoring such a program must come to grips with the matter of financing. It is, of course, unfortunate that

the original cost estimate for the Interstate System was several billion dollars less than that which was determined to be a more valid figure in the cost estimate filed with the Congress in 1958. The reasons for this difference have been thoroughly explained to the Congress and repetition of the explanations does not appear to be necessary at this time. While the cost estimate which will be considered by Congress in 1961 has not been officially released, rumors indicate that the total figure for both State and Federal funds will not vary to any great extent from that previously filed in 1958. However, Congress has not yet solved the problem of providing the Federal share of the cost of the entire Interstate System. Authorizations contained in the 1956 Act were based on the lower cost estimate."

## **PROSPECTS FOR NEW HIGHWAY REVENUES**

"...In passing it could be stated that no doubt most of the funds necessary to construct the Interstate System will be derived from highway user taxation. On the basis of the current thinking among those interested in financing the construction and maintenance of highways there probably will be some attempt made, and it is a fair assumption that these attempts will be somewhat successful, to obtain a part of the funds necessary for highway construction and maintenance in the future from non-users of those facilities. It is expected that the so-called '210 Study' to be filed with the Federal Congress will contain data in regard to this matter. Without, therefore, being specific in regard to how the financing will be authorized, the answer would appear to be that financing will be authorized in sufficient amount to complete the Interstate Highway System in 1972 and to carry on construction of the ABC Systems."

"The third question as to how and by what governmental agencies the national highway program will be continued involves the traditional Federal- State relationship which has existed in the highway field for the past 44 years..."

He gave a philosophical dissertation tracing the Federal-State relationship from the earliest times when the States were practically autonomous and postulated that when the States were perceived to be failing in their responsibilities, it was then that the Federal government moved into the function and it was almost always funding that was the issue.

## **THE HISTORY OF FEDERAL AID**

"A classic example occurred in the field of welfare. Until the great depression of the 1930's welfare and the care of indigent persons were primarily the responsibility of local government. Because local government either could not or would not carry on in an adequate manner during the depression days the Federal Government stepped into the picture and we now have the tremendous welfare programs financed for the most part by the Federal Government which originated in the Roosevelt Era. There was little excuse for the Federal Government to be in the welfare field except from the standpoint of finances."

"...There were two governmental activities which were very close to the hearts of our ancestors, namely education and highways. In these two fields local and State governmental units have progressed to a point where they, at least until recently, could give a good accounting. The administration and financing of these programs has developed to such a point that there was little that the proponents of better education and highways could point to as a need for Federal

intervention. While it is true that we had Federal Government grants-in-aid for highway purposes, until the so-called 90-10 program most of the funds for construction and maintenance of highways were appropriated by State and local governmental units. We now see a tremendous push for Federal funds in the field of education. As a matter of fact, in the recent political campaign both major parties indicated that they were for Federal monies for education, the only difference between their views being the method of making the funds available to the States. It is only a question of time before we will see Federal monies being made available to the States for this purpose and despite the rather naive viewpoint of our friends in the education field, Federal regulation and eventually supervision will follow the flow of those funds."

## **THE EVOLUTION OF RED TAPE**

"...With the passage of the 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act it was almost inevitable that there would be changes in this relationship (the partnership). An examination of the events in the Federal-State relationship in the highway field since that time, and more specifically during the last two years, by an impartial person would certainly bring forth a conclusion that there have been increased requirements and regulations imposed on the States by the Federal Government."

"In exploring the reasons for the increased regulatory activity by the Federal Government in the highway field we are confronted with the following facts: First, it is not strange that there has been a tendency toward centralization. As a matter of fact it is only through the record that the States have made in the past years that centralization in the highway field has been postponed. It would be most unusual if there were not some tendencies toward this centralization. Secondly, with the passage of the 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act we came into the days of the 90-10 matching ratio as compared with the former ratio of 50-50. There was also a substantial increase in the total Federal dollars available for highway construction. It is inevitable that when a higher level of government, in this case the Federal Government, increases its proportionate share in any grant-in-aid program that more reports are required from the lower level of government, in this case the States."

"In the highway program the increase in the number and size of highway construction projects under the program has resulted in complaints to Congressmen which, in turn, have led to inquiries and some criticism of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. Congress has been required to increase highway user taxes. It is always a very painful process for a Congressman to explain to his constituents the reason for increased taxes. The net result of the increased size of the program has been, therefore, more attempts on the part of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads to secure answers and to 'tighten up' the administrative aspects of the program."

## **IMPROPER PRACTICES BY SOME STATES**

"The third factor has been the matter of improper handling of public funds, improper relationships between engineers and contractors and poor workmanship which have been discovered in some of the States. In any grant-in-aid program, whenever improper procedures are discovered there is a tendency on the part of the higher level of government to act as a policeman. This in itself results in more reports being required of the lower level of government and additional instructional material. Usually this is a futile attempt as no dishonest

person is ever made honest by a PPM. As a matter of fact, dishonesty thrives in an atmosphere of red tape."

"Another result of improper practices in any governmental activity is the investigation which is inevitably authorized in an attempt to ferret out the instances of dishonesty and to prevent such occurring in the future. We have seen the authorization of a special committee in the House of Representatives of our Congress charged with the task of investigating the highway program. While we all regret the necessity for such a committee to be created, nevertheless any fair-minded person would conclude that on the basis of the committee activities to date the committee should continue in an effort to determine all of the facts in regard to any improper practices that exist in the highway program. While the members of the committee and the committee staff have an objective approach to the highway program, by the very nature of the committee activities, namely in the investigation field, there is little opportunity for an over-all evaluation of the highway program. It is to be hoped that Congress in the coming session will provide an opportunity through hearing, probably on the Senate side, for such an evaluation."

### **MEDIA ATTENTION**

"Certain segments of the public press and the news media have, of course, been having a field day by reason of the relatively few instances of improper practices in the highway program. Criticism by the press will continue. Unfortunately the everyday, constructive activities of government are not sufficiently spectacular to appeal to the readers of the public press. It is only when some improper practice is discovered that we have the full treatment, so to speak, by the press. This is a situation which exists in every governmental program and is not peculiar to the highway field. The answer, of course, is to eliminate the improper practices."

### **A THREAT TO THE PROGRAM**

"In attempting to answer the question of how and by what governmental agency the national highway program will be continued, it is apparent that the traditional Federal-State relationship is in the process of being modified. If this trend is carried far enough it could result in the States being deprived of the opportunity to carry on within the Federal-State relationship as they have in the past. The States' role within this relationship is being threatened by, first, the size of the program and, secondly, by evidence of improper practices on the part of some of the States. The threat by virtue of the size of the program can be met only by the States proving their ability to cope with the program...The ability can...be demonstrated."

"The threat in the form of improper practices can only be met by the States through a demonstration to the satisfaction of the Congress and the general public that the States do have honesty and integrity to carry on the program in a proper manner. Personally I believe that the State can demonstrate these characteristics in a manner which will satisfy any unbiased person."

**SEN. PAT McNAMARA**, Mich., November 28, 1960 to AASHO

Sen. McNamara was Chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Public Works Committee.

## **PROGRESS**

He reviewed the history of highway legislation and the Federal-aid program and noted the progress on the Interstate System in that 9,600 miles were open to traffic, 4,600 miles under construction and over \$9 billion put to work. He registered concern that many miles of designated Interstate would have to wait until the tail end of the program for construction thus leaving the designated routes in a congested condition for the time being. He stressed the importance of not slighting the ABC program since it was a "keep even" program as opposed to a new system.

## **PROBLEMS FOR THE NEW ADMINISTRATION**

He reviewed the financing of the Interstate provided by the 1956 Act noting that the estimates of cost and revenues were too low so that adjustments had to be made by increasing highway user taxes. He stated his opposition to the Byrd Amendment as slowing the program down. He felt that borrowing from the general fund to make up the deficits was the proper way to go. He felt that the new Congress would have to make some very basic decisions about how they wanted the highway program to go. He felt that the Cost Allocation Study and the new Interstate Cost Estimate would be essential in making those decisions. He noted that it was not very clear as to what the Administration's position was in regard to the Interstate since they seemed to change from advocacy to restraint and back again. He noted that in January the Administration and the Congress would be of the same party. He solicited the views of AASHO for the upcoming highway hearings that would be concerned with the major decisions that he spoke of.

### **REP. GEORGE FALLON, Md., Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads.**

He noted that the primary problem for the new Congress was to put the highway program on a sound financial footing and to consider the urban aspects of that program:

#### **THE URBAN PROBLEM**

"As an example, consider the problem of urban transportation, Transportation is one part-perhaps the key part-of what has been called the most urgent problem confronting America today, that of rebuilding and revitalizing our cities...There is no doubt about the seriousness of the problem. There is no doubt about its complexity. However, there is no shortage of proposed solutions. The really tough nut to crack is the fact that the proposed solutions are all costly."

"It seems to me that any workable solution to the urban transportation problem must rely quite heavily on improved highway transportation. In many areas, thinking is running toward increased reliance on mass transit, including subways, commuter railroads and monorail lines. I believe that many cities are going to find it necessary to improve their mass transit facilities substantially."

"...Because of the great and growing need for highway transportation, it is highly important that highway-user revenues be spent for highways, and not diverted to the construction of mass transit facilities. So, you see, we come back to the money problem."

## **OPPOSED TO STRETCHOUTS AND CUTBACKS**

"...There is a feeling in some quarters that the Interstate program can readily be stretched out. There is some sentiment in favor of curtailing the program in some way, to bring the program in line with the present capacity of the Highway Trust Fund."

"Personally, I am strongly opposed to stretchouts and cutbacks. I am in favor of adhering strictly to the construction schedule which was contemplated in the Highway Act of 1956. This means, for the Interstate program, that the final apportionment of funds would be that for the fiscal year 1969. Since the apportionment for fiscal 1962 has already been made, this means providing for the completion of the Interstate System in seven more annual apportionments. I am also in favor of increasing the annual apportionment of funds for the construction of ABC highways to \$1 billion annually. This is the program that was contemplated in 1956. It is just as sound now as it was then."

## **INCREASE THE PROGRAM LEVEL TO FINISH ON TIME**

"I am fully aware of the implications of the position I have just stated. To complete the Interstate program on schedule, it will be necessary to increase the annual Federal authorizations from the present level of \$2.2 billion to about \$3.5 billion. This, together with an annual ABC authorization of \$1 billion would result in annual Federal highway expenditures of about \$4.5 billion. This program would require increased revenue to the Highway Trust Fund of about \$10 billion over the next 11 years-an average of almost a billion dollars a year."

"Admittedly, this is quite a substantial sum, and finding ways and means to raise such an amount will be no simple task. It may be anticipated that any proposal to raising such a large amount of money will be met with violent opposition. But the urgency of the need and the economic justification of the early completion of the Interstate System, dictates the necessity of finding some means of finance."

He went on to point out that for such legislation to occur required public support of early completion of the Interstate and that required a public relations campaign which had to be carried out through the States, not from Washington.

### **B. D. TALLAMY, Administrator, BPR-"Highway Progress 1956-1961"**

He gave a status report of the progress of the highway program.

"As of now, we have in use nearly one quarter of the 41,000 miles of the Interstate System..."

## **URBAN PLANNING**

"...The Bureau and the States have conducted the first factual inventory of the status of city planning on a nationwide basis. The summary of data, so far received, reports information for 411 'urban places' with 25,000 or more population located on the Interstate System. It shows that 89 percent of these 411 metropolitan areas have some type of urban plans; 78 percent have comprehensive plans. These preliminary results demonstrate the large amount of



city planning that has been done, and run contrary to the views of some critics who have deplored the lack of it."

"Both the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments have encouraged such plans for urban areas, and have advanced them through the use of 1 1/2 percent funds. In some cases, the best routes for Interstate and other urban highways are immediately obvious. After these have been finished, others whose locations are less obvious can be built where they will be most beneficial to community development..."

## **THE OUTLOOK**

"...The outlook under present legislation is for future reimbursable obligation schedules of about \$3.2 or \$3.3 billion for each of the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 the reimbursable obligation rate would drop back to about \$2.5 billion annually, for the Interstate and ABC program combined. Interstate apportionments would drop to \$1.5 billion for fiscal 1964 rising only at a slow rate thereafter. However, it is hoped that Congress will take action this coming year which will enable continuation of the program at a high rate designed to complete the Interstate System by 1972 as originally planned."

"Authorizations of about \$3.2 billion annually are necessary starting with fiscal year 1963 if that objective is to be met. With the revenue schedule in effect in 1972 under present legislation and Section 209(g) (the Byrd Amendment) applicable, extension of the Highway Trust Fund to the end of the calendar year 1976 would be necessary to finish the System."

## **THE COST ALLOCATION STUDY**

"Of course, in order to develop a long range financing program, it is necessary in addition to the 'Highway Cost Allocation Study' previously mentioned to take another look at the estimate of cost to complete the System."

"The Bureau is now putting the final touches on this estimate. We appreciate the meticulous work you have all done in putting this together. The new cost estimate will not differ materially from that submitted in 1958 and I can tell you at this time that it will not be greater. The soundness of the 1958 figure has been demonstrated by the new estimate and by recent comparison of the actual Interstate project costs with 1958 figures. For 47 States and the District of Columbia rural costs were 92 percent of the 1958 estimates, and urban costs 102 percent of the 1958 figure. This is indeed strong support for the firm position we took before the Congressional Committees that the 1958 estimate of total cost was sound and could be used with confidence."

## **OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE FUTURE**

"All of us should approach the new year, then, with a certain amount of pardonable pride in our accomplishments, also with confidence. The new Administration (The Kennedy Administration) is on record as favoring the continuation of the expanded highway program along the general course charted by the Act of 1956. There has been no substantial change in the complexion of Congress nor is there likely to be in the membership of the committees dealing with highway matters. The coming year is a critical year for our cooperative program. Nothing worth while comes easily and there are numerous roadblocks

ahead. But I have great confidence that our mutual efforts are winning a great vote of confidence from the general public and will receive approval by the Congress."

The rest of the report was a detailed progress report.

## **FAREWELL**

"...In closing, I wish to express my deep appreciation to this Association for the assistance and support you have given to me as Federal Highway Administrator. Without it no Administrator could carry on his work and I trust you will be as generous with your assistance and understanding with my successor. In the near future, I will submit my resignation but in doing so I want you to know that I will feel a sense of personal loss at the breaking off of the close associations I have had with all of you during my tour of duty with the Bureau of Public Roads..."

### **E. H. HOLMES-Asst. Comm. BPR on Urban Planning**

The title of the speech given to the AASHO Annual Meeting on December 1, 1960 was "Urban Transportation Planning and the National Highway Program"

## **THE ROOTS OF URBAN PLANNING**

"...State highway departments have been actively concerned with urban problems since 1944, the year the first home-interview travel survey was started in Little Rock. This study was closely followed by similar studies in Tulsa and New Orleans, and soon thereafter by others throughout the country. They were designed to provide the specific data needed to permit planning of highway developments in urban areas, to meet the needs for highway travel consistent with the general plans for community development."

"...The analyses of these surveys, which showed primarily the origin, destination, time, and purpose of each trip by each mode of travel, produced the desire-line charts that soon outmoded the traffic flow map as a basis for planning. The analysis left much to be desired, especially in projecting the travel desires into the future. But the product of the surveys, checked and tested by statistical means and actual ground controls, was so far advanced in relation to other planning data that the home-interview survey became and remains the basic urban highway planning tool."

## **DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TECHNIQUES**

"Highway planners were by no means satisfied with the limited analyses then possible, or with the extent to which the possible analyses were actually carried out. Highway departments made effective use of the results in planning specific routes or projects, but had little desire or reason to continue analyses to aid in broad urban planning. And city planners seemed unable or uninterested in capitalizing on the wealth of information available in the boxes of punch cards filed away in some storage area. It soon became evident, however, as planning and research people delved into the facts assembled and tabulated in one city after another, that basic relations between travel desires and land use and other social and economic factors of the metropolitan area must exist. But it was not until the high speed computer became available, and perhaps the almost simultaneous introduction into the field of highway planning of the sociologist, the

geographer, the economist, and the city planner, that a real breakthrough in establishing these relations was achieved."

"...Technical developments of themselves can be of value only to the extent which they can be applied, and the application of the now available planning techniques requires a high degree of cooperation between State and local agencies. Moreover, in view of the importance of decisions in the field of transportation in shaping the exploding metropolitan areas, local officials must in their own self interest join the State officials in the developing and carrying out plans that are mutually most advantageous. In this area of organizing cooperation highway officials have also taken a leading role."

"On the national scale, one of the early efforts to improve planning techniques and develop State-local cooperation was made by the National Committee on Urban Transportation. This committee financed primarily by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Automotive Safety Foundation, did its job well, and having done it, closed its doors last July."

"The AMA-AASHO Joint Committee on Highways is and will continue to be an effective force in bringing about close State-local relations. This committee has sponsored several State and regional meetings at which State and local officials were brought together to consider the cooperative approach to urban transportation planning, and it joined with the Urban Research Committee of the Highway Research Board in sponsoring the Sagamore Conference."

#### **THE SAGAMORE CONFERENCE**

"The Sagamore Conference itself was a milestone along the road to better mutual understanding between State and local groups. Here carefully selected highway officials, mayors, city managers, city planners, business men, economists, and other specialists hammered out a statement of individual and mutual responsibilities of State and local officials that, if conscientiously met, must surely produce a sound, mutually acceptable plan for transportation best suited to future community and highway user needs."

"...A survey has recently been completed by the Bureau of Public Roads through its field offices in behalf of the AMA-AASHO Joint Committee to determine the extent to which the States are carrying out the recommendations of the Sagamore Conference. Many States were doing an effective job well before the Conference, but in others the report seemed to stimulate or initiate a more positive effort to develop the necessary State- local cooperation."

#### **GROWTH OF URBAN PLANNING IN HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS**

"This survey shows that in 36 States the highway departments have joined with local authorities in developing plans for urban highway systems. In 12 others similar cooperative approaches have been made in connection with the location design of one or more major routes, even though the studies have not encompassed the entire system. An impressive list of what we called 'noteworthy examples' of State-local cooperation resulted from this inquiry."

"States have placed responsibility for urban highway planning in a variety of organization units. In some, and probably most commonly, the work has been regarded as one aspect of overall highway planning, and responsibility rests in

the highway planning division, with or without an urban highway planning unit separately established. In others an urban highway planning unit coordinator has been set up. In still others such words as 'metropolitan,' 'local roads and streets,' and 'urban development' appear. But under whatever title, 28 States have formally designated individuals or units to be responsible for insuring the essential cooperative approach. While some might call attention to the 22 States which have not given such formal recognition to the urban highway problem, it seems more constructive and more significant to point to the 28 States that have so adequately responded to this newly developing urban problem."

"It is interesting to note that 8 States reported that they now prepare 5-year programs of urban highway development. This step was strongly urged by the city officials and planners at Sagamore and its acceptance by even this number of States is encouraging."

### **CRITICS OF URBAN HIGHWAY PLANNING**

"...This is a record of constructive accomplishments in which highway interests take pride and satisfaction. It has been recited in some detail to show the depth and breadth of the accomplishments. Yet, despite the soundness of the approach and its demonstrated success in State after State, urban highway planning is being subjected to increasing criticism and the responsibility of the highway departments for highway planning in urban areas is threatened. Misinformation about highway planning and the impact of highways on metropolitan and urban development is being widely spread."

"Why is it?"

"Some misinformation is undoubtedly the result of well-intentioned efforts on the part of persons of influence who, with newly acquired interest in transportation are still uninformed on highway planning and transportation matters."

"Others, with special interests, find the positions becoming increasingly difficult as the highway program advances, and in their legitimate self-interest cast doubt on highway plans or becloud issues by raising scarcely relevant questions of economic or social nature."

### **DEFENSIVE ABOUT RAIL TRANSIT**

"Others attribute to the highway program ills that are in reality the result of changing times and modes of living."

"Still other groups have a sincere, if unjustified, fear that new urban highways will be detrimental not only to their own interests, but to their whole community."

"And we must recognize that despite the many, many examples of good cooperation between State and local agencies, there have been occasions when this was not the case. While such cases eventually are settled to mutual satisfaction, their existence, even if temporary in duration gives critics support for their positions."

"As just one example of misinformation that gains wide circulation is the assertion in national advertising and elsewhere that it takes twenty lanes of freeway to

move as many people in an hour as can be moved on one rapid transit track. This statement has gained wide acceptance judging by the extent to which it is repeated by persons who evidently have not analyzed it."

He gave a lengthy analysis of the statement pointing out that it could actually be done but is almost never done under actual circumstances and what about the other 24 hours of the day and weekends and what about goods movement.

"...We have let ourselves and our whole urban highway program be placed on the defensive by an argument that touches only one facet of the problem of metropolitan area transportation, and one which has the hollowest of support."

"Most of the criticism can be answered, and doubts and fears allayed. by facts. But criticism and complaints reach far more ears than factual answers, and the very necessity for answering the critics places highway transportation in a defensive position. We need not be apologetic for the constructive work we are doing. We should not be facing daily the necessity of defending and justifying our work and plans. But the breadth of criticism, unjustified though it may be, is placing sound highway planning in jeopardy."

#### **LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES THREATEN HIGHWAY OFFICIALS**

" One result of this culminating criticism is seen in a bill introduced in the closing days of the last session of Congress. It represents a sincere effort to accelerate general urban planning and to bring about better coordination between general planning and highway planning. You are familiar with it, I am sure, but among other provisions it would increase the 1 1/2 per cent of Federal aid for highway planning to 2 per cent, and would make the added 1/2 per cent available under certain conditions to planning commissions in metropolitan areas for long range land-use and transportation planning. The general urban planning is expected to develop the transportation needs of the community and determine the location of highways to serve those needs. Beyond that, under the bill, plans for any Federal-aid highway construction in any standard metropolitan area would be required to be submitted to the metropolitan planning commission for its consideration and comment before construction could proceed. In effect, responsibility for urban highway planning would be taken from the highway official."

"This approach, giving the main responsibility for highway planning in urban areas to the city planners, would be a complete reversal of the cooperative approach we are so diligently carrying forward. Nonetheless the voices of the many critics have been heard and heeded, and this bill is one result. While it was not introduced in time for hearings this year, it or a similar one will undoubtedly be introduced promptly as the next session of Congress convenes."

#### **THE DEFENSE**

"The highway officials' answer to these and other efforts that tend to erode their responsibility and authority must be their demonstrated ability to carry out a fully adequate cooperative job of urban highway planning, to provide highways best suited to the needs of the users and the community at large. I continue to repeat and emphasize this last point, for the principal criticism lies in the alleged failure of highway officials to understand or be sympathetic to the needs of the community at large."

"...We can say with assurance that highway planners have produced the most effective and powerful tools ever available for highway planning. We are assured that these tools are invaluable to urban and regional planners as well. We can demonstrate again and again the effectiveness of these tools when cooperatively and skillfully used. Yet we are on the defensive."

#### **SKILLS MUST BE INCREASED**

"If we maintain the position in urban highway planning we have earned by constructive effort, if we are to retain our proper responsibility and authority in this area, we must continue to upgrade our technical competence in our own field. We must understand and speak the language of the planners and the professionals in the other fields with whom we shall be dealing as competently as they. We must achieve complete local cooperation and pursue with vigor the establishment and maintenance of sound relations with and among local officials and citizen support groups. And we must do a better job of informing the public of our effective work to place our critics, rather than the highway official, on the defensive."

#### **Excerpts From the April 1961 Issue of American Highways. AASHO POLICY STATEMENT, 1961**

#### **HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS ADEQUATE TO THE TASK**

"...The Association should vigorously oppose any proposals that would require a certain type of organization and operation for a State highway department as a prerequisite for the State receiving federal aid highway funds inasmuch as highway departments are departments of Sovereign State governments. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1916 required that the State highway organization be adequate for the purpose and proper safeguards now exist in federal law to protect the federal interests."

#### **BPR SHOULD BE THE ONLY RESPONSIBLE FEDERAL AGENCY**

"...That no federal agencies or other groups, other than the Bureau of Public Roads, should have the approval power over federal aid projects initiated by the State highway departments. However, the State highway departments should develop their projects in close cooperation with other affected groups and agencies. To extend the area of project approval could invite controversy and delay the initiation of vitally needed highway improvements."

#### **NO DIVERSION FROM THE TRUST FUND**

"...That the Association vigorously opposes the use of any federal Highway Trust Fund monies for any purpose than now authorized by law. They should not be extended to subsidize mass transit."

#### **RESTORE CONTRACT AUTHORITY**

"That the 'reimbursement planning' or 'Contract Control' is a temporary expedient for an interim period and should be considered as such. The 'Contract Authority' procedure should be restored as soon as adequate financing can be arranged for the program..."

### **STAY ON SCHEDULE WITH THE INTERSTATE**

"...The Association endorses the Interstate System completion schedule as outlined in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, and reassures the Congress of the State highway department's ability to efficiently construct the program within that time schedule, and warns of the adverse economic impact of interruptions, cutbacks or stretchouts in the program."

### **SIMULTANEOUS COMPLETION**

"The Association endorses the periodic Interstate estimates...as the only equitable and proper basis of apportioning funds to the several States to achieve simultaneous construction and completion of the Interstate System..."

### **DON'T ADD INTERSTATE MILEAGE**

"...That adding mileage to the Interstate System at this time would result in the delay of the completion of transcontinental routes and would extend the whole program over a longer period of time..."

### **DON'T SLOW DOWN THE URBAN INTERSTATE**

"That the urban portions of the Interstate System are an integral and very important part of the system, which should be planned and developed by the State highway departments in close cooperation with the cities. The importance of the urban sections of the Interstate Systems cannot be over-emphasized, and an eventual enormous increase in cost could be created by a failure to recognize the problem at this time."

### **A COMPREHENSIVE URBAN PLAN SHOULD NOT BE A REQUIREMENT**

"That the development and adoption of a comprehensive urban transportation plan should not be a requirement for the approval of a federal aid highway project in an urban area, but State highway departments should lend all possible assistance in the development of such plans in order that effective coordination of highway and urban development may be attained..."

### **Excerpts From the Jan. 1962 Issue of American Highways-the Record of the 47th Annual AASHO Meeting Oct. 9, 1961.**

**D.H. BRAY**, Ky., the President's Address

### **THE FUNDING CRISIS SOLVED**

"A little less than a year ago when we met at our last annual meeting in Detroit, Michigan, our principal concern then was whether or not necessary funds would be provided so that we could go ahead with our highway program on the schedule originally contemplated for the completion of the Interstate System...Since that time...the necessary funds have been provided."

### **WE MUST RESTORE CONFIDENCE**

"...We have been given the go-ahead signal. Now, it is up to us to demonstrate that we have both the ability and the integrity to carry on the work efficiently and

honestly. I think that our ability is little questioned; but because of the improper conduct of a few highway department people, the entire field of state highway department administration has become to some extent suspect in the public mind. Confronted with this undesirable and regrettable situation, it behooves all of us to be constantly vigilant and aggressive in keeping our individual highway departments as scandal-free as is humanly possible..."

### **BE ALERT AGAINST DIVERSION**

"...Presently, there seems to be a growing threat for the diversion of highway funds to rail transit development; and rail transit development is being promoted at a rather startling rate. Highway officials should keep alert in this matter to see that their interests are protected."

### **THREAT OF DIRECT FUNDING TO URBAN AREAS**

"During the past session of Congress, we have seen the new housing bill which goes into the field of transportation planning in urban areas. We hope that the state highway departments will realize their responsibilities in this area and so conduct themselves as to maintain a position of importance in any transportation planning studies in their respective states. Legislation is being drafted on Capitol Hill by some who are extremely urban oriented, which legislation would grant Federal- road aid directly to the metropolitan areas. It is doubted if the best interest of highway transportation would be served by such an operation. However, it behooves state highway officials to eliminate any source of criticism which might encourage such by-passing of state authority. In a country destined to become more and more urban in character, it is essential that state highway administrators constantly review the changing times and needs in evaluating their highway organizations and what constitutes a current balanced highway program. Our rural road responsibilities will always remain extremely important and will be with us permanently; but highway department operations, by necessity, must become more urban-oriented as time goes on..."

**SEN. PAT McNAMARA**, Public Works Committee and Subcommittee on Roads.

"...Last November in Detroit, I made the observation that there was great confusion in the Interstate Highway Program because we were unable to determine precisely the position of the Executive Branch in many of these matters."

### **PRESIDENT KENNEDY**

"...On February 28, 1961, President Kennedy sent a special message to Congress concerning the highway program. He stated:

'Our Federal pay-as-you-go Highway Program is in peril. It is a peril that justifies a special message because of the vital contribution this program makes to our security, our safety, and our economic growth. Timely completion of the full program authorized in 1956 is essential to a National defense that will always depend, regardless of new weapon developments, on quick motor transportation of men and material from one site to another.' "The President considered as acceptable, the previous Administration's recommendation for an increase of the 4 cent Federal tax on gasoline to 4 1/2 cents a gallon."



## **FEDERAL GAS TAX REMAINS AT FOUR CENTS**

"I did not agree completely with all of the President's proposal, just as I did not fully agree with his predecessor's. The congress considered the President's proposal and arrived at what was felt to be a more equitable assessment of taxes."

"As you know, the tax on gasoline and diesel fuel remained at 4 cents a gallon."

"There were increases in the tax on tires and tubes and on trucks, but the planned transfer of automotive excise taxes into the Trust Fund was rescinded."

## **COMPLETION IN 72 STILL THE TARGET**

"...The Congress also went along completely with the President's proposals for authorizations for apportionments to the Interstate System so that now we have authorized funds for the completion of the Interstate System by 1972, which is quite near the goal set when we passed the 1956 Highway Act."

"The 1961 Act will increase the funds received into the Trust Fund by \$9.6 billion through 1972."

"This will produce a total of about \$52 billion to meet the Federal share of the Interstate System-now estimated at \$37 billion-and a stepped-up ABC program."

## **NO DIVERSION**

"...Someone once coined a definition of the wealthy Ford Foundation that goes like this: 'It is a large body of money surrounded by people who want some of it.'"

"I think there are a good many people who would apply that definition to the Highway Trust Fund."

## **AVOID CRITICISM**

"We in congress, have consistently taken the position that the Trust Fund was established to construct Interstate and ABC routes, and that any attempts to 'raid' the Trust Fund for other purposes should be resisted."

"...Criticism has been leveled at the Highway Program in several instances, because of excessive right-of-way costs and certain irregularities, and suspected graft."

"I am certain you recognize the importance of conducting the program in such a manner that the taxpayer will be satisfied that his money is not being wasted..."

**REP. GEORGE FALLON**, Md.-Chairman, House Subcommittee on Roads.

## **ON SCHEDULE**

"...I feel that the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 is an outstanding legislative accomplishment, in the enactment of which the cooperation of the state highway

officials played an important part. The 1961 Act corrects the major legislative deficiencies which stood in the path of the Interstate program. Congress has given the States the green light to go ahead, on schedule, and to complete this vital Interstate highway network."

"The 1961 Highway Act represents a large part of the highway legislative program which was sent to Congress last winter by President Kennedy. Some other parts of the President's program were deferred. No doubt these proposals will be renewed and will require careful consideration by the Congress."

## **HOUSING**

"The President urged Congress to amend the Federal highway law to require assurances that decent, safe and sanitary housing be made available for all families displaced by future Federal-aid highway projects at prices they can afford and in suitable locations. The subcommittee on Roads felt that a very careful study should precede the enactment of any legislation along these lines, including a sound estimate of the costs which might be charged to the State highway departments or to the Highway Trust Fund, or both. There is considerable sentiment in Congress in favor of aiding these distressed people, and I feel sure that the proposal will be renewed, in one form or another."

"The President also proposed that the financing of forest and public lands highways be transferred from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund, at a cost to the Trust Fund of approximately \$37.5 million per year. This was not a new proposal. It had been proposed earlier by the Eisenhower Administration. Again, it is a proposal with considerable backing among members of Congress."

"Still another proposal of the President would have transferred aviation fuel tax receipts, which now go into the Highway Trust Fund, into the general fund of the Treasury. In the current fiscal year, these receipts will amount to about \$22 million. This proposal falls within the jurisdiction of the House Ways and Means Committee, but is of obvious interest to the Subcommittee on Roads because it would reduce the amount of money available for highways."

## **REIMBURSEMENT FOR TOLL ROADS**

"In addition to those proposals of the President, we expect to have a number of other difficult highway legislative problems to consider."

"For five years now, we have been giving thought to the matter of settling Federal policy on reimbursing the States for toll roads and free roads built before the 90-10 Interstate matching formula became effective and later incorporated into the Interstate System. Federal policy is still unsettled. Meanwhile, we have begun to hear expressions of concern, some questioning the wisdom of building toll links into the Interstate System, and some fearing that the construction of certain free roads may cause financial difficulties for some existing toll roads. There is a variety of problems regarding toll roads, and they all seem to be perplexing."

## **URBAN PLANNING**

"I think that all of us are fully aware of the necessity for synchronizing urban highway construction with urban land-use planning and with the plans which are

being made to improve mass transit facilities in the larger metropolitan centers. At the same time, we know that our urban highway needs are urgent and increasing, and that the time element is a vital factor. We recognize the importance of comprehensive urban planning, but we cannot afford to let our urban highway programs bog down. Inasmuch as the Congress is becoming increasingly concerned with the problems of our cities, the urban situation is certain to be affected by Federal legislation. What form the legislation will take, and how it may affect the highway program, we cannot tell..."

The rest of the speech concerned the necessity for completing the Interstate for defense needs because of the troubled international situation.

**REP. GORDON H. SCHERRER**, Ohio, -Subcommittee on Roads.

### **MISJUDGED THE COST**

"...The 1956 Highway Act was a good piece of legislation but not that good. We- with your help- had completely missed the boat on total cost and a number of other things."

"True it is, we had handed you the ball but the cost differential we got back was a politically hot potato! The Republicans and Democrats tossed it around so long, hoping it would cool off, that the construction program came dangerously close to a grinding halt."

"Eisenhower did not want to see the program which he started in 1953 bog down and, therefore, recommended to the Congress additional financing which would complete construction on schedule. The Democratically-controlled congress balked. However, when Mr. Kennedy took over in January of this year, he was smart enough to see that the highway program had been opening up new frontiers in every nook and cranny of the United States ever since 1956. He was not going to let a new frontier disappear merely because it had a Republican label."

### **SCANDAL**

He reminded them of the speech he made in Atlantic City in 1956 where he warned them of the possibilities for corruption and scandal. He then recounted the statistics of the scandals uncovered by the Blatnik Committee and others:

"What I am trying to say is that some of these sharp practices and misuse of highway funds place in the hands of our opponents the most effective weapon for destroying the federal-state highway partnership."

### **CRITICAL OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

"...You all know that, as a Republican, I did not hesitate to lower the boom on the Eisenhower Administration when the White House Bragdon Committee started to scuttle the effectiveness of the Interstate system by deemphasizing it in metropolitan areas. That nonsense died a quiet death. Perhaps today if we turn just a little spot light on some of the political shenanigans that are taking place in the Department of Commerce, we can have another quiet funeral that will also benefit the highway program."

"...Politicians in the Department (of Commerce) are making decisions and reversing prior decisions in matters which are way over their heads as to all kinds of technical and engineering problems. Such decisions in the past have always been left to knowledgeable and experienced men who have national recognition in their field."

"...An example of this may be found in the National Transportation Policy study now under way by the Department. I understand that in August of this year, soon after the President directed the Secretary to develop such a policy for submission to the White House by November 1, a meeting was held by the Department to determine the scope and nature of the study and to receive suggestions and recommendations from persons representing the views of various modes of transportation. Fortunately, the American Association of State Highway Officials was invited to have a representative at this meeting."

"However, the Bureau of Public Roads was not invited and did not even know there was to be such a meeting. This is too obvious an oversight to ignore, for the Bureau has available more information on highway transportation than any other source..."

#### **THE BLATNIK COMMITTEE**

"...In 1959 a Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, chaired by the Congressman, John A. Blatnik, who is now the extremely capable chairman of the Highway Investigating Committee, held hearings on the selection of the location of the Interstate route through Reno. Although the subcommittee pointed out certain procedures which should be improved, it expressed complete confidence in the professional competence of both the officials of the Bureau of Public Roads and of the state highway department. The committee concluded that the location which had been selected was feasible and that its construction would not constitute a waste of federal monies."

#### **WHITE HOUSE INTERFERENCE**

"Shortly after becoming Secretary of Commerce and in response to the urging of the Congressman of the District, Secretary Hodges ordered the Bureau to rescind the approval of the route. Those who are familiar with this matter are convinced that this action by the Secretary was mostly politically-inspired for the detailed surveys, studies, and investigations made by the State of Nevada, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Congress over a period of several years were obviously disregarded."

"Although I cannot prove it at this time, I am reliably informed that the White House is ready to add some 150 miles to the interstate system in West Virginia. This 150 miles would come from the small reserve mileage being held back for making vitally needed adjustments in the lengths of approved routes in the various states as projects are advanced to construction. Of all places where this valuable mileage is not needed is the State of West Virginia."

"...I hope that some of the unpleasant things that I have talked about here today may be corrected before this Association meets in 1962 so that, if you ask me to speak again, I will not want to dig down into my files and give you other examples of questionable practices in such places as Massachusetts..."

## **HOUSE HEARINGS ON THE 1962 HIGHWAY ACT**

The hearings were held by the House Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works during April and May 1962. The Chairman was **GEORGE FALLON** of Maryland.

The Chairman opened by announcing the purpose of the hearings was to take information on 3 bills, H.R.9725, H.R. 11199 and H.R. 9848. All three bills were to authorize highway funds for FY 64 and 65. 9725 and 9848 were very short and dealt only with authorizations. H.R. 11199 dealt with authorizations and two other sections, "Assistance For Displaced Families And Businesses" and "Transportation Planning In Metropolitan Areas."

**REX M. WHITTON**, Administrator, BPR

Mr. Whitton made it clear that 11199 was the Administration bill. He explained the authorization requests and:

### **TESTIFYING FOR THE ADMINISTRATION**

"I will turn now to the specific recommendations of the President for amendments to the Federal-aid highway legislation made in his recent and timely message on transportation, a subject vital to the interests of the entire country."

### **RELOCATION ASSISTANCE**

He first described the President's request for relocation assistance in the highway program that would provide the same benefits as then available in the urban renewal program.

"In his message on transportation, the President also recommended 'that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to permit more extensive use of Federal-aid secondary funds for extensions of the secondary system in urban areas.'"

### **COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

"Another of the President's recommendations relates directly to highway projects in metropolitan areas."

"A major objective of national transportation policy in the use of Federal assistance programs is to encourage and facilitate the development by States and local communities of balanced transportation systems consistent with long-range comprehensive development plans."

"Enactment of this provision is believed timely in view of the increased emphasis being given to long-range planning and programming by the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments in connection with expenditures of Federal-aid highway funds. It would require the States and their metropolitan areas to adopt a process of planning already demonstrated by trial to be feasible and effective. The experience of the Bureau of Public Roads in the highway transportation field could be utilized to the advantage of all levels of government concerned."

## **CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS**

"Moreover, the proposed requirement would place the Federal-aid highway program in a position with respect to planning comparable to the urban transportation program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA), and thus strengthen the coordinated approach to urban transportation development already informally established by the two agencies."

"The president has referred in his transportation message to...the use of funds...that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to increase the percentage of Federal funds available to the States for research and planning."

The proposal would require that all of the 1 1/2 percent funds (1 1/2 percent of the State's apportionment of highway funds) would have to be used for planning or research or they would lapse. An additional 1/2 of one percent would be made available at the States option for planning and research.(Prior to the 1962 Highway Act, the States could use the 1 1/2% money for either construction or planning and research.)

He then gave a very detailed progress report on the highway program with emphasis on the Interstate program.

**J. C. WOMACK**, Cal., President of AASHO

## **RAIL TRANSIT**

Mr. Womack said that AASHO supported H.R.9725 which was the bill that simply reauthorized the program with no amendments. In support of that he introduced the AASHO policy statement developed at the Denver meeting in Oct., 1961. He also introduced the 1962 AASHO policy statement having to do with the proper role of highways in national transportation policy. It was a very lengthy statement but the key section was named "Urban transportation." It dealt with what AASHO felt were misguided efforts to deal with metropolitan-wide transportation problems by building central city-oriented rail transit systems: "Any effort to stifle a form of transportation in order to preserve the central business district of a major urban area as the major retailing and service dispensing area of the region should be carefully weighed as to its ultimate effect on the overall economy and as to whether or not it is actually in the public interest. It may be that the modern function of the central business district is to undergo some change with retailing and services being adapted to a form of transportation desired by the public." The complete statement has been abstracted elsewhere. Mr. Womack said: "It was developed and presented to counteract some misinformation regarding highways and other forms of transportation."

He defended against allegations of scandal in the highway program and:

"We are quite concerned about the attitude in many quarters that the program is or should become a Federal program."

## **AGAINST RELOCATION ASSISTANCE**

He said that sensational journalism generated by very few events had unnecessarily caused adverse public reactions and had caused unnecessary

investigations, increases in regulations and red tape. He testified against the Administration bill provision of Assistance to Displaced Families: "We believe that it would be the means of introducing controversy, delay, and political pressures into the program to the point that it could effectively stop the highway program in certain areas." The AASHO position was that, if right-of-way acquisition took place sufficiently in advance of construction and owners received a fair price for their land and they were given plenty of time to relocate, there would be no problem.

### **AGAINST MANDATORY URBAN PLANNING**

He also testified against the Administration provision that would require that: "...The Secretary shall...make a finding that such projects are consistent with adequate comprehensive development plans for the metropolitan areas..." Mr. Womack said: "Before such planning is made mandatory, we would suggest that we give our presently launched program time enough for tryout to determine if the cooperative approach with all of the agencies and levels of Government involved give satisfactory results, and not result in a controversial impasse...The wording in the bill leaves the decision as to whether a highway project properly fits into a comprehensive and balanced transportation plan to the Secretary of Commerce, but in communities where a considerable difference of opinion exists as to what constitutes a balanced transportation system, or where there is pressure to make additional expenditures on a highway project to enhance certain other community developments, longtime delays could be inevitable, for agreeing upon a plan would be almost impossible...highway transportation is the only mode of transportation that will be involved in a transportation plan in the majority of our cities, and we predict that if transportation planning is made a prerequisite for approving a Federal-aid highway project in an urban area, it will stop the highway program in our larger metropolitan areas."

### **CLARENCE D. MARTIN, Under Secretary of Commerce**

Mr. Martin referred to the President's message on transportation: "We believe it is the most comprehensive transportation planning and action program ever proposed by a President to the Congress and the people."

### **A PATCHWORK APPROACH**

"One of the reasons our national transportation system is burdened with pressing problems is the patchwork way all levels of government have administered, promoted, and regulated the various modes and facilities over a long period of years."

"More than a year ago, President Kennedy recommended that the Congress adopt a method of assisting families and businesses forced to move because of the Federal-aid highway program...You gentlemen are aware that the principle of relocation assistance is firmly established in the urban renewal program. In addition, the administration is proposing similar assistance be included in a Federal-aid program to help cities solve their mass transportation problems...A highway project is not an isolated Federal-aid activity. It is closely interrelated with the whole economic and social fabric of our communities. Equality of treatment at the hands of the Federal Government demands that assistance to displaced persons and families be incorporated in the Federal-aid highway program now."

## **PRESIDENT KENNEDY**

"President Kennedy, in the portion of his transportation message dealing with urban problems, said this: 'To conserve and enhance values in existing urban areas is essential. But at least as important are steps to promote economic efficiency and livability in areas of future development. Our national welfare, therefore, requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth.'"

"It is to answer this challenge of our growing urban centers and expanding economy that the administration proposes a new section providing for transportation planning in metropolitan areas...We have found that the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments have a wealth of talent and experience in metropolitan transportation planning."

"We believe that it is necessary to contribute this talent and experience so that a cooperative and coordinated program can be most beneficial to our expanding metropolitan areas. In this way, we can be assured that the full benefits of an already proven program will be considered in striving for balanced transportation systems in our cities."

He also noted that the administration bill would increase the 1 1/2 percent funds to 2 percent and require that they be matched and they must be used for planning and research, instead of the existing option of using them for construction. The primary reason for this was to provide the necessary funds for the comprehensive urban planning requirement.

## **BEN WEST**, Mayor of Nashville, Testifying for the American Municipal Assn.

He favored the increase in 1 1/2 percent funds: "...A good master transportation plan for any community will include all of the best features of every mode, each in its proper place, and each with differentiating functions and services. To do this requires funds. Urban transportation studies do not come cheap..."

"H.R. 11199 requires the Secretary of Commerce...to determine that...projects in metropolitan areas are part of a comprehensive development plan or be based on the results of a continuing planning process before approving those projects. That portion of the proposal requiring that a continuing planning process be established seems reasonable and not overly restrictive and is supported by our association. That portion requiring that the projects are part of a comprehensive development plan does seem to be unreasonable. Unreasonable in that a comprehensive plan for an area can only be a general guide for development of the area. Even then the plan is not static but needs continual revision as a part of the planning process. We recommend that this requirement be deleted from the bill." Congressman Baldwin handed him a copy of the bill and asked him to edit out the words that he disagreed with.

Mayor West supported the other features of the administration bill and also advocated the establishment of a Federal-aid Urban System, or at least the Congress should commission a study on the subject and a report within a specified period of time.



The National Association of Counties also appeared and supported the comprehensive planning requirement.

## **SENATE HEARINGS ON THE 1962 HIGHWAY ACT**

The Senate Hearings were on August 7 and 8, 1962 and were on S.3136 and H.R. 12135. They were conducted by the Subcommittee on Roads under the Chairmanship of Senator Pat McNamara of Michigan. The parent Committee was Public Works. The Chairman noted that H.R. 12135 had passed the House on July 19, 1962.

**REX WHITTON**, Administrator, BPR, accompanied by F.C. TURNER, submitted a long statement for the record in support of the Administration bill. It was essentially the same statement he gave the House Subcommittee.

**SENATOR RANDOLPH**: "...I believe, Mr. Whitton, it would be appropriate at this time for you to indicate the Bureau of Public Roads position in reference to the action or contemplated action on the elimination or the delay of three important highway projects in the District of Columbia."

The Senator indicated that he had read an editorial in the Washington Star the evening before:

"...It relates to the delay of three important District highway projects. The editor wrote that although we are awaiting the so-called (National Transportation Agency) mass transportation report in November, he (the Editor) questioned the delay of necessary planning and construction of highways that are vital to the movement of traffic here in the Nation's Capital, movement not only of the people that live in the area, but of the tourists and of the increasing numbers of trucks coming into this area."

**MR. WHITTON**: "Well, the program is being delayed, let me say it that way. The money is available, and I certainly would like to see them go ahead with it...I don't think anybody ever built any road in any city in the United States where there were no objections to it...There are objections to the inner loop and they are being heard, they are talking and you hear them."

**SENATOR KERR**: "Isn't that an area that has some very considerable historic significance in addition to the actual economic values of the property?...Isn't a great part of that effort being made by people who feel that additional consideration should be given to providing the transportation artery at a place where doing so would not cause as much damage to buildings and environments of what is regarded to be of great historical significance?"

**WHITTON**: "Yes, sir."

**SENATOR KERR**: "...I think we have probably one of the most efficient departments of Government represented in the Bureau of Public Roads, and certainly their job is to get on with the business and do it as economically as possible and as efficiently as possible."

"As far as I know, there is nothing in the law that charges them with the responsibility in connection with the preservation of historic environments. But I

can well understand how people with those concepts might feel a great urge to impress upon the ones making the decisions, that decisions should not be made that would hold too lightly or disregard the effects of the proposed arteries on these areas in the Nation's Capital."

**JOHN MACKIE**, Mich. for AASHO

He entered a long statement for the record that in essence said that AASHO had polled its constituency and that AASHO could live with the House bill as passed. They objected to the additional 1/2 percent planning funds being mandatory but could live with it being at the State's option. They could live with the urban planning requirement with the House amendment restricting it to a planning process rather than an agreed upon comprehensive plan.

**SENATOR CASE**, New Jersey

Senator Case entered a long statement in the record in support of the administration and its initiatives in mass transit aid, urban renewal, housing and comprehensive planning. His appeal was for the restoration of the President's original wording in the section on comprehensive urban transportation planning which would require agreement on a comprehensive plan rather than the existence of an on-going process. He felt that the revised House wording was not strong enough to insure that adequate mass transit planning would be accomplished before highway projects were approved.

**MRS. JOHN F. SNYDER**, Federation of Citizens' Assns., Wash.D.C.

"...I have come to support S. 2928 and to suggest an additional clause which we feel is important to the solution of the people-space- highway problem to which this bill is addressed."

"We feel that it is imperative that Federal highway laws be brought up to date through the provisions of this bill for assuming responsibility for the relocation of persons displaced by highway construction. In our opinion this bill will have the effect of giving greater consideration to the location of interstate highways in nonresidential areas, which is in accord with our policies. We also feel that we have a collective responsibility for businesses displaced by the highway system, and for the record, we urge that provision for relocation aid be extended to businesses during the process of amending these laws."

"...If the object of this bill is to keep the highway program moving, while at the same attending to the needs of those to be displaced, then it should provide for dealing with duly constituted authorities representing the several jurisdictions in metropolitan areas such as Washington, instead of being geared to deal only with individual States for those relocated within the same jurisdiction from which they are displaced."

"Since Federal aid to highways has from its inception been an incentive program designed to achieve maximum coordination among the States, extension of its coordinating power into the tense jurisdictional stalemates of metro areas would be thoroughly in keeping with traditional objectives."

"You gentlemen are familiar with the major factors in the District of Columbia citizen versus highway controversy which has consumed so much yardage in the

press and so much time in congressional hearings. The loose housing and welfare policies of Washington administrations, as opposed to the tight policies of surrounding jurisdictions have resulted in a concentration of indigent and semi-indigent families in the Federal City all out of proportion; so that in the growing metro area of which it is the center, we have virtually all the public housing in the area."

"How do you meet the demand for more highways, displacing more people, who require more public housing on less space, with a dwindling tax base? The citizens who have chosen to stay and fight for the survival of this city have reacted, singly and collectively, to this pressure as we are prone to do when we find ourselves backed into a corner. The reaction ranges in intensity but it is clear that much of the opposition is based upon the universal conviction that the District of Columbia can no longer play the role of the goose that lays the golden egg for suburbia."

### **Excerpts From the April 1962 Issue of American Highways.**

**ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG**, President, Better Highways Information Foundation.

Mr. Armstrong was Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads during the Eisenhower Administration. This speech was an address to the Association of Highway Officials of North Atlantic States on March 22, 1962.

"...Providing highways is one of the largest operations of Government. If we are to bring to fruition the plans for a greater America that we have under way, it must be with the understanding and support of the individual citizen. Whether we like it or not, individual John Q. Public in our democracy is the one who determines the program that can be accomplished. He is the judge. And he judges on the basis of his understanding."

### **BAD PRESS IS DAMAGING THE PROGRAM**

"...It is a fact that the program is being, with a very few exceptions, competently, honestly, and effectively administered and accomplished. Controls built into the program at the state level and the Federal level have kept wrongdoings to a minimum. There have been some few mistakes, wrongdoings, and errors of judgement; perfection in the world of man is still a goal rather than an actuality...Even the two year probings of Congressional investigators have failed to uncover anything of any consequence that is new...Unfortunately these investigations often appear not to be entirely objective, and equally unfortunately have been conducted by investigators not familiar with, or trained in the complexities of modern highway problems..."

### **THE GREAT HIGHWAY ROBBERY**

"These facts seem to be overlooked or discounted in some of the recent vicious, unfair attacks on the highway program. Some of these are doing great harm and point out the need to greater effort to keep the program and its problems in true perspective. The recent article in Parade magazine with which I'm sure you are familiar, is one example of the problems you face..."

"The article makes a number of rather wild, sweeping statements such as '...a monstrous spider, called corruption, is devouring tax dollars by the millions...' and '...new highways are paved with waste, inefficiency, and boondoggling.' These

statements are distortions that are just not so! The article offers as 'proof' a score of cases that I will discuss. The great disservice, injustice, and danger in the article is the innuendo and implication, the frequent use of 'for example' when there may have been no other example known, and the clever writing to create the impression of a 'Great Highway Robbery'".

"Careful review of the article's allegations, including checking by the States and the Bureau of Public Roads and with the Blatnik Committee and the industry, developed the following analysis which shows how far the article deviated from fairness and objectivity in its story. Probably because of misunderstanding and lack of research, and by reliance on 'back-fence' gossip, it fails to present the whole story and widely distorts actualities. Part of the allegations are true; but take a look at these allegations as compared with the facts."

Mr. Armstrong presented 15 allegations and stated the facts surrounding each case. There was an element of truth in each allegation but the presentations were distorted and sensationalized.

## **U.S. WARNS ON ROAD SURVEYS**

Chicago's American-May 13,1962

Cities and states that fail to make planning surveys will not receive federal expressway system funds.. Rex M. Whitton...sounded the warning at a press conference following a 2-day meeting with 250 state, county and municipal officials from thruout the midwest.

Whitton said that when and if the President's pending transportation program bill is passed by Congress, work will be pushed on the network from coast to coast...

"The measure provides that if cities, states and counties do not have their plans completed by July, 1965, they will not share in the federal funds."..

## **WHY NOT TRIM TRANSPORT NEEDS**

Boston Globe-May 2, 1962

ATLANTIC CITY-Are urban planners paying too much attention to expansion of transportation facilities and not enough on ways to reduce these needs?

This possibility was advanced before the American Society of Planning Officials convention yesterday by Tracy B. Augur, assistant commissioner for urban planning and community development, Urban Renewal Administration.

...On the same panel, D. Grant Mickle, deputy Federal highway administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, said that by July, 1965, in aid programs, the department will insist that road plans are consistent with comprehensive development plans for a metropolitan area.

Augur said two ways of meeting increasing transportation demands are to increase facilities for handling them or to reduce or stabilize the demand.

"The latter is apt to prove much less costly than the former"

He said he didn't think it should be assumed that increasing demands on city transportation systems are inevitable and that, therefore, widened pavements, new arterials, express highways, rail rapid transit and yet unknown devices will be needed to permit the continued functioning of urban areas.

"Modern urban aggregations, cannot get along without well planned transportation systems, but they can have better and more economical systems if the patterns of urban settlement and the facilities to serve them are worked out in concert."

## **AAA ON 'BELTLINES'**

New Hampshire Sunday News-June 24, 1962

The venerable AAA, now in its 60th year...has joined battle publicly with forces endeavoring to restrict U.S. citizens in their right to operate private automobiles...

AAA centers its fire on groups and individuals seeking on one or another pretext to exclude the private automobile from "metropolitan areas." AAA does not identify these people by name but they include figures high up in the Kennedy administration as well as certain influential members of Congress.

These enemies of the motor car hope to curtail its use through the diversion of public funds from road building to the subsidization of various crack-brained schemes for the restoration of "mass transit."

Under this heading they propound everything from trolley-cars to the elevated monorail as cures for urban "traffic congestion."

In a hard-hitting broadside backed up by its member clubs over the country, AAA quickly explodes the idea that city congestion originated with the automobile: "Congestion and over-crowding have been urban problems since the dawn of history. The root cause of today's congestion is not the automobile, but the failure over a long period of years to provide adequate street and highway facilities".

...No urban freeway system can be considered complete, AAA warns, until coupled with an "inner belt" system of "routes leading into and through downtown," plus, of course, "ample downtown parking facilities."...

### **Excerpts From the July 1962 Issue of American Highways.**

**A. E. JOHNSON**, Executive Secretary, AASHO on Urban Planning

The title of the speech was 'Urbanization, the Automobile and You'. It was given to the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments and to the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States in March, 1962.

## **HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS MUST PAY ATTENTION TO URBAN PROBLEMS**

"...You may say that you have no urban problems because you have no large metropolitan areas in your State. But, let me assure you that you have an urbanization problem for it is relative and all cities are experiencing similar problems, irregardless of size."

"An essential part of the opportunities, challenges, and responsibilities of the State highway departments at the present time and in the future lie in our urban areas. If we fail, someone else will take over our urban activities."

"It behooves every State highway department to constantly evaluate what constitutes a balanced urban-rural program and make an equitable division of available funds to care for the needs of both areas. All systems of roads are needed to keep our economy strong. Eventually a more equitable representation in State legislatures will occur and the rural domination will be adjusted, which will influence the future activities of State highway departments."

He gave statistics and background to illustrate the dynamics of the urbanization of the country and saw no sign of slackening.

### **THE 56 ACT MADE THE URBAN PROGRAM POSSIBLE**

"It was...the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, together with the establishment of the Highway Trust Fund that really caused urban highway problems to come to life as we know them today, because the means were furnished to actually start work on highways to alleviate critical urban congestion."

"This Act gave the State highway departments, through the Bureau of Public Roads, the legal responsibility of carrying out the program, both in rural and urban areas. It was a proper assignment, and it was based on a solid record of accomplishment of the Bureau of Public Roads and the state highway departments over a period of 45 years."

"Almost immediately we started having problems, criticisms and challenges. Without doubt some of this was encouraged by some shortcomings on the part of the State highway departments, but a large part of the difficulties can be charged to the fact that the program was big and glamorous and a lot of money was involved. It brought forth challenges from competitive forms of transportation and from agencies, officials and individuals wanting to get into the act, because of its size and importance. Many who had never shown any interest in the highway program previously, immediately displayed an intense interest in its handling."

### **THE HARTFORD CONFERENCE**

"...The Hartford Conference, held in Connecticut, was where we first heard a serious proposal that the highway program in urban areas be delayed to permit city planners to initiate and finish planning."

### **SAGAMORE**

"The Sagamore Conference in New York was held to spell out guide lines for area-wide and cooperative planning of highway facilities and urban development. I had the privilege of serving as General Chairman of that conference."

"Next we heard serious proposals that the urban sections of the Interstate program be eliminated." (This was probably a reference to the recommendations of the Bragdon Committee in the White House.)

### **CRITICISM INCREASES**

"Charges were made that highway planners were incompetent to locate and design facilities in urban areas, although the State highway departments have had the main responsibility in planning and designing practically all urban freeways to date."

### **WOODS HOLE**

"The Woods Hole Conference held in Massachusetts was where we first heard the theory that in order to conserve our resources and to hold transportation costs to a minimum, our transportation system should be planned and integrated with a national policy dictating what mode of transportation should be used for the movement of people and goods and to avoid a duplication of facilities or competition between modes."

"We heard charges that suburbs have created 'urban sprawl' which is alleged to be very undesirable and wasteful and has caused far too much private automobile travel."

### **CRITICIZED BY ARCHITECTS AND URBAN PLANNERS**

"...We heard charges that the suburbs are making it difficult to establish rail transit facilities."

"We heard critical comments by many planners as to the activities of the State highway departments, but these planners themselves do not seem to agree as to how to plan the spatial form of the city or what the future land uses, especially in the outer fringe areas, are likely to be. Sometimes they fail to make much contribution to the highway planner in studying his problem. Transportation plans must be practical, feasible, justified and within financial possibility. Some planners proposals do not qualify as to the latter requirement."

"Certain architects have been very critical of the State highway departments, but they in themselves are very unlikely to agree as to what is the proper aesthetic treatment to be given highways and their criticisms have been rather vague and not constructive."

"...Certain rail transit promoters have put out propaganda as to the relative capacities of the urban freeway vs. the rail transit facility, which is entirely erroneous and downright misleading. Recently, one so-called authority stated that it required 21 lanes of freeway, completely filled with automobiles bumper to bumper, and loaded to capacity, to carry as many people as one rail of transit..."

"We are not in competition with rail transit and we don't believe that they should be with us, but, it is downright interesting to see some of the artists' depictions that are distributed as part of the rail transit promotion scheme along with some of the artists' drawings of monorail facilities, where the track is a very aesthetic, graceful and dainty thing, all of which is as misleading as the figures they quote."

"Charges have been made that people in the modern city are forced to own automobiles against their will, because of the spatial form of the city and because of the lack of suitable public transportation."

"In certain public hearings, we have seen incited emotional opposition to our proposed projects from neighborhood associations, college alumnae, and others who have not really checked into the need for the facility nor the reasons for its proposal, but who have followed a critical leader."

"We are certain that lip service has been paid to rail transit, not because of support for rail transit but for the purpose of delaying highway improvements for other reasons."

### **THE WASHINGTON D.C. HIGHWAY CONTROVERSY**

"We have seen the Congress of the United States pass legislation establishing a moratorium for 5 years for the construction of an important part of the Interstate System in Washington, D.C., in order to give another form of transportation a chance."

"Although a number from that agency have been friendly and cooperative, we have heard a top housing official state resentment toward the State highway departments because of the legal authority that they have over Federal-aid highways in urban areas."

### **THE RISING TIDE OF CRITICISM**

"We have heard a top housing official be very critical of the State highway departments activities in cities, alleging they are engrossed only in locating the highway along the cheapest line without thought to other factors."

"It has been rumored that certain people have pressed for Highway Trust Funds to be apportioned directly to cities, not necessarily for highways, but for transportation purposes, and that they be administered through a proposed Department of Urban Affairs. Federal Housing Administrator Weaver has, however, put the housing agency on record as not having designs on the Highway Trust Fund."

"We have heard a prominent National Capitol planner state that he would be happy if there were never another foot of highway built in the District of Columbia and if there were never another automobile sold there."

"We have heard city planners propose rigid housing control and zoning to force a spatial form of a city that would lend itself to rail transportation."

"We have seen official proposals for artificial barriers against the use of private automobiles in downtown areas."

"We have heard transit people press for delays in the Highway program to give proposed rail facilities a chance."

### **THE CITY AND THE AUTOMOBILE**

"It is evident that improved highways are needed now for the movement of people, goods, and services and if rail facilities are indicated, they should be planned and constructed with the highway program if at all possible, but needed highways should not be delayed for such ridiculous reasons."



"We have heard it charged that the State highway departments do nothing to help displaced tenants in the metropolitan areas and that the highway program is destroying taxable property and making people homeless."

"We have heard anti-highway charges that evolved in the large metropolitan areas as part of the rail transit propaganda, used to hinder the development of the highway program, in cities the size that are unlikely to have the need for rail transit facilities in the foreseeable future, if ever, and where adequate highways offer the only solution. I refer to such claims that 'the automobile and the city can never live together,' and that 'urban freeways create far more problems than they solve.'"

"We have heard the statement that too much of the consumer dollar is going for private automobile transportation."

"We have heard an outstanding urban leader say that in the not too distant future it may be necessary to curb private automobile ownership to make people save their money."

He gave extensive statistics on automobile ownership and use.

#### **THE HIGHWAY ENGINEER'S IMAGE**

"The result has been the development of a rather prevalent and unfavorable set of 'images' particularly in the urban areas. An all too prevalent 'image' of a highway official is a crude, single purpose individual with no sense of values of aesthetics, with a total disregard of public opinion, incompetent to work in urban areas, who shows a blood passion for wanting to displace people and who wins his argument, as to project location, by putting a bulldozer out in front of him and clearing the line for the new highway against all opposition."

#### **THE FREEWAY IMAGE**

"The 'image' being given the urban freeway is an expensive and unneeded facility, strangling the life out of the city, creating ugly slashes in the urban area, destroying taxable property, making people homeless, creating more problems than it solves, and a malignancy of concrete and asphalt that is consuming the entire area."

#### **THE AUTOMOBILE IMAGE**

"The 'image' of the automobile is that of a monster that takes too much of the people's money; that is holding up the establishment of a better and cheaper form of transportation; that is responsible for urban sprawl; that is an inefficient contraption wasting our resources; that is creating intolerable congestion, and is poisoning our air."

"Our big challenge at this time is to recreate these 'images' in their proper perspective, and it is indeed a challenging necessity."

"What have the State highway departments done about it?"

"Thirty nine of them have established some form of urban unit in their organization..."

### **WHAT HAS TO BE DONE**

"After the Sagamore Conference, a special committee of AASHO planned and staged four regional seminars for the purpose of acquainting highway planners and city planners with the abilities of each and how they could work together in aiding each other in their work, and especially how the city planner can be of assistance to the highway official in carrying out his assignment to construct urban highways."

"It has been the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads, who have been responsible for the development of most of the scientific techniques in urban transportation planning."

"It has been the State highway departments that have been responsible for initiating and conducting, to date, most of the urban transportation planning that has been undertaken."

"It has been the State highway departments that have developed urban freeway design standards."

"AASHO created a joint committee with the American Municipal Association, which has been very successful and constructive."

"AASHO has established a permanent committee on Urban Transportation Planning."

"At the 1961 Annual Meeting in Denver, Colorado, AASHO took an unprecedented step in developing and adopting a Transportation Policy Statement, spelling out the importance of highways and automotive transportation in our economy and their proper role in any National Transportation Policy that might be developed."

### **WHAT SHOULD BE DONE**

He spelled out the elements of the policy which were based on the concept that urban highways are an extension of the statewide highway system and that they must be planned accordingly. The policy went on to state that urban highways must be cooperatively planned with urban development and:

"That if the modern suburb or urban automobile traffic becomes objectionable to the average citizen, natural phenomena will correct the problem, and changes would not be forced to match some pet theories, or to accommodate the profit incentive desires of a few."

"It is our honest belief that if the average person knows the whole story that they will agree with our position."

"...Very shortly a series of regional conferences will be held to explain the necessity for such a program (of transportation studies); to explain how the planning activity can be organized, how the various committees are set up, how

to utilize the capabilities and abilities of the City Engineer, the City Planner, housing Officials, the City Traffic engineer, and the City Administrator, as well as the technical personnel, housing and administrative personnel of the County and other levels of Government involved in the program."

"It is important that this program be successful in an America where urbanization is increasing, and where we must know more about the effects of transportation on the city and the interaction between transportation, land use, and urban economics."

"...We are fortunate in that we still have the opportunity to handle this urban problem, and before a federal directive appears requiring such planning as a prerequisite for approval of any federal-aid highway project in an urban area." (The 1962 Highway Act requiring such planning was passed later that fall.)

"...We must demonstrate our exceptional interest and competency in the field of urban highway planning, even to the point of maybe 'going a little overboard' or stand the chance of losing the urban part of the program."

"I am certain that the State highway departments are anxious and ready to cooperate with anyone who can contribute constructively to planning highways in urban areas, but they will resist giving up their authority to any other group or agency or let anyone else, not presently authorized, have the veto or approval authority over their operations."

## **WASHINGTON OBSERVER**

Engineering News Record-Sept. 13, 1962

Federal-aid highway construction is not keeping pace with projected goals.

In a strongly worded letter to state highway officials, BPR Administrator Rex M. Whitton urges "all possible measures" to put the road program into "high gear". Otherwise, he warns, the public may demand a "change in the legislation that for many years has maintained the cooperative federal - state highway improvement process". This is a thinly guarded way of saying the federal government may have to assume a stronger role.

The number of highway - contracts awarded in the first half of this year was 8% lower than the comparable period of 1961...The first-half 1962 rate of completion on the Interstate system was 4.6 miles a day.

At this rate, says Rex Whitton, the Interstate program won't be completed until 1981, missing the 1973 goal by eight years. Between now and 1973, he warns, the completion rate must be stepped up to 7.8 miles a day. This is a full 70% faster than the progress rate of the past 12 months. Congress appears unlikely to act on President Kennedy's three-year, \$500 million mass transit program this year, though the Administration hasn't given up hope of such action completely. The measure has cleared committees in both houses, winning comfortable bipartisan support. The Senate Democratic Policy Committee has cleared it for debate in that chamber-without setting a date.

The real rub, however, is in the House. The House Rules Committee which determines which bills reach the House floor and when, hasn't considered the measure at all. The Senate isn't likely to act unless there is a major breakup of the existing logjam in higher priority bills...

### **MASS TRANSIT AID DEAD?**

New York Times, Sept. 28, 1962

"Senate Shelves Transit Aid Bill." "2.6 Billion Allotted in States' Road Aid." These were two recent headlines on news dispatches from Washington that betray the Government's one-sided interest in highway construction for the automobile, to the almost total exclusion of any assistance to the financially stricken railroads.

The \$500,000,000 Kennedy program for helping metropolitan areas solve their problems of traffic congestion by improvement and expansion of mass transportation facilities is apparently dead.

There is no legitimate quarrel with large expenditure of funds for the Interstate highway program, mainly financed by user taxes, or with much other road construction. No one doubts that the automobile is here to stay. Our cities are trying to live with it, and make room for it. But it is a losing battle.

There can be no satisfactory future for New York, for instance, that does not make the subway, the commuter railroad, the bus the principal reliance of people on the move. If the general good requires, as it does, the survival of the railroads and their improvement-especially in respect to commuter services-then Government cannot remain aloof from the rail problem while enthusiastically accepting highway construction for the automobile as a prime and legitimate responsibility...

### **MOSES FEARS TRANSIT MAY DELAY HIGHWAYS**

The Evening Star-Sept. 26, 1962

It is against the public interest to delay highway construction in the Washington area for a "highly problematic" rapid transit system, transportation veteran Robert Moses said last night.

Acceptance and financing for rapid transit is doubtful because in a city the size of Washington the initial cost is too great, he said. Subsidies are hard to come by and no fare structure can be visualized that will pay for the system, he added...

...In reference to recent congressional postponements of several District highway projects, Mr. Moses said:

"It is not in the public interest to delay this program on the theory that an as yet undisclosed and undetermined rapid transit system will make such highway arterials unnecessary or materially alter the proposed network."...

..."There are locations where rapid transit can be combined with vehicular lanes with the same right-of-way, but not many. No doubt commuter subsidies of some kind are inevitable, but they should depend on superior rail service after the

relative roles of the train, bus, car and aircraft have been determined by experts concerned only with the truth."...

**Excerpts From the October 1962 Issue of American Highways.  
THE 1962 HIGHWAY ACT-An Editorial.**

The 62 Act approved October 23, 1962, had several milestone developments. Section 5 provided payments for displaced families and businesses and required that the State give assurances that assistance will be provided for displaced persons and businesses as a condition of project approval for right-of-way acquisition.

**THE 3C PLANNING PROCESS**

Section 134, "Transportation Planning in Certain Urban Areas" was as follows:

"It is declared to be in the national interest to encourage and promote the development of transportation systems, embracing various modes of transport in a manner that will serve the States and local communities efficiently and effectively. To accomplish this objective the Secretary shall cooperate with the States, as authorized in this title, in the development of long-range highway plans and programs which are properly coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation and which are formulated with due consideration to their probable effect on the future development of urban areas of more than fifty thousand population. After July 1, 1965, the Secretary shall not approve under section 105 of this title any program for projects in any urban area of more than fifty thousand population unless he finds that such projects are based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by States and local communities in conformance with the objectives stated in this section."

Section 11, "Highway Planning and Research Funds", made the use of the "1 1/2 %" funds mandatory for planning and research instead of optional. In the past, those funds could be used for construction projects if the State so elected.

**JAMES S. BURCH, N.C., "Cooperative Urban Highway-Street Planning"**

Mr. Burch reported on the rather unique urban planning program in North Carolina:

"...Since 1957, when Mr. W. F. Babcock became Director, great strides have been made in this important field. Among these have been the creation of the Planning Board, the Advance Planning Department, and the enactment of the statute in 1959 which requires in effect that:

'Each municipality shall, with the cooperation of the State Highway Commission, develop a comprehensive plan for a street system that will serve present and anticipated volumes of traffic in and around the municipality. The plan shall be based on-population growth, economic conditions and prospects, and patterns of land development. The State Highway Commission may provide financial and technical assistance in the preparation of such plans.'

'After completion-the plan may be adopted by both the municipality and the State Highway Commission as the basis for future street and highway improvements in and around the municipality-based on agreement of the parties-no change to be made effective until it is adopted by both the Commission and the municipality."

He described the successful operation of the process for the five preceding years:

"Thus, great progress has been made toward the goals, which are briefly as follows:

1. Start with facts. Complete, unbiased, objective facts-related, and analyzed; in such fields as growth of population (in small segments); land use; traffic generation, traffic assignment, and street capacity; using Traffic Engineering principles based on research.
2. Vision to break through the unknown future with the best predictions which logic, experience, judgement and research will permit. To locate the future population, to anticipate its traffic needs by volume, direction, and time. Difficult and inexact? Yes, but definitely necessary.
3. Employ the technical abilities and disciplines of Engineers skilled and experienced in all applicable fields, Traffic, Construction, Water, Sewer, Power-and the overall vision of the Planner. It is our belief that bringing these viewpoints and abilities together portends the best approach to the projections of understanding of future need.
4. For the state, and for each community, to develop an overall plan to provide for an ultimate, permanently protected, adequate, coordinated, and connected network of highways and streets in 1980.
5. To follow the plan, in order that we may (a) guide all street-highway improvements, and (b) aid private and corporate development and re-development of land as related to transport.
6. To acquire and preserve necessary space now, and until needed.
7. To outline a continuing financial program to support progressive implementation toward the agreed goals.
8. To review completed plans at about five year intervals, to check on original forecasts and then anticipated land developments and traffic assignments; and to jointly revise the plans in the light of the new knowledge."

"That the procedure has been complex, difficult and taxing is readily admitted. It has involved problems and questions so difficult as to be almost imponderable. Mutual agreement has often required much negotiation, discussion and joint effort. However, all worth-while objectives are difficult of attainment, usually varying in complexity with their importance. Problems deferred from year to year in the past have been attacked, and best apparent solutions have been found and agreed to. Real progress has been made, and the effort is being continued at even a faster rate. We are confident that future appraisal will show the present work to have been eminently worthwhile."

## **INTERSTATE ROADS-LAGGING OR NOT?**

Engineering News Record- Nov. 20, 1962

At the annual convention of the American Association of State Highway Officials in Miami Beach next week, Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton and

other Bureau of Public Roads officials will urge the states to step up their efforts to complete the \$41-billion Interstate system on time.

Last September, Mr. Whitton said:

"During the 12 months ending June 30, 1,675 miles of the Interstate system were completed to full standards. At that rate, we were completing 4.6 miles a day. But if we continue at that rate, the system won't be completed until 1981".

"We cannot afford that leisurely pace...Between now and 1973, we must sustain a completion rate of 7.8 miles per day...This is 70% faster than the progress rate of the last 12 months".

State highway officials, on their part, stoutly deny that the program is in trouble and is behind schedule, except in a mere handful of relatively small roadbuilding states...

Highway officials say there are three main reasons why federal-aid contract activity dropped during the first half of 1962.

- ?? Because of the highway scandals and resultant tightening-up of contract control procedures, it's harder to get decisions from both BPR and the state highway departments.
- ?? Many states are concentrating on urban work. Great controversies arise over these routes, and the work is more complex and slow. Therefore, although important projects are in the works, progress reports don't reflect big advances.
- ?? Many states are trying to acquire their urban ROWs now and this, too, is a slow and tedious process fraught with controversy...

The Bureau feels it is important for the states to show more progress in the form of completed pavement because:

- ?? The benefits promised to the public in safer, cheaper and more efficient transportation cannot be fully realized unless the maximum rate of construction is maintained consistent with available financial and other capabilities.
- ?? Visible progress is the best possible answer to the assorted criticisms being aimed at the program, since complaints have a way of disappearing once a completed highway materializes.

BPR is suggesting, and will reiterate at the AASHO meeting, that the states orient their programs to:

- ?? Develop long, usable sections of completed highway as "demonstrators" of the benefits of the Interstate system.
- ?? Concentrate on providing continuous stretches, rather than individual segments, of completed highway between principal cities, both within individual states and between neighboring states.
- ?? Otherwise, concentrate on deficient or hazardous sections. (The rest of the article gave a run-down by state of progress.)

## **HIGHWAY PUSH**

The Wall Street Journal-Dec. 3, 1962

## **U.S. STRIVES TO SPEED LAGGING CONSTRUCTION OF VAST INTERSTATE SYSTEM**

### **HALF THE STATES FALL BEHIND SCHEDULE**

#### **WILL U.S. PRODS SPUR COMPLETION BY 1972?**

Federal road planners are launching a major effort to speed laggard construction of the vast interstate highway network in hope of completing it on schedule by 1972.

Nearly half the states are well behind schedule with Montana, West Virginia and Indiana at the very bottom. Unless present lags are reduced, the 41,000-mile system, now one third built, won't be entirely open to traffic until sometime in 1975. This would mean growing traffic snarls and possibly needless loss of lives on overburdened older highways. And there would be significant delay in the full economic benefits expected to flow from completion of the new system...

(The rest of the article gave a run-down of progress by state.)

## **BPR TRIES TO STRENGTHEN ITS ROLE**

Eng.News Record- Dec. 13, 1962

To the casual eye the 48th annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials in Miami Beach last week looked like the standard convention with committee meetings, pleas for progress and integrity, and discussions of technical developments.

But close inspection of behind the scenes developments made it clear that drastic changes are taking place in the federal-state partnership that has characterized the federal-aid highway program in the United States for more than 40 years.

Orders apparently have gone out from the Secretary of Commerce (and others in the Kennedy Administration) for the Bureau of Public Roads to withdraw to arm's length in its dealings with the state highway departments. These actions at Miami Beach are symptomatic:

- ?? Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton resigned his membership on AASHO's executive committee.
- ?? Bureau of Public Roads personnel have been withdrawn as secretaries of nine of 18 AASHO committees on which they filled these positions, some of them over periods of many years.
- ?? The Bureau of Public Roads made, but did not announce, extensive shifts in its division engineers, the federal agency's state representatives.

These actions apparently reflect a growing desire on the part of federal officials to make BPR the "senior partner" in the federal-aid program, particularly in matters pertaining to the Interstate system. And, some believe, they portend an eventual attempt to federalize some portion of the country's vast highway system.



(The rest of the lengthy article reported on the other activities that occurred at the annual AASHO meeting.)

## **WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER**

### Roads and Streets-January 1963

The Bureau of Public Roads, presumably under pressure from the Department of Commerce, took two actions last month which captured headlines at the AASHO convention. In an apparent attempt to divorce itself from the state highway fraternity, the BPR withdrew from key positions in the organization. Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton resigned from the Executive Committee of AASHO and a number of BPR officials who have served as secretaries of committees were pulled out of these highly responsible posts. The move is being widely interpreted as a decision of the Department to "get out of bed" with state highway departments and put itself in a position where it can "lay down the law."

Thus, the 90% responsibility for financing the Interstate System which almost everyone urged upon the federal government in 1956, has led to changes in state-federal relationships which many believed could not happen. The traditional prerogatives of the states-in highway matters-might be threatened but never usurped. Throughout the long history of federal-aid for highways, every effort has been made to keep federal officials and the AASHO working as closely together as possible. Yet, within just six years after passage of the 1956 Act, giving the federal government more financial responsibility for highway system development, the inevitable has happened.

From this new position, the BPR told the states they must step up construction on the multi- billion-dollar Interstate System. Setting a deadline of 50 percent completion by 1964, the half-way mark in the long-range program, Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton spelled out the terms. This means a completion rate of eight miles a day, a big step from the present 4.8 miles. Also, BPR wants a shift in emphasis from the tediously slow, extremely complex urban projects to long, continuous stretches through open country. Such a showing will take the steam out of public criticism of the highway program, the federal officials feel...

### **Excerpts From the January, 1963 Issue of American Highways-the Record of the 48th Annual Meeting-Dec. 1962.**

**J.C. WOMACK**, Cal., the President's Address.

This speech was given at the annual meeting in December of 1962 in Miami Beach, Florida. He stepped through the functions and progress of each of the AASHO Committees.

### **IRRESPONSIBLE ATTACKS BY THE MEDIA**

"...It is regrettable that this year has also seen a continuation, in fact a worsening, of irresponsible attacks on the morals of the entire highway engineering profession, based on a tiny segment of the highway program in which wrongdoing took place. I am not sure why these attempts to discredit a remarkably successful highway program before millions of readers and television viewers are continuing, but if they are a necessary part of getting good highways built, we will just have to go ahead and get the job done anyway. After all, the

fortunately rare sensation-peddling journalist is responsible to no one but his publisher or his network, and is concerned only with today's headline or show. The Bureau of Public Roads and the state highway departments are responsible to all the people and for all time; the successful discharge of that responsibility in the form of safe, adequate, efficient highways is a public record which will remain on the books long after the new pencil marks have worn away..."

**SEN. PAT McNAMARA**, Mich., Chmn. Subcommittee on Roads.

This speech was given at the annual meeting in December of 1962 in Miami Beach, Florida. It was presented for the Senator by his assistant Robert Perrin.

The Senator complimented AASHO on the progress of the Interstate System and expressed alarm at some of the anti-automobile initiatives that were taking place in urban areas. At least half the speech was devoted to the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 which was designed to provide employment and stimulate economic growth.

**REP. GEORGE FALLON**, Md., Chm., House Subcommittee on Roads.

This speech was given at the annual meeting in December of 1962 in Miami Beach, Florida.

"...Despite this fine accomplishment (progress on the Interstate), highway officials have been unduly criticized, and undoubtedly are going to be subjected to more abuse as time goes on."

"Of course, this is not entirely a new feature of public office, and, as Harry Truman once remarked, 'If you can't stand the heat you ought to stay out of the kitchen.' Public officials have to expect criticism."

#### **THE REASONS FOR PUBLIC CRITICISM**

"However, it is a frustrating thing to be subjected to continual criticism when you know there is nothing in the world that you can do to satisfy the critics."

"...You've found some shady operators and you have exposed them. But every time you expose some shenanigans, the situation is held up as an example of what is claimed to be the typical state of affairs."

"...What's the argument all about?"

"Two things."

"First, a program as big as the highway program has an impact on practically everything else. You are displacing families, and the families have to have some place to go. You are disturbing farms, schools, churches, park lands, and forest lands. You are bypassing filling stations, motels, and restaurants."

"Highway officials have been saying for years that the Interstate system was a tremendous economic force that would remake the face of America. Some people believed you 100 percent, while others thought you were overstating the case, and discounted your statements accordingly. Now those claims are proving

out. The highway program is changing America. Whenever you have change, you will have people who are opposed to it, because, no matter how desirable the change may be, it is sure to bring some problems with it."

"The fact that the road program has an impact on every American is sufficient to make it the center of innumerable controversies. You cannot avoid these controversies. You can prepare yourself for them, and you may be able to minimize the controversies by telling your side of the story in a convincing manner, but you cannot eliminate the controversies."

"That's one of the things the argument is all about."

### **THE EFFECT OF 90-10**

"The other thing I want to mention today is the fact that a 90-10 Federal-aid program stirs up more watchdogs of the Treasury than a 50-50 program."

"There seems to be no more than the usual amount of controversy over the ABC program. The 50-50 matching ratio fits in with the generally accepted concept of what a partnership ought to be..."

He spoke at some length about standards and specifications and degrees of tolerance and how auditors look at such things as contrasted with engineers.

"The source of growing controversy- unfortunately, and, in my opinion, unnecessarily is a resurgence of the age-old argument summed up in three words-rail versus rubber."

### **RAIL VERSUS RUBBER**

"...The argument is going on in Washington now, and the rail transit advocates have succeeded in bringing the District of Columbia freeway program almost to a complete halt. The National Capital Transportation Agency has presented a report to the President recommending that a large part of the District of Columbia's Interstate program be scrapped, and that, instead, the National Capital Region should embark on a \$793 million program of rail transit construction."

"It seems to be generally agreed that Washington needs an improved mass transit system, principally to serve commuter traffic. Some say rail transit is needed, while others seem to think that buses could do the job if they were favored with reserved lanes and other special provisions to keep them moving during the peak traffic hours."

"I can agree that a mass transit system may be needed, but I cannot see the necessity of cutting down the Interstate program in the District of Columbia. The Interstate links are required to handle highway traffic moving throughout the Washington area. There is no chance that local truck traffic will be diverted to the rail transit system, and I believe that the millions of tourists who visit Washington each year will prefer to drive their own automobiles around the area rather than attempt to go sightseeing on an underground rail transit system..."

This speech was given at the annual meeting in December of 1962 in Miami Beach, Florida. He reviewed the highway problems confronting the 87th Congress from funding to relocation of displaced people. He was disappointed that stronger laws were not passed on fraud and conflicts of interest.

He spoke at length against the proliferation of toll roads on the Interstate and advocated stronger measures to prevent it. He spoke of the double standard in Florida where the Florida Turnpike Authority had entered into agreements with the bonding houses not to complete I-95 before 1972 while at the same time Florida was representing to BPR that I-95 would proceed on schedule.

He noted that extensive hearings on the truck size and weight issue would be coming up the next year.

**REX M. WHITTON**, Federal Highway Administrator

This speech was given at the annual meeting in December of 1962 in Miami Beach, Florida. The title was "R.I.P.: Relations, Integrity, and Progress."

He discussed integrity first and used the Boy Scout Oath as his recommendation of how the highway administrators should conduct themselves.

**NEED FOR GOOD PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAMS**

In discussing relations, he pointed out all the relationships that exist in the highway field and the need for cooperation among all of the players. As far as public relations were concerned, he urged the highway departments to take advantage of every event, no matter how minor, to develop a story for the public. He felt that in that way public relations could be built in a steady way through accomplishment and that that would have a greater effect than the big splashes of sensational journalism that had been happening.

His third subject, "Planning for Progress":

"Nothing succeeds like success, someone said. Which brings me to my third subject, planning for progress. The Interstate System is its own best advertisement. Every mile that we put into service is another demonstrator of the benefits of freeways. A new highway is like a new automobile. No salesman can offer a more convincing argument than a trial ride."

"So building good highways as fast as we can is the best means we have to combat the carping critics and mud-slingers. Two years from now, 1964, AASHO will be 50 years old. Let's set our sights, as a 50th anniversary present to the public, on 50 per cent of the Interstate System in service."

**PROGRESS ON BUILDING THE INTERSTATE**

"This is an entirely reasonable goal. By the end of 1964, more than 50 per cent of the funds covering the estimated cost of the system will have been apportioned. Fifty per cent of the time allotted for completion of the system will have elapsed."

"It is an entirely practical goal, too, for the position where we now stand. At the end of September, over 13,100 miles of the Interstate System were open to

traffic. But 2,300 miles were toll facilities, so we can claim credit for only 10,800 of the miles open to traffic."

"There are 4,900 miles under construction on the Interstate. It is not unreasonable to suppose that all or most of that construction can and will be completed and opened to traffic by the end of 1964."

### **PROGRESS MUST BE ACCELERATED**

"To meet our objective, then, we must get that done and also put under construction and open to traffic an additional 4,800 miles during the next two years. This will reach the goal of half the system in service."

"...Particularly important are those projects that will link up continuous, long route sections, especially those connecting the larger cities. It is such completed Interstate highways that best demonstrate to the public the benefits of the system-time saving, travel ease, and safety.

"...I look forward eagerly, a few years from now, to the opening of a route clear across the country."

"What an impact that will have on the public! While we won't drive a gold spike, perhaps we can erect a gold sign-conforming with the Interstate sign manual, of course."

"...I have been talking of an objective that lies only two years away. But we have an even more important objective. It lies a full decade ahead- completion of the entire Interstate System."

"...Every one of us must face up to the existing situation. It isn't enough for us to just say we're honest. We have to clean up, not only all possibilities of wrongdoings, but all possibilities of adverse criticism."

### **ASKS FORBEARANCE**

"I ask you, please don't take any of our (BPR) actions as a personal affront. Let's get our homes in order, remembering that we have to live in glass houses. And remember that what the public sees or suspects it sees in one house, it will assume is happening in all our homes."

"I want to be reasonable about controls. I don't want or intend to impede progress. Nor am I going to ask for anything I don't believe is necessary. But the public has to be convinced both that we are making progress and that we are doing it efficiently and honestly..."

### **MY PERSONAL OPINION (Mertz)**

(I believe that I detect the beginnings of a change in policy in the above speech. Before the passage of the 56 Act, MacDonalld advocated the building of the Interstate from the city centers, where the congestion was, outward. For the first time, building long rural segments is being advocated in this speech. The reasons given are to get more miles open to traffic quicker in order to speed up the completion rate in order to stay on schedule. It is also apparent that another

reason was that long stretches created good publicity and it was felt that the public image of the highway program was in need of repair. A third, but unstated, reason was the growing controversy over urban Interstate projects. The issue being continually discussed was the integration of urban Interstate projects into comprehensive city and metropolitan plans and how that would be done, even down to the details of techniques, but the unstated reasons, in my judgement, were really contests of authority. Who would ultimately decide what would be built in urban areas?)

**REP. JOHN A. BLATNIK, House Public Works & Special Investigations**

This speech was given at the annual meeting in December of 1962 in Miami Beach, Florida.

"...Most assuredly, I do not intend to review the work of our Subcommittee. This already is self-evident in the reports we have issued and in the verbatim transcripts of our hearings on several aspects of the highway program in a number of states. The important thing I would like to emphasize again is what I said in Boston in 1959 and have repeatedly stated since then: We have always tried, and I have made it a personal point of responsibility, to stress the fact that while we were going to be objective and fair, we were also going to be thorough and firm..."

"I believe we all remember that in 1959 the highway program ran into financial difficulties and there was a decline in the rate of highway construction because the necessary funds were getting short. This was three years after we had passed the necessary legislation and the program had really not gotten off the ground. When the bill to increase the gasoline tax came to the floor of the House the roof literally caved in on us. All kinds of wild charges were made about graft, corruption, inefficiency, extravagance, overdesign and operation under footloose and fancy free conditions. This Special Subcommittee was established because the House leadership decided that there should be a systematic and responsible way of determining if these allegations had substance."

**SURPRISED BY THE FINDINGS OF THE INVESTIGATIONS**

"...To be perfectly frank about it, I thought that when we started the hearings and our inquiry into the highway program we would find a very minimum of so-called inefficiency or work not up to proper standard. We had no idea whatsoever about some of the things we have run into. At first I was inclined to believe that some of the conditions and some of the situations were peculiar to a given State or locality or area, but as we moved from one State to another and examined different aspects of the program, we began to find out things that we want very much to prevent from happening elsewhere."

"The most significant thing to my mind is that almost uniformly the responsible people, the officials in the highway departments and those who are in charge at both the Federal and State levels, did not know that these things were going on. They were shocked and surprised, as shocked and surprised as we were."

**AASHO IS TOO SENSITIVE TO CRITICISM**

"..None of us likes to be criticized, but there is such a thing as being too sensitive about it. We all get criticized at one time or another. Those of us who are in the

political field get it constantly. I like to think of it this way: That anyone who does anything is subject to criticism no matter what the field of activity..."

"I think it is most important that we view criticism in proper perspective. I may be wrong in my opinion, but I want to be candid. I do feel that to some extent the very fine organization you have has been a little overly sensitive about some of the criticism that has come from the press, radio and TV commentators. I do not mean to lecture. I came here as a friend, as an associate and as a colleague of yours in this great undertaking in which I share the same pride that each and every one of you do in what has been accomplished. If there is one suggestion I might make it is this: Face the facts squarely and the people will support you and Congress will support you. Take whatever corrective measures are necessary and do it promptly."

### **CONGRESS IS SUPPORTIVE OF THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM**

"...I see no reason why the people in the highway industry should be on the defensive. As far as criticism is concerned, be realistic about it. Pay less attention to what is written about some of these situations, or what is said about them, but give more attention to what you do about them, and the support you have in Congress. Insofar as Congress is concerned, I am not too concerned with what is written in the newspaper or what is said on TV and radio about the highway program. Believe me, when I tell you that we Congressmen are close to the people, particularly the people that support us. I think it is highly significant and most important for you to realize that the feeling in Congress today differs greatly from that which prevailed in 1959. During the last session of Congress I do not think any speech- certainly not any major speech- was made by a Congressman criticizing the program. The measure of confidence in you men and in the program was best exemplified in the overwhelming vote by which the multibillion dollar tax structure was up-graded last year to insure the completion of the program on schedule."

"This brings me to another point which I feel I must give particular emphasis to at this time. You have already heard from Rex Whitton that the Interstate program must be stepped up if we are to complete this tremendous road network as scheduled in 1972. He has already told you that the completion rate in 1962 was averaging 4.6 miles per day. Unless this is increased to 7.8 miles per day, this job will not be finished as Congress intended."

"...The responsibility and the major burden continues to rest on your shoulders, but I think it would be wrong for any of us to pretend that some of the things we have encountered do not exist. You must continue to be on the alert against these insidious little cancers. Just as the doctors do, you must detect them in the early stages, because if you wait until you start feeling pain, it is too late. That is why I keep saying that the need for effective controls is extremely important."

"I am confident that the Interstate program will be stepped up as the responsible people say that it should be. We will have more problems as we go along, but we will work them out together. In spite of the criticism that has occurred, I am completely confident that when this is all over, we will have achieved the greatest public works project in the history of mankind, greater than the Chinese wall and the pyramids and the Roman roads all combined..."

### **TOP KENNEDY OFFICIALS URGE TRANSIT FUNDS**

Chicago Sun Times-Feb.28, 1963

Two Kennedy administration officials urged Congress Wednesday to approve a \$500 million mass transit program but neither could estimate the eventual cost to the government in solving the commuters problem.

Federal Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver and Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton testified in favor of the administration's three-year program at the start of five days of hearings by the House Banking Committee...

## **VETO POWER OVER ROADS BEING EYED IN WASHINGTON**

Sommerset (N.J.) Journal 4/25/63

Buried in the text of a speech made last Friday in Honolulu, Hawaii, is an indication that Massachusetts may be facing trouble from Washington because of delays in constructing the master highway system.

The address was made by H.E. Humphreys, Jr., chairman of the National Highway Users Conference, one of the most influential organizations in the country.

In a speech before the Western Highway Institute, Humphreys noted there is an "aggressive attack" underway in some states to "throw obstacles in the way of planned development" of the Federal government's blueprint for a network of superhighways.

"In some places," he declared "it is still in the propaganda stage. In others it has reached the point of Legislative threats and even enactments" to create the obstacles.

Massachusetts has caught attention from the national capital for its law which gives certain communities the power to veto any proposed route of a highway.

Several communities have invoked the state- given right.

The Humphreys statement forecasts a crackdown. The Highway users conference works closely with the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, grand overseer of the country's pattern of expressways.

In addition, there has been much speculation that Washington will take steps to erase Massachusetts' veto power law, on the ground it interferes with the national defense and welfare...

Meanwhile, some factions in Congress are seeking a drastic cut-back in the highway program in favor of rail rapid transit. Reportedly, a Federal agency is engineering the move.

Humphreys made mention of the feud in his statement saying, "eager rail transit hands may try to reach into the Federal Highway Trust Fund, and many members of congress currently seem inclined to subsidize rail transit."...

**Excerpts From the April 1963 Issue of American Highways.**



**REX M. WHITTON**, Federal Highway Administrator.

This speech was given to the Committee on Administration at the annual meeting in December of 1962 in Miami Beach, Florida.

### **A WARNING**

This was generally a progress report on the status of Interstate construction but it was also a warning that unless progress was stepped up, the program would fall behind schedule. He called for early completion of long rural sections on coast-to-coast routes in order to add large mileage quickly and to rebuild public confidence in the program.

He had asked each State to analyze its position relative to completion and to report on what action was needed to finish on schedule. He gave a summary of the results. Forty six percent was expected to be open to traffic by the end of 1964. Inclusion of the toll sections brought that up to 49 percent at the half way point in time. He said that this progress was made because some States had progressed at a much faster rate than the rest and the inclusion of the already existing toll segments. Some States, about 20 percent, were lagging having only opened 10 to 20 miles per year. The problems seemed to center on planning, right-of-way, design, construction and financing. He discussed each of these problems in detail.

He stressed that the Congress had reiterated the urgency of completing on time and that they had readjusted the financing in order to achieve that.

### **STAY ON SCHEDULE**

"Backing into the schedule, as we have just done (in this speech), will point up the urgency of the present situation to those States that are now lagging."

"In hearings on the highway legislation, the Congress has been given repeated assurance by the State highway departments, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the construction industry that we could accomplish this task. We can, and it's our responsibility to do so. I ask for full effort by every State, toward this end, and I offer my wholehearted support in that effort."

**JOHN C. MACKIE**, Mich., President of AASHO

This speech was given at the Mississippi Valley Conference of AASHO in Chicago, March 14, 1963. He spoke of the magnitude of the expanded highway program and the "regeneration" of the highway system that was taking place.

### **THE NECESSITY FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION**

"...I suggest to you today that there needs to be a concurrent improvement in the attitude of highway departments in giving the public the information needed to make wise and proper decisions on highway programs-not only in relation to a specific highway route, but also in relation to the larger question of highways and other means of transportation."

"A public which forms opinions without adequate information can prove to be the biggest barrier to the future of our highway programs. If the public does not have adequate information on the highway effort under way, I think it is the fault of the highway industry and the highway agency involved; in other words, it's our own fault. We should blame nobody but ourselves."

He advocated the free flow of information and noted that highway developments were big news to the public.

"A constant flow of straight factual information from the agency to the news media is the best and most effective way to be sure that public information is playing its full and proper role in the formation of public policy..."

### **CORRECT ERRORS OF FACT**

"There is a third level of public information and this involves the question of whether an agency should reply to misinformation issued by persons attacking the highway industry, or by people who simply do not understand what the facts are."

"...I submit that a governmental agency has the right to keep the public record straight and that it should do so promptly and consistently. If we do not correct errors of fact, who is going to do it? If an accurately informed public is essential to the proper functioning of a democracy, who is going to make sure that accurate facts replace errors if we don't do it? I think we will wait a very long time if we wait for the mythical 'someone' to do it for us."

He gave an example where the Michigan highway department was criticized in the press for not providing commercial services along the Interstate. A letter to the editor pointing out that such services were prohibited by Federal law was sent to the editor and it was printed.

"A question can be raised as to whether a governmental agency has the right to influence the public opinion which it needs to support the programs it is carrying on. In other words, how is the danger that the agency may become a propaganda organ for its own programs to be averted?"

"It has been my experience that it has been the press itself is the best guarantee that this will not happen since the press is quite able to distinguish between news and propaganda. There is, however, a responsibility that the agency act with integrity and honesty in its handling of public information and if it does this, it will not become a propaganda device."

"When we move from the simple correction of fact to the involved charges which arise in the political arena-charges of corruption and similar wrongdoing, the question of setting the record straight becomes more difficult."

### **SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT**

"In congressional or legislative investigations, we should cooperate fully to provide complete information on any subject or area under review. We should at the same time present documented summaries of the facts to all the media. I think we need also to have statements issued by national highway organizations-

American Association of State Highway Officials itself as well as groups like the Better Highways Information Foundation."

"...we must be aware that serious charges require serious answers and that failure to answer is often taken as an admission of guilt."

"...I suggest that every highway department should review its public information programs to see to it that no barriers are put in the way of the free flow of public information to the citizens at large."

"We are spending public money, we are making public policy, we are changing public habits of transportation. We have a tremendous record of achievement in the highway industry-both public and private-but this record of achievement cannot be maintained without the continuing support of the general public."

"The highway facts need no dressing up to be exciting and interesting. The great highway building program under way today is as important to the economic growth of America in the second half of the 20th Century as the building of the railroads was to the second half of the 19th Century."

In the rest of his speech, he recounted the achievements and progress of the highway program and said that the public should know about them.

## **URBAN TRANSPORT PLANNING NEEDS UNITY**

Engineering News Record- July 11, 1963

"Comprehensive, Cooperative and Continuing" were the words used to describe adequate urban transportation planning processes by representatives of federal, state and local governments at a regional conference staged in Albany N.Y., last week.

The conference was the tenth and last of a series of regional meetings sponsored by the American Association of State Highway Officials, the American Municipal Association and the National Association of Counties. Conferees came from the six New England states, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware....

Main purpose of the meeting was to explain and discuss the portion of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 that requires cooperative transportation planning in urban areas of more than 50,000 population as a condition of federal aid to highways in such areas after July 1, 1965...

## **HEARINGS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 134 OPENING DISCUSSION**

The formal title of the hearing was "Transportation Planning in Certain Urban Areas". They were held by the House Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works in the eighty eighth Congress, first session, June 25, 26, 27 and July 9 and 10, 1963.

**REP. GEORGE H. FALLON**, Maryland, Chairman:

"Testimony presented to this committee during the hearings held on May 27, 28, and 29, indicated that satisfactory progress was being made in the construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways authorized in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. However, it is evident that most of the progress to date has been accomplished in rural areas."

"It is generally recognized that the most difficult phase of interstate highway construction will be encountered in urban areas. It is here that the program faces complexities which, unless given the most careful attention, could defeat the desirable goal of completing the entire system by 1972."

"These complexities are in no sense limited to the location, design, and construction of the highway itself. Highway development in many urban areas can only proceed at a rate consistent with the overall development of other affected transportation systems. It was with full recognition of this fact that the Congress, in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, required as a condition precedent to the expenditure of Federal-aid funds in urban areas the establishment of a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process."

### **DELAYS**

"...there is already evidence indicating delays of sufficient magnitude to preclude compliance with the July 1, 1965, deadline in many areas. Lack of compliance with the planning deadline would prohibit the approval of any Interstate project in the affected areas. Such a situation could totally defeat the expressed intent of Congress that the entire system in all States (urban as well as rural) be brought to simultaneous completion."

### **COMPLETION IN 1972 ESSENTIAL**

"In the interest of the national economy and the national defense, it is essential that the entire system be completed by 1972 as now planned. Because of the pending threat to the orderly completion of the Interstate System as planned, I have called these hearings for the purpose of ascertaining as definitely as possible existing and potential delays affecting compliance with section 134 and developing such amendatory legislation as may be found to be necessary and requisite."

**CONGRESSMAN CRAMER**, Florida, led off with a statement:

"I think it would be well, as a foundation for the hearings, to refer to the report that accompanied the legislation we have before us for consideration. On page 12 of the House report there is language to this effect:

'This section would encourage transportation planning and improve the quality of urban planning generally. It would not delay the current Federal-aid highway program, inasmuch as reasonable time would be allowed for States and local communities to establish the continuing planning process that would be required.

'The committee recognizes that transportation planning is almost invariably a continuing process; hence, this section has been drawn in such a way as to make it clear that a completed comprehensive plan, as such, is not necessary to meet its requirements.'

## **DESIGNED TO EXPEDITE COMPLETION**

"And I think that throughout the discussion of this section and its purpose it was clearly shown, in the committee report and in consideration of the bill, that it was not the intention of the Congress, and the section was specifically worded to make certain it was evidence of that intention that this section should not result in undue delay in the completion of the Interstate System of which urban extensions are a vital and an integral part. If the 41,000-mile Interstate and Defense Highway System should be usable and effective, I believe it is obvious that the limited access highways through urban areas have to be completed by the completion date of 1972, and that they should not be delayed. As a matter of fact, it is my opinion that this section was put in partially, so far as Congress is concerned, to expedite these constructions, to avoid conflicts, to permit planning that would avoid those conflicts, with the result that urban extension and construction would be expedited rather than delayed, and that any construction of this section to the contrary is subverting rather than carrying out the intent and purpose of the Congress."

"...So my concern is to make certain that the section (134) is not being interpreted in a manner that would delay rather than expedite the completion of the Interstate and Defense Highway System which is essential to the economic development and safety of highway users in this country."

## **THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PROBLEM**

"I would also, Mr. Chairman, like to have made a part of the record at this point the letter which I addressed to the chairman requesting hearings concerning this matter generally, and specifically as it relates to recommendations made concerning transportation planning in the District of Columbia as a part of that. I ask that it be made a part of the record at this point."

## **LETTER TO THE CHAIRMAN**

Hon. George H. Fallon, Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads.  
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: By letter dated May 27, 1963, the President transmitted to the Congress the transit development program of the National Capital Transportation Agency, together with draft legislation which would authorize the Agency to proceed with the construction of a mass transit system. In his letter, the President recommended that appropriations for the Three Sisters Bridge, the north leg of the Inner Loop, and further commitments for the Potomac River Freeway be deferred pending a "careful reexamination of the highway program of the District of Columbia in the light of the transit development program, and the social, economic, and esthetic impact of highways on the Nation's Capital."

'The Three Sisters Bridge, the north leg of the Inner Loop, and the Potomac River Freeway are all designated routes of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. They have been the subject of exhaustive study continuing over a period of several years. For example, in 1953, a report entitled "Highway Transportation in the Washington Metropolitan Area of Virginia" prepared for the Virginia State Highway System by Wilbur Smith & Associates, recommended a bridge across the Potomac River at the Three Sisters site. In 1959, the mass transit survey prepared by the National Capital Planning Commission and the

National Capital Regional Planning Council provided for the highway facilities which the President now recommends be made the subject of further study.'

'...The recommendations of the President are based upon the report and recommendations of the National Capital Transportation Agency. I have reviewed the reports and recommendations with considerable care and have not been able to find any indication that the Agency gave adequate study or consideration to the critically important aspects of the national defense and the problems of interstate transportation. In fact, the report and recommendations show quite clearly that the primary consideration was for the solution of "traffic congestion created by the movement of large volumes of people to and from their places of employment during a very few hours of peak demand each day."

#### **DELAY TO THE NATIONAL SYSTEM**

'I do not believe that the construction of critically important parts of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways should be further delayed on the basis of recommendations which do not take into account the purpose and objectives of the Interstate System. Interstate highway construction in the District of Columbia is already behind schedule. At the present time, the District of Columbia has obligated only 30 percent of the interstate highway funds appropriated for fiscal year 1963, compared with a national average of 97 percent of fiscal year 1963 funds obligated. Thirty two States have advanced further than the District of Columbia in the construction of the Interstate System...However, if the restudy proposed by the President results in a recommendation that the Potomac River Freeway not be completed, two things will result: first, the part of the facility already under construction will not serve the purpose for which it was designed and second, it will almost certainly be taken off the Interstate System so that the Federal Government would bear only 50 percent of the construction cost, meaning that the District government would have to refund the Federal Government several million dollars.'

'The proposal of the President based upon the report and recommendations of the National Capital Transportation Agency will have such an impact on the interstate highway construction program that I feel it is essential that consideration be given to this aspect of the matter as well as to the largely local problem of handling commuter traffic. In my opinion, the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Federal-aid highway program, should hold hearings to give the highway officials and other interested and informed persons an opportunity to review this aspect of the matter. I don't think such hearings could or should be construed as opposing a justified and properly financed mass rapid transit program that may be needed but would serve notice that any such planning should not be permitted to destroy the effectiveness or unduly delay completion of the Interstate and Defense Highway System-be it in Washington, D.C., or elsewhere.'

'The purpose of this letter, therefore, is to request that you, as chairman of the Roads Subcommittee, arrange for public hearings on this subject at the earliest possible date.'

**REX M. WHITTON**, Administrator, BPR

Mr. Whitton was accompanied by **FRANK TURNER**, and **THEODORE (E.H.) HOLMES**.

"...Highway planners and city planners have not always seen eye to eye. If we have had differences, it is at least in part due to the great contrast in our approaches to urban problems."

### **CITY PLANS NOT ALWAYS SPECIFIC**

"Highway plans are necessarily specific. City plans, on the other hand, are more often conceptual."

"Highway plans are based on design standards and criteria developed from physical measurements and operations research. City plans are necessarily based to a great extent on intangibles, often called community values, that are not expressed in measurable terms."

"...there can no longer be any doubt that the highway and city planners face a tremendous task, and one in which they must work together. Today our cities- especially the larger ones-are facing many critical problems."

### **THE HISTORY OF URBAN PLANNING**

He recounted in detail the evolution of urban transportation planning beginning with the 1939 report "Toll Roads and Free Roads", the 1944 Act which made urban highways eligible for Federal aid, the 1956 Act, the Sagamore Conference, the Hershey Conference, the AASHO-American Municipal Association Joint Committee activities and testified that 200 urban transportation studies had been completed. He spoke of the joint committee established between the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Bureau of Public Roads to jointly finance comprehensive transportation planning throughout the country. He said that the National Association of Counties had just recently joined with AASHO and the American Municipal Association with a resolution to accomplish studies in all cities over 5000 in population.

He emphasized President Kennedy's message to Congress in April of 1962: "Our national welfare\*\*\*requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth."

The president also recommended: "\*\*\*a long- range program of Federal aid to our urban regions for the revitalization and needed expansion of public mass transportation\*\*\*Highways are an instrumental part of any coordinated urban transportation program and must be an integral part of any comprehensive community development plan."

WHITTON noted that many of the President's recommendations were incorporated into the 1962 Act by the Congress. Among them were the dedication of the entire 1 1/2% fund to planning and research, an increase in the level of the ABC program, the use of Secondary funds in urban areas and Section 9 (Section 134, Title 23) which established the so- called 3C planning process requirement.

### **A COMPLETED PLAN NOT REQUIRED**

"I want to emphasize that the Congress has wisely required a planning process, not a complete plan. We have every reason to expect that by July 1, 1965, the planning process will be far enough along in every city so that at least some parts of an ultimate urban highway development plan can be justified and approved."

"...The comprehensive character of the planning process involves four features. First, that the economic, population, and land-use elements be considered fully. Second, that estimates be made of the future demands for both public and private movement of both people and goods. Third, that terminal facilities and traffic control systems be included in the planning. And fourth, that the entire area within which the forces of development are interrelated should be included-not just as it exists now, but as it is expected to be urbanized within the forecast period."

### **AGREEMENTS REQUIRED**

"The cooperative character of the planning process requires that there be formal understanding and agreement between the State highway department and the governing bodies of the local communities affected. Or a properly constructed areawide agency, qualified to act for the local communities, might act on their behalf. Such an agreement should prescribe the procedure for carrying out the planning process."

He described the other elements and aspects of the urban planning process in great detail: "This, then, is our concept of the full meaning of the comprehensive, cooperative, continuing transportation planning process, which must be in operation in the urban areas of more than 50,000 population before July 1, 1965."

"...It was to give stronger emphasis to our planning interest that in 1962 we established the Office of Planning as a primary unit in the public roads headquarters. A prominent part of that Office is the Urban Planning Division."

**JOHN C. MACKIE**, Mich., President of AASHO

In his statement, he noted that the planning requirements were yet another burden laid on the States in the development of projects but that compliance would not be too difficult because the requirements were the same as the program that the States had been pursuing voluntarily for several years.

### **THE HARTFORD CONFERENCE**

"In 1957, at the so-called Hartford conference, we first heard serious proposals to stop the highway program until planning could be started and catch up. There were not enough trained highway planning personnel to start on the job, and the action was not warranted."

"...We feel very strongly as we get further into this formal urban transportation planning process that we will find very few, if any, of the highway facilities that have been planned and constructed in recent years that can be seriously criticized."



"We say this because there was a great deal more actual and effective planning accomplished on an informal basis than most critics realize."

"...There may not have been the formal type of planning operation in all areas, but we maintain that there has been an informal type of operation that has been extremely efficient."

### **THE HERSHEY CONFERENCE**

"...Just about a year ago, the Hershey Conference was held, bringing together, in one group, highway planners and some of the critics of the highway program. I think it was evident to most highway administrators that such a meeting did not alleviate the criticism problem. The highway program is now so big and important that many interests want in the decision area, and some maintain their national prominence by being professional critics."

### **AASHO'S URBAN POLICY**

"In 1961, at the Denver annual meeting, the State highway departments agreed that the urban transportation picture was so important that the association should adopt a transportation policy, with a special chapter dedicated to the urban phase. This policy was predicated upon the following assumptions and is the basis for this statement:

1. That the choice of the mode of transportation should lie with the individual.
2. That the individual should be allowed to live where and in the type of housing he chooses.
3. That highways should be planned and provided to the extent that the public desires them.
4. That highways and other forms of urban transportation should not be viewed as competitive, but, where both are needed, they should be planned to complement each other.
5. That whenever suburbs or the private automobile become a major problem, the public will react and natural phenomena will solve any problems of consequence, and artificial means of regulating or regimenting the method of travel or type of housing is not the American way.
6. That needed highways should not be delayed because of controversy as to what mode of transportation should be selected to serve commuters to the central business district.
7. That urban transportation planning should be done, on an urban areawide basis, and that it should be done cooperatively, utilizing the capabilities and contributions of the administrative, legal, and technical people of all levels of government, having direct and indirect responsibility in transportation. However, it should be recognized that the State highway departments have the legal responsibility for moving the State and Federal-aid highway programs and keeping them on schedule and, as such, should make the final decisions regarding highway projects if indecision and delay are to be avoided.
8. That the State highway extensions in urban areas must be considered a part of and planned as a part of the statewide highway system, and they cannot be severed and be considered only as a local matter."

He discussed the States' views of the planning process at some depth: "...It is for these reasons that the American Association of State Highway Officials, by policy, has asked that none of the planned segments of the Interstate System be delayed 'to give other forms of transportation a chance.'"

#### **CONTROVERSY REGRETTED**

"...We regret very much that there seems to be a controversy between highways and other forms of urban transportation. We observe, too, that much of it seems to be involved around emotion and promotion. Actually, anything so important should be determined entirely on a basis of fact and economics."

"We believe...that it would be highly desirable that any proposal coming before the Congress dealing with any phase of urban transportation should be routed through the Public Works Committees in order that urban transportation planning can be accomplished and coordinated within the Congress itself, and that committees having a long experience in drafting legislation and evaluating such programs can have an opportunity to act on them."

**CONGRESSMAN FALLON** observed that Mr. Mackie's statement conveyed an atmosphere of cooperation with urban governments and other forms of transportation. He then asked for Mackie's opinion as to whether the delay of Interstate projects in the nation's capital and the lack of cooperation by the National Capital Transportation Agency would have an effect on other urban areas.

#### **D.C. AN ADVERSE PRECEDENT**

**MACKIE:**" In answering that question, I should point out the American Association of State Highway Officials has not taken a position and does not on local problems. So I want to qualify my answer by saying I am speaking for myself and the State of Michigan. We would be very much afraid that the situation in the District here would establish an adverse precedent in other major cities."

**CONGRESSMAN CRAMER** had before him a copy of the House Committee on Banking and Currency report on the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963. He complained that the wording seemed to be oriented to reviving mass transit systems and not toward the solution of urban transportation problems in general. He also noted that it seemed to be anti- highway in its tenor and devoid of any principle of cooperation. He deplored the fact that the Public Works Committee was not consulted on mass transit matters when mass transit is in fact a public works program and more particularly a transportation program.

There was considerable discussion of the likelihood of further delays or postponements of urban Interstate endangering the national defense by failing to connect a total system.

**MAJ. GENERAL LOUIS W. PRENTISS**, American Roadbuilders' Assn.

#### **ABSENCE OF A PLAN MIGHT BE DETRIMENTAL**

**GENERAL PRENTISS** was a Corps of Engineers career officer and a former Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia where he supervised all public works, including highways.

He pointed out that the District of Columbia had had for many years a cooperative planning process very similar to what Section 134 calls for but as of that time, there was not a single adopted comprehensive transportation plan extant for the metropolitan area. He felt that the absence of a requirement for a plan in the legislation might be detrimental in the long run.

He pointed out that the 1952 thoroughfare plan was about as close to an adopted plan as the District got. The 1959 MTS study and the Year 2000 Plan done by the National Capital Planning Commission, although comprehensive, were not formally adopted by other agencies including the highway departments. Although a lot of planning had been going on and a lot of cooperation in many cases, the District seemed to be trending toward separate factions.

"The essential reason for the transportation crisis now confronting the National Capital region is that the National Capital Transportation Agency has interpreted its legislative authority to include the power and responsibility to undertake an independent and unilateral review of the highway program."

#### **CRITICAL OF NCTA**

He went on to critique in some detail the NCTA report and some of the assumptions contained in it.

"...In developing a justification for the rail transit system, therefore, the National Capital Transportation Agency apparently limited its concern for the local transportation problem, and, in considering the relationship between the rail transit system and the highway system, did not concern itself sufficiently with the interstate and interregional demands which will be placed on the planned freeway system."

"...Although more adequate liaison with the agencies responsible for highway development probably would have avoided some of the weaknesses of the NCTA's report, this lack of liaison is not the only reason for the weaknesses. Throughout its report the NCTA gives evidence of having set itself up as a promoter for the proposed rail transit system rather than as an objective appraiser."

#### **GRAVE EFFECTS**

"...The effect of the NCTA report on transportation planning in Metropolitan Washington area is grave. Unfortunately, the activities of this Agency also have a national impact. The suspension of Interstate System projects in the District of Columbia is being regarded by some individuals and groups as a signal to other urban communities to slow down progress on their segments of the Interstate System. Some who have never been convinced of the value of the highway program are interpreting the recent events in Washington as a sign that the Federal Government has discovered some magic solution to urban transportation problems. The word is being spread that cities should wait and see what the discovery is rather than proceeding with their highway construction plans."

He said that a responsible body should be appointed to do a detailed and unbiased cost and feasibility analysis of the rail transit plan. The Potomac Freeway should proceed immediately to construction, the Three Sisters Bridge required at least a year of detailed design. The North Leg of the Inner Loop required detailed location, economic and even feasibility studies, as BPR Administrator Whitton testified, before it could proceed.

#### **AMENDMENTS MAY BE NECESSARY**

"...As we have indicated, we believe that serious difficulties will be encountered in some communities. Perhaps amendatory legislation will be needed to make the planning provision more workable. However, such legislation might well be considered in connection with the 1964 Highway Act, and we have no recommendations to make at this time."

**CONGRESSMAN FALLON** asked if it was possible for the District to build only selected segments of the Interstate System.

**GENERAL PRENTISS:** "Of course, the States can do that if they want to. I think the question then will come up as to whether they can qualify for 90 percent Federal aid. It is my understanding that it was the express desire of the Congress that this Interstate System be one which interconnects all of these major cities of our country, not only interconnects them, but going through and around them, and isolated sections of the Interstate System would not be in accordance with the expressed desire of Congress."

**CONGRESSMAN FALLON** asked to what extent the downtown loop of the proposed transit system served the same purpose as the Inner Loop of the Interstate System.

**GENERAL PRENTISS:** "I think it serves exactly the opposite purpose. It serves the purpose of getting the people who want to be in the central business area within walking distance of their destination, whereas the inner belt highway system is designed for those people who do not want to be in there and want to get somewhere else."

The General indicated that a cooperative planning process did not in any way guarantee implementation. The only guarantee in a democracy was that the people had to be educated and informed and ultimately they would decide. He felt that the detailed locations of the urban Interstate suffered from not enough publicity before decisions were made.

**CONGRESSMAN BLATNIK** asked who or what organization had the authority to say stop or proceed.

#### **WHO CAN DECIDE?**

"Is it within the Bureau of Roads? Do we have to go higher up to the Department of Commerce and call in all of these divergent land groups and governmental subdivisions and State departments involved?"

**GENERAL PRENTISS:** "I am of the opinion that the only way we are going to get this deadlock broken is by the public rising up and saying, 'We want this to go

forward now.' And then those in authority will pay attention. I do not know any other way. I do not know of any organization that has the authority right this minute to say go ahead."

**WILLIAM C. FLAHERTY**, Auto. Mfg. Assn.

This was a very lengthy and technical report on research done by the Association that concluded that the central cities of the large metropolitan areas were declining in population but the metropolitan areas, as a whole, were growing explosively which meant a decline of downtown oriented traffic, absolutely and relatively, and great increases in suburb-to-suburb travel that could be accomplished only with the automobile.

**EDWARD V. KILEY**, American Trucking Assn.

He testified that the complete Interstate System was vital to the trucking industry. The urban segments were perhaps more vital because they would relieve congestion and expedite truck movements. He strongly objected to the postponement of critical segments in Washington D.C. which would greatly reduce the value of any remaining segments because of fragmentation.

**BRIG. GENERAL FREDERICK J. CLARKE**, Engineer Commissioner, Wash., D.C.

General Clarke was accompanied by **HAROLD AITKEN**, Director of Highways and Traffic and **COLONEL DUKE** who would become Clarke's successor in two weeks time.

"I hope that on the basis of 3 years association with transportation planning in the Washington metropolitan area I can be constructive in my evaluations and suggestions relative to comprehensive urban transportation planning."

"First, the new section 134 of Title 23, United States Code, stirs the 'fire under the pot' which hopefully will consume the embers of inaction and indecision, even if by the threat of project disapproval under section 105 of this title."

#### **PIECEMEAL PLANNING IS COSTLY**

"The time has come when planning agencies must halt costly piecemeal consideration of transportation segments whether it be for highways or rapid transit. Instead, we must plan at least 5 years ahead and implement usable, efficient, and economical systems. An example of the former is the slow progress that has been made in the piecemeal planning and implementation of the District of Columbia inner loop, which has been an accepted planning concept for many years. In contrast, the concept of the National Capital Beltway which soon will completely encircle the metropolitan area has been adhered to and typifies the benefits of farsighted system planning and implementation."

#### **AUTHORITY FRAGMENTED**

He noted that the National Capital Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Council had the legislative authority and responsibility to establish and maintain a comprehensive planning process. He said that there were other legislatively established agencies having various degrees of authority including

the National Capital Transportation Agency and the Park Service, the Architect of the Capitol, the Smithsonian Institution and so on.

## **COOPERATION**

**CHAIRMAN FALLON** asked about the NCTA report and asked about the degree of cooperation that existed with the Commissioners and the Highway Department during the preparation of that report.

"We shared with the National Capital Transportation Agency the metropolitan transportation study group that we have, which is a technical group and which runs computers to see what the various programs put into the computers would produce in the way of traffic loadings under certain assumptions. The assumptions that were fed into the computer were entirely the product of the National Capital Transportation Agency. The various systems which were to be studied in the computer analysis again were the product of the National Capital Transportation Agency."

**NOTE:** I, Lee Mertz, was the head of the above mentioned group.

**GENERAL CLARKE** and **MR. AITKEN** were both asked whether any expert advise had ever been asked for or given in the preparation of the NCTA recommendations. Mr. Aitken responded:

"...the first time I was briefed by the Administrator of NCTA on their plans for financing, or engineering, or any aspect of their study was October 10, 1962. The printed report was available by November 1. So presumably the report was ready, and perhaps in the hands of the printer by October 10. This was simply a briefing, and there was no question of exchange of ideas, or thought, or principles or policy."

**CONGRESSMAN FALLON** asked to what degree **MR. AITKEN** was in accord with **NCTA's** findings and recommendations:

**MR. AITKEN:**"I think I would say that we are in accord with the philosophy that we need improved mass transit. I find considerable difference of opinion with NCTA's recommendations on the highway system. We are in accord on the parts that are under construction, the parts that are built, the center leg and some restricted elements of the system. But with reference to their approach to planning, as indicated in their reports, I find considerable difference."

## **DIFFERENT ASSUMPTIONS**

**MR. AITKEN** explained further that certain standards in regard to highway capacity and the forecasting of traffic were required nation-wide for the Interstate System. He said that NCTA used quite different assumptions in the preparation of their analysis and report. Mr. Fallon asked Mr. Aitken if the north leg, the Three Sisters Bridge and the Potomac Freeway were postponed as recommended by NCTA, would the funding revert to 50 percent Federal if they did not proceed as Interstate projects:

"Within the last few days I have attempted to get certain things approved by the Bureau of Public Roads. For example, we have submitted documents asking

program approval for the preliminary design of interchange C, and for preliminary studies and design of the center leg. As late as yesterday, and confirmed again this morning, the Bureau of Public Roads has informally told me that they will not approve any such action on the center leg of the Interstate System until the reexamination of the north leg, Potomac River Freeway, and the Three Sisters Bridge is completed and until the Bureau is satisfied the District of Columbia is going to have a properly integrated and connected interstate highway system."

"So when you talk about the north leg of the inner loop system, this is like a block that holds up the house: with this one everything is in doubt."

#### **VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND ALSO AFFECTED**

He noted that the Virginia and Maryland Highway Departments had projects that were critical to the integrated system. There was considerable discussion as to whether the District could afford to build on a 50-50 matching basis. Mr. Aitken said they were having difficulty matching Federal aid on the 90-10. 50-50 would be out of the question.

**CONGRESSMAN CRAMER** noted that the District Board of Commissioners in April of 1963 had considered the NCTA recommendations and had, after considerable deliberation, decided to proceed with the projects that NCTA wanted postponed:

"Now, so far as you are concerned, has anything happened that would change this? All of the facts remain the same, do they not, as it relates to the necessity and purposes of these facilities as of April of this year?"

#### **THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE**

**GENERAL CLARKE** and **MR. AITKEN** both indicated that the new factor was the President's message to the Congress dated May 27, 1963 as follows:

"There is a need for careful reexamination of the highway program of the District of Columbia in the light of the transit development program and the social, economic, and esthetic impact of highways on the Nation's Capital. I am requesting the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to undertake this reexamination in cooperation with the appropriate agencies. Decisions can be made at this time to proceed with two of these projects, the proposed east leg of the inner loop and the Fort Drive Parkway. Decisions on the appropriate highway facilities for the north leg of the inner loop, particularly whether it should be built to interstate standards, should await the outcome of the reexamination I have outlined above."

"Since the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge as an Interstate facility appears to depend on decisions which must be made with respect to the north leg, its construction should likewise be deferred until all of the alternates have been reexamined. For similar reasons, no further commitments should be made at this time with respect to the Potomac River Freeway."

#### **DEFENDS THE PRESIDENT**

There was discussion as to why it made sense to delay those projects that had been developed many years ago. General Clarke defended the President's decision because of the effect of the north leg on housing, family displacement and other effects. The Congressmen were amazed that the location and other critical studies had not been finalized and that the north leg was no more than a line on a map.

**GENERAL CLARKE** explained: "In 1959, when the plan was adopted, I believe the basic consideration was-is there a need to put a freeway through the north leg region? I think it was accepted by all agencies that there was a need to do it. And the concept that was adopted and approved was also that there would be built to Interstate standards a north leg."

"Now the problem of how it was to be built, precisely where it was to be built, and just how it was to be treated, was a matter that was deferred for later consideration. The District had always, in our financing of the highway system, planned this would be financed about 1969. This would give several years of study to just how to properly put it through, recognizing it was a difficult area."

### **STUDY ADVANCED**

"As I see it now, we are going to advance that study that would have been made in later years. We are advancing that now to accomplish it this year so that, in the light of sociological considerations and esthetic and economic considerations, a decision will be made probably by the administration as to whether or not that it will be built to interstate standards."

**CONGRESSMAN CRAMER** asked whether the Board of Commissioners would make the decision after the study:

"No, sir; this is the President's decision after considering our recommendations."

**CONGRESSMAN BLATNIK** observed: "...we have this bounding around to conferences, consulting with agencies, and Good Lord, not knowing quite sure who makes the final decision or determination, no one charged with the responsibility of executing this huge program...It seems to me somehow the planning function has become an end in itself, and you are running around and around and not getting anywhere."

### **GENERAL DISAGREEMENT EXISTS**

**GENERAL CLARKE:** "I think you have described the situation very well as to the confusion that exists...over the past year or so the planning agencies were not able to agree really on anything in the highway program; and, if the District of Columbia and the State of Maryland and the State of Virginia are to meet this 1972 deadline, if the planning agencies cannot bring this all back in a package so we can make orderly progress, I think we are going to have to come back to the President or to the Congress and say we have got to find another way to do it outside of the planning agencies."

### **D.C. SERVES AS A NATIONAL EXAMPLE**



**CONGRESSMAN CRAMER:** "It looks to me as if Washington, D.C., whether intentionally or otherwise, is becoming a national example of the hodge podge that results from lack of long-range planning and programming and actual construction, when you apparently get involved in a fight for prestige position between mass transit proposals and highway proposals. I am concerned with this example being set in the District of Columbia, which certainly does not accomplish the end result intended in the Interstate Defense Highway System on which some \$41 billion is supposed to be spent. That is now being bogged down and is likely to be more so in the future, not only in the District of Columbia, but in many other major cities, as the result of this overriding consideration now of municipal planning in general, and mass transit planning in specific."

"The reason I became so concerned about it when it came to our attention in the hearings on the other bills is that, if that is the case, then the Interstate Defense Highway System conceivably would not, and probably would not, be completed by 1972 in the most critical areas, meaning the urban areas."

**CONGRESSSMAN BLATNIK:** "...Maybe we ought to create a planning agency of our own and join with the others in a real hassle and just find out what in the world is going on."

"I am amazed by this type of thing. I am completely perplexed. Here are these tremendously important complicated pieces of engineering and construction before us, decisions to be made, and somehow no one is making decisions. The whole thing is suspended...Can we ask, Mr. Chairman, that somehow, by an independent consulting concern, or our own staff, we have a committee report for our own information?"

"The Congress or the executive branch are the ones that can move and break the deadlock. Is that correct, General?"

**GENERAL CLARKE:** "That is right, sir. It is between the Congress and the administration, I am sure."

**CONGRESSMAN BALDWIN:** "Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that these 3 days of testimony have indicated that the National Capital Transportation Agency has deliberately violated the intention of Congress. It is very clear, by the wording of the Federal Interstate Highway Act and the act of 1962, that it was the intention of Congress that the responsibility for the plan to complete the Federal Interstate Highway System would remain in the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads as far as the Federal level was concerned in coordination with the highway departments of each of the States and the Highway Department of the District of Columbia. There is nothing in the Federal Interstate Highway Act or in the act of 1962 that said any other agency should have the right of veto over the plans to complete the Interstate Highway System."

#### **CONGRESSIONAL INTENT FRUSTRATED**

"Certainly it is not the intention of Congress to authorize a program of this magnitude and have some individual independent agency have the right to veto and block the intention of Congress."

"It seems to me that the National Capital Transportation Agency has violated the intention of Congress, and has acted in a completely arbitrary manner, because

the testimony here has shown it has not cooperated with any other established planning agency, although the other planning agencies have had a far greater history in planning. I do not think Congress should allow this to continue."

"The only purpose of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 was that there should be a comprehensive transportation planning process, that there should be cooperation and coordination in planning. The one that violated this is the National Capital Transportation Agency, and because they have acted in this arbitrary manner, because they have completely ignored all of the reliable planning agencies that have been planning and building this highway system, is even more reason for us not to allow this to continue."

**Excerpts From the October, 1963 Issue of American Highways.  
FISH AND WILDLIFE POLICY**

The title of the editorial was "Federal Policy Developed to Prevent Highway Construction Damage to Fish and Wildlife."

"Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today announced a joint policy of coordinated planning designed to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat at Federal-aid highway projects. Methods for implementing the policy have been worked out by the Bureau of Public Roads...and the Fish and Wildlife Service..."

This was obviously a press release. The exact date did not appear but the announcement had to have been in mid-1963.

"...the joint policy recognizes that in order to achieve maximum effectiveness in the expenditure of public funds and at the same time protect wildlife, close coordination and cooperation are required in the planning and construction of highways which have an effect upon fish and wildlife preservation programs."

"...The joint policy requires that state highway departments supply to state fish and wildlife agencies advance plans for Federal-aid highway development programs. It will be the responsibility of the state fish and wildlife agencies to review these highway programs and make recommendations on ways to develop highway projects which will be compatible with fish and wildlife habitat."

"The policy is implemented through a Bureau of Public Roads Regulation which requires that by January 1, 1964, each State, in requesting Department of Commerce approval for the use of Federal-aid highway funds must certify that it has given consideration to the effects of the proposed highway project on fish and wildlife resources..."

"...The joint policy was worked out after meetings with members of Congress who were seeking coordination of the Federal highway and fish and wildlife preservation programs."

**W.O. WRIGHT**, Nev., Pres. of WASHO- "Jonah and the Whale"

This speech was presented to the 42nd annual Conference of WASHO, Sept. 17, 1963 at Denver, Colorado.

## **JONAH AND THE WHALE**

"...I intend to approach a couple of delicate subjects upon which a highway administrator must necessarily tread lightly..."

"I speak up in protest ...against a trend...which bids fair to wreck the excellent relationship of long standing between the Bureau and the states..."

## **THE PARTNERSHIP UNDER STRAIN**

"...The 'big-brother' relationship was sound in principle and excellent in operation, but it appears to me now that it has changed to one of 'foster-parent and child'..."

"In view of this new relationship...to one of administration, regulation, policy determination, needless duplication of engineering talent, and - yes - even inspection, perhaps now is the time to take a second look, a fresh, new, even bold look, at so-called Federal-aid..."

He pointed out the differences of the highway program from normal Federal aid where funds are appropriated from the general fund and either used directly by the Federal government such as the Corps of Engineers or are made as a grant to some unit of lesser government. He felt that the Highway Trust Fund, highway user taxes, pay-as-you-go, apportionment, contract authority and state initiative as specified in highway law made the program so different that it should not be referred to as Federal aid.

"Since the principal function of the Federal government is that of a collection and distribution agency, such funds should not be classified as, and termed, Federal-aid."

"...The image in the public's mind that the government is handing out large sums of money as 'Federal-aid' for highway construction is erroneous. It is the image which encourages juries to allow excessive awards in condemnation trials. It encourages those in the driver's seat to think of themselves as the great benefactors. In reality, the highway users have paid in hard cash in advance for the privilege of riding on our modern highways, built and maintained with their own money and not by 'Federal-aid'."

"...Again I quote: United States Department of Commerce-News Release Monday July 8, 1963...'The Bureau of Public Roads furnishes 90 percent of the cost of the Interstate system, and 50 percent of the cost of other Federal-aid projects.'"

"The Interstate construction identification signs at each end of a project are misleading in language as to Federal-aid and Highway-Users' funds. I believe we must agree that the Bureau does not contribute one cent of the cost, but the Bureau does play a major roll in the highway problem."

"...All of which brings me to the title of this address, 'JONAH AND THE WHALE.' Perhaps it should have read, 'THE JONAHS AND THE WHALES.' For, in my mind, there are several in the overall picture."

"Are we, as highway engineers and highway departments, to become whale-like by engulfing the highway contractors by overly-tightened specifications, over-inspection and unnecessary regulations?"

"When a resident or project engineer has been pressured to the extent that he is afraid to make normal and proper decisions on the spot, we are failing to do our duty as engineers and are placing the contractor at a distinct disadvantage."

"Reason and good common sense and sound engineering judgment gained by experience, must prevail at all costs, lest we price the contractors out of competition, and ourselves out of matching funds by perhaps too much refinement."

"Every dollar spent beyond a normal inspection and policing system is a waste of public funds in my opinion. Record sampling, or the final sampling at designated locations by employees of the Bureau, and at their discretion, is an unfair practice if I ever saw one. Were this procedure to be used as a physical and economical analysis to determine the behavior of certain materials under severe stresses for revision of specifications it would be logical and informational. But certainly, it is not so when used to determine whether a contractor has conformed to specifications."

"In what other field of endeavor is a producer required to manufacture a material or product to certain specifications-to subject and expose that material to all sorts of stresses, uses, climatic elements and other factors-and then be required to have it meet the original specifications for final acceptance? Particularly, when such specifications, made in the interest of economy, can result in false economy."

### **WILL JONAH BE SWALLOWED?**

"...Are we, as highway engineers and departments, to be swallowed by the Bureau of Public Roads?"

"Recent withdrawals of Bureau personnel from AASHO Committees, the increase in decisions that are made by the Bureau at all levels are indications of a trend toward forcing the various highway departments into the plight of Jonah."

"...Have we reached a point in our existence where the Bureau can no longer carry our banner in disputes with other bureaucratic agencies?"

"Do we now have to submit to the decisions of other agencies which are infringing on our responsibilities?"

"...We are criticized today for the narrow winding, crooked roads built thirty years ago. Are we to be criticized thirty years hence, or sooner, for the same mistake because some nature lovers, bird watchers and those who wish to hinder the path of progress want traffic to travel at a snail's pace? Or that a divided highway is not necessary?"

"The modern highway, in my opinion, must come first-then the wilderness areas, recreational areas, industrial areas and suburban areas will come as naturally as an infant's first smile and a child's first step."

"Is the Bureau of Public Roads to become a Jonah and be engulfed by its parent agency? (The Department of Commerce) Has it reached the point where the Bureau must support the views of super-level administrators rather than the recommendations of AASHO and the individual states?"

"...Finally, let me describe the whale that looms larger in retrospect than all the rest. This is the whale that is making decisions without regard to engineering facts and decisions, that indulges in recommended citations beyond plausible reason and bids fair to make Jonahs of all of us. This whale takes the form of the auditors with their newly-found authority, who, without technical or engineering background, are empowered to act with an autonomy that is beyond my power of comprehension."

"...In conclusion, may I quote this phrase 'The heritage of the past is the seed that brings forth the harvest of the future'-and offer the hope, desire and yes, even a prayer, that we be allowed to return to the cooperation and unity, the wisdom and sound philosophy of our past partnership, and that we can again work hand in hand for the benefit of this and future highway programs."

**A. E. JOHNSON**, Executive Secretary, AASHO

#### **WHAT IS EFFECTIVE VIGILANT ADMINISTRATION?**

The title of the speech was "What is Effective Vigilant Administration?" It was presented to the 42nd WASHO meeting on Sept. 17, 1963.

He defined the terms "vigilant" and "administration" and set forth thirty vigilant acts that he felt State highway administrators should follow in order to practice good administration. The tenor of the speech was that they were all under the spotlight resulting from recent adverse publicity and they all needed to review their practices to make sure that there would be no more future surprises.

#### **DEFENDS BPR**

"...Recently two Chief State Highway Administrators advised that they were tired of putting forth so much effort to accommodate the Federal Government and its Interstate program. How ridiculous can people get? State Highway Officials endorsed this program in the beginning. They knew this system of modern highways was needed. They all wanted the opportunity to build this needed type of highway and this program provided their only opportunity for doing it. The State Highway Departments got the first chance to do it. How much of it reverts into a Federal program depends largely on their performance..."

"...The investigative spotlight on the use of untrained people in the highway program has brought forth a serious proposal for a National Highway Academy to train State highway personnel. There exists a distinct possibility of required qualifications being established at the Federal level for State employees on Federal-aid work. We can say the exposed cases of incompetence and irregularities constitute the exception and not the rule, however, we must agree such instances crop up with embarrassing frequency."

"Staffing State highway departments with competent people is a problem we must solve, or have others do it and move us further back from the driver's seat. You have the first chance at doing the job."

"State highway departments are going to retain just as much position in the program as they insist upon and deserve."

"'Vigilant Administration,' with emphasis on employee training and development, is the best deterrent to the loss of position..."

#### **D. GRANT MICKLE, Deputy Federal Highway Administrator.**

The speech was made to WASHO on Sept. 19, 1963. The title was "State-Federal Relationship at the State Level."

"This is a subject about which much has been said-and I suppose much more frequently behind closed doors and in terse impious phrases than in more formal and gracious public utterances."

"Of course, it isn't that bad, and we know it, if we would stop and think. It's only the moments of wrath that are well remembered. Yet they are just isolated volcanic peaks in the broad, smooth plain of generally harmonious cooperation."

#### **A PLEA FOR FORBEARANCE**

He described the recently delegated authority of the Federal highway program to the Division Offices which made the State Federal interactions much more on a face-to-face and personal level which should go a long way toward making the relationship less remote and bureaucratic. On the other hand, he pointed out that there was a great variability among Division Engineers, both in style and personality, just as each highway department was different.

He made frequent reference to a prior speech to WASHO by D.C. Greer, Texas: "Finally, Mr. Greer said to this Association-and it was 15 months ago: 'We must "keep our house in order" and the "skeletons out of our closets." This is our job on the State level and, if we fail to do this, we really have no right to complain about increased Federal control.'"

"Unfortunately, a few more skeletons have been discovered in closets since then. We are all confident that most of our closets are clean. But after all the outcry of the past about scandals, we can no longer afford the luxury of even one small skeleton."

"So, regretfully on our part as on yours, you have had increased Federal controls. We in Public Roads believe they are just and reasonable; that they are far from oppressive. If you think they are too strong, remember there are others who think they are too weak."

#### **WHAT HAPPENS TO THE INTERSTATE AFTER 72?**

##### **Engineering News Record-Oct. 31, 1963**

Completion of the Interstate highway system by 1972, and the nature and extent of the federal-aid highway program after 1972 were the dominant themes at the 49th annual convention of the American Association of State Highway Officials last week, at Portland, Ore...

As he had done at Miami Beach a year ago, Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton urged the states to speed their efforts to complete the 41,000-mile national system of Interstate and defense highways by 1972.

"This year is probably the most critical period in this undertaking," Mr. Whitton said. "If we act now, and act properly, and on time."

"If you (the delinquent states) don't act now, I don't know when you expect to start. Time is running out," he said...

"We should begin now to list, and think about, the questions that will need answers," he said. "We must set the scope of our study, define the problems and collect and analyze relevant data. And we should arrive at single or alternative proposed solutions, which we as the responsible highway authorities of this country can recommend and support as a group."

"Although highway administrators and planners cannot draw up the final answers (because Congress must enact the program), they would be remiss in their duties if they offered to the Congress neither guidance nor suggestion on these complex questions."

#### **ROAD CHIEF WARNS OF INTERSTATE CASH DEADLINE**

Charleston W. Va. Gazette-12/5/63

Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton says he may soon find it necessary to disapprove the granting of money for interstate highway projects on which construction cannot begin in time for completion by 1972...

If only the 50-50 program continues after 1972, uncompleted portions of the Interstate system would have to be finished on this basis, instead of on the 90-10 basis, he said.

Even if Congress provides for an extension of the Interstate program, he said, it may offer something less than 90 per cent federal aid...

Excerpts From the January, 1964 Issue of American Highways-The Record of the AASHO Annual Meeting Oct. 22, 1963.

**JOHN C. MACKIE**, President, AASHO

#### **PREDICTS INCREASED INTERSTATE MILEAGE**

"...Everyone would benefit if the interstate system were completed ahead of schedule...I predict that Congress will authorize an additional 10,000 to 20,000 miles of interstate when the present 41,000 miles are completed. America's motorists like what they have seen and will, I am sure, support an expansion of the program."

The rest of the speech was devoted to a progress report on the Interstate and how highways stimulate economic growth.

**REP. GEORGE FALLON**, Md.-Chairman House Subcommittee on Roads.

This speech was given Oct. 22, 1963 to the AASHO Annual Meeting in Portland, Oregon.

### **EMPHASIS ON URBAN PLANNING**

"This is an excellent opportunity for me to remind highway officials-those that need reminding- that very serious problems are arising, and will continue to arise, in connection with the construction of urban expressways."

"...Obviously, planning is essential. Equally obvious, the planning must be comprehensive-it must take into account all of the social and economic factors that make the city what it is and will be."

"It follows that highway planners must work closely with the planners responsible for guiding the development of urban areas so that highway plans and urban plans mesh."

"This is the thinking behind the urban transportation planning requirement which was written into Federal law by the 1962 Highway Act. It provides that, beginning July 1, 1965, the Secretary of Commerce shall not approve any program for Federal-aid projects in a community of 50,000 population or more unless he finds that the proposed projects are based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by States and local communities."

"No doubt you are all familiar with the law. But I think it is important that I remind you, first, that the deadline is approaching, and, second, that while the requirement is reasonable and not unduly restrictive that failure to meet the requirement will result in the shutting off of Federal-aid funds in the affected urban area."

"...The House Subcommittee on Roads held hearings on this subject last May. We were encouraged by the testimony presented by the American Association of State Highway Officials, through your capable and efficient president, John Mackie, to the effect that the State highway departments are facing the problem aggressively and that rapid strides are being made in almost every State to make certain that the deadline will be met."

### **THE D.C. PROBLEM**

"However, these same hearings spotlighted very serious difficulties in the District of Columbia. In the national capital area, a comprehensive planning process very similar to what is required by the 1962 Act has been in effect for several years."

"In spite of the existence of this planning process, the highway program in the District of Columbia and the surrounding metropolitan area is the target of constant sniping. The objections are numerous and varied, but the central argument which ties all the objections together is that highway officials insist on building roads without regard to the social and economic welfare of the city. They are accused of smashing historic shrines, destroying churches and schools, breaking up neighborhoods, choking off the downtown area and, in general, making life miserable for the city's inhabitants."



"In some circles, indeed, the notion is bandied about that it is almost unpatriotic to drive an automobile in city traffic because, it is said, too much valuable urban space is being appropriated for highways, streets and parking facilities."

"The situation in the District of Columbia, of course, is an unusual one. As far as local government is concerned, there are too many cooks in the kitchen. The United States Congress, the White House and the State governments of Virginia and Maryland are all involved, exercising their jurisdiction through a complex combination of agencies and advisory boards."

"The immediate issue in the national capital area is also somewhat unusual-a conflict between highway planners and the planners and advocates of a proposed \$792 million rail transit system."

### **GOOD GUYS AND BAD GUYS**

"But one situation, I fear, is not so unusual- the tendency to regard the urban planners as the defenders of what is loosely referred to as 'urban values' as the 'good guys' in a battle against the 'bad guys'-the bad guys being the highway officials and the highway users..."

### **AFTER 72**

"...I have just introduced legislation calling for a study of highway needs nationally. The principal objectives of this bill are to make accurate engineering determinations on which we can pass legislation covering an extension of the Interstate program after 1972. I believe it is quite important to get this study underway at once so there will be no gap between the end of the current Interstate program and whatever kind of program follows it..."

**SEN. JACK MILLER**, Iowa, Public Works Comm.

### **THE HIGHWAY IMAGE**

He asked two questions: "Have you, as state officials, ignored your public relations image to the point where the public has become concerned over what they feel (whether real or imaginary) are roughshod methods of planning without due consideration to local situations?" and "Are you turning more and more to Washington to work out the highway problems in your individual states, or are you planning and working closely with local government officials to develop a coordinated approach to these problems?"

"All of you have a responsibility (in public relations) because failure to present a good image causes resentment which will linger long after you have completed a job in a local community...What price are we to pay in the coming years for the growing number of complaints that big government has become so preoccupied with highways that it has failed to give sufficient consideration to the people for whom they are being built?"

### **THE PEOPLE PROBLEM**

"...James J. Morton, special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, made a cogent observation. He said: '...The most serious obstacles in our roadbuilding

program are not money, nor engineering problems, nor cruel terrain-but PEOPLE. In the cities we hear the growing din of controversy. We see the barriers erected against the United States' urgent need for a modern highway system. We hear false prophets sow confusion and doubt. We hear the outcry of civic groups who protest that highways will leave ugly scars across the face of the landscape. We hear that highways are going to carve up residential areas, ruin property values. We hear flippant remarks that every freeway we build has a built-in traffic jam. We hear the specious pleadings of special interests; we hear know-it-alls with quick and easy remedies guaranteed to solve all our urban transportation woes."

"He noted, and rightly, that highway officials are dismayed by this; that they have taken public acceptance for granted. And therein lies the crux of the problem of your public relations image-for your subcommittee on Public Information particularly to work on. You just cannot take public acceptance for granted."

"And the public does have a case. In this great debate over the future of our highway system, there is a tendency to discuss at length the 'needs' without thinking very hard about the purposes. Press releases are issued, parading statistics and tables about the growing number of miles and the billions of dollars spent or to be spent. Mountains of figures are furnished by various groups, private and governmental, that this is what has been done and this is what should be done. But these data are not always received with awe and reverence by citizens who have a right to know about 'whys' as well as the 'wheres'."

#### **THE POWER OF PUBLIC OPINION**

"...It is so much easier to talk about the many miles and the billions of dollars that we are tempted to become worshippers of material progress. I think we should reexamine our approach. Public opinion can be a mighty adversary-just as it can also be a vital partner. We must take the time and trouble to cultivate it so that it will accept material progress-and this means that progress must be defined by government officials in terms of both material and human values."

"...it is awfully late. What defense is there to the mounting complaints about routes chosen for new superhighways, high prices paid for property acquired for right of way, expensive designs, bridges built too low, sky-rocketing costs, and the failure to consider the economic future of those whose property is taken?"

"The second area of questioning...relates to close coordination at the local level and less reliance on planning in Washington to solve highway problems...(he quoted the planning requirement of the 1962 Act). Will our state officials wait until next year and then deliver a memorandum to city officials, warning that the deadline of July 1, 1965 is nearing and that they had better get moving and come up with something? Will their plans be drawn up so quickly that the human element will not have been adequately weighed?"

#### **THE QUESTIONS**

"...These, then, are the questions you are going to have to continually answer and continually review your answers to: (1) Are we doing enough to give recognition to human values in our measurement of progress, and are we doing enough work to build a favorable public image of this progress? (2) Are we thinking enough of those who will follow us in our jobs-are we doing all we should

be doing to see to it that our highway systems are coordinated with all interested governmental units so that they will render the maximum service for which they are intended?"

**REP. WILLIAM C. CRAMER**, Fla., House Public Works Comm.

#### **AFTER 72**

The speech was delivered for Mr. Cramer by Clifford Enfield, Minority Counsel, House Public Works Committee. The first part of the speech was devoted to the need to proceed with studies of what the nature of the highway program should be after completion of the Interstate in 1972. He noted that AASHO had officially assured the Congress that the states had the ability to complete the system on schedule at the last annual meeting in Miami. He felt that it was particularly necessary at that time because it was imperative the big reduction in expenditures envisioned in 1972 should be carefully staged in to avoid economic dislocations:

"We want to avoid recurrence of problems such as those which arose in the early years of the present program."

"You may recall that the money authorizations for completion of the Interstate program, set forth in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, were based upon cost estimates submitted to the Congress in 1955. Later estimates, prepared in 1957, and submitted to the Congress in 1958, showed that the cost of completing the designated Interstate System would be some \$10 billion more than the 1955 estimates-and a financial crisis in the highway program came into being. Some of you may not be aware of how near we came to losing the highway program in 1959."

He noted that suggestions had been made that the studies should be made by a Congressional Committee. He said that this had been done before- in 1953 and called the National Highway Study. He said that this did not result in action or recommendations and that it was not until the Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a study with the highway departments did action result, so he felt that procedure should be followed.

#### **MASS TRANSIT**

"Before closing, I'd like to make brief mention of one more subject of growing importance in the highway field, and that has to do with mass transit. We hear a great deal today about mass transit, particularly about the competition that exists between the highway interests and the mass transit interests. I'm sure you all agree with me that there should be no such competition, at least not in the sense that one must be the winner and the other the loser. If there is such competition, the only real loser is the American public."

#### **WASHINGTON, D.C.**

"...A good example of what should not but what can happen is found in Washington, D.C., where desperately needed highway projects are being delayed because of the morass of mass transit proposals. Plans for the Interstate highway routes in the District of Columbia include, among other things, a bridge across the Potomac River-the so-called 'Three Sisters Bridge'-and also include

an inner loop which is a key part of the Interstate system in the Washington area around the downtown area. The bridge and inner loop were selected after exhaustive studies and after planning which has continued over a period of many years. The proposal for the Three Sisters Bridge goes back as far as 1953."

"In 1960, however, the Congress created a new agency called the National Capital Transportation Agency and directed it to prepare a 'Transit Development Program' for the Nation's Capital. In May of this year, the President transmitted the 'Transit Development Program' to the congress and recommended adoption of the program recommended therein."

"However, in addition to the recommendations with respect to mass transit contained in this program, the President also recommended that appropriations for the Three Sisters Bridge and certain essential parts of the inner loop be deferred pending a 'careful re-examination of the highway program of the District of Columbia in the light of the Transit Development Program and the social, economic and esthetic impact of highways on the Nation's capital.'"

"The recommendations of the President in this regard were likewise based upon the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency. I and many others connected with Congress, have studied these reports and supporting material with considerable care, and have not been able to find any indication that the Transit Agency cooperated with other agencies involved, that they gave adequate study or consideration to the critically important aspects of highway to take care of interstate transportation for national defense."

"The law specifically required this Agency to cooperate and coordinate with other agencies on arterial highway matters, and the law spelled out specifically that the responsibility and authority for the location, design, construction, and operation of highways shall remain with the agencies now having jurisdiction thereof. Despite this, testimony before several committees of the House of Representatives has clearly shown that the Agency did not cooperate, did not coordinate, and did not solicit, in fact it did not accept the views or the assistance of the highway agencies involved."

"Notwithstanding these and other shortcomings in the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, several essential parts of the Interstate system in the District of Columbia which have already been exhaustively studied and which have already been delayed far too long are being further delayed pending additional studies. I cite the Washington situation merely as an example. We must not permit the 41,000 mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to be subordinated to mass transit proposals and to localized problems of urban planning and improvement. We cannot permit this unless we are ready to abandon the goal of completing the Interstate System in 1972."

**REX M. WHITTON**, Federal Highway Administrator

#### **AFTER 72**

He noted that the highway departments had a background of 50 years of planning. The planning surveys, the needs studies and others had created a vast wealth of information. He said that when all the urban transportation studies were done, they would add greatly to the information available. He felt that the time

had come to begin systematic studies of what program should follow completion of the Interstate in 1972.

He noted that the Highway Trust Fund would go out of business at that time as planned, all the more reason for studies to begin. He listed the questions that he felt needed answering ranging from how many miles should be added to the Interstate System to rationalization of the Secondary System. He noted that the Secondary System varied greatly in size between States for no particular explainable reason. Another question was what provision should be made for the addition of capacity to the completed Interstate. Another set of questions revolved around the proper matching ratios and methods of apportionment. It was a comprehensive and well thought out speech.

**A.E. JOHNSON**, Executive Sec., AASHO

### **OUR HIGHWAY HERITAGE**

"I have selected for my title today 'Our Highway Heritage'. It is being tarnished and eroded away and the matter deserves our most serious attention."

He recounted the golden years of the highway program partnership and then reviewed the troubles encountered since the 1956 Act including the right-of-way scandals, the urban problems, a hostile press and so on. He worried about the tendency of the BPR to operate more at arms-length than the old partnership. He said that there was increasing talk of the Federal government assuming complete control and the highway departments assigned the role of simply contractors carrying out the Federal program.

### **CAN THE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS SURVIVE?**

"Recently, I asked to head a discussion period at the AASHO-NHUC Management conference at Williamsburg, Virginia. The subject was not selected by me, but was assigned, and it was 'Can The State Highway Departments Survive?'"

"I have found out that this subject has been seriously discussed in various forms by several groups in the highway industry. They have been concerned with the eroding influences that are being exerted against the State highway departments."

"All it would take for the State highway departments to immediately be cast into a secondary role would be the naming of an unfriendly Federal Highway Administrator, one who would not allow the State highway departments any part in developing the design standards, specifications, and policies used in the Federal-aid highway program of the country."

### **AMERICAN HIGHWAYS, Jan. 64**

"To take a stand for a continued position of importance for the State highway departments will either be a militant or amiable affair, depending upon the time and personalities of the people involved at that time. When the time comes it will require collective concerted action on the part of all the States. Any attempt to

register a complaint or correct the trend by individual action or stubbornness is senseless."

## **AFTER 72**

He noted that Rep. Fallon had just introduced a bill directing the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the highway departments to prepare a comprehensive "after 72" study of highway needs. He described this as the opportunity to become the architects of their own future and asked that every highway department support it.

He enumerated some of the things that ought to be considered in this study to be presented to the Congress in 1967. In the meantime, he said, there must be outstanding performance on the part of each highway department in order to win back some of the public confidence that had been lost.

### **Excerpts From the January 1965 Issue of American Highways-The Record of the 1964 Annual Meeting.**

**J. BURCH McMORRAN**, N.Y.-The President's Annual Address, December 8, 1964.

#### **THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF AASHO**

"...While this is our Golden Anniversary year, it has, in many ways, resembled the beginning of a great adventure...I was impressed by the vibrant sense of challenge and excitement generated not only by our passing the halfway mark in the Interstate program, but by our planning for what will follow completion of the Interstate System."

"...It is up to all of us to exert every effort to meet the 1972 deadline for completion of the Interstate System. This should be our first priority as AASHO begins its second half-century."

"At the same time, we must apply ourselves to completion of the study encompassing highway needs beyond 1972. The crucial importance of this undertaking is evident in the fact this study will be a basis for new Federal-aid highway legislation that will influence highway programs for a decade or more in the '70's and '80's."

#### **OPPONENTS OF HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT**

"...We find some neighborhood planners and architects-men extremely competent in their fields, but with no experience in ours-crying out against highway development. They assail what they call the despoliation of natural or esthetic values, belittling the esthetics of well-designed roads and ignoring the greatest value of all, inherent in the highway program: its service to society."

"We find others with pet projects and programs who decry the allocation of sizeable funds to highways while attempting to raid the treasury for their own purposes."

"Elsewhere-and among the same critics-are the self-appointed transportation experts who batter reason and logic with their argument that rail rapid transit is a substitute rather than a complement for urban highway systems."

"...And finally we must contend with the less publicized but no less sinister insistence of a minority that the highway program has grown too large to be administered under the cooperative arrangement born here in Atlanta, and proved in the tests and trials of fifty years..."

**SEN. JENNINGS RANDOLPH**, W.Va., Senate Public Works Committee.

He complimented AASHO on their 50th anniversary and attacked them for limiting the use of coal tar in their specifications. He was concerned about rumors of a \$4 billion increase in the Interstate Cost Estimate. He suggested that the Congress consider repealing the Byrd Amendment so that States that could do so could finish by 72. He worried about whether the metropolitan areas would meet the 65 deadline on comprehensive planning.

### **RELOCATION ASSISTANCE**

"The Federal-aid Highway Amendments of 1962, which provide relocation assistance to displaced persons and businesses, were a step in the right direction. But they are inadequate. For Federal assistance is limited to those States which provide aid under their own statutes. In addition, both Federal and State laws have largely ignored the responsibility to provide low-income rental housing for the impoverished inhabitants of the blighted areas which so often are the corridors for freeways. This is a problem to which I hope the 89th congress will give attention, but it also requires the concentrated effort of State and local authorities..."

**REP. WILLIAM C. CRAMER**, Fla.

### **AFTER 72?**

"...The 16-year period, ending in 1972, for completion of the current accelerated Federal-aid highway program is now half-gone. On a national basis, about half of the work is completed or underway. As you know, the House of Representatives passed a bill, H.R. 8853, on December 19, 1963, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study, in cooperation with the State highway departments, of the needs of the Federal-aid highway systems after 1972, and to submit a report thereon to congress by January 1, 1967. Unfortunately, this bill was not acted upon by the Senate. I hope that a similar measure will receive both House and Senate approval early next year. In the meantime, however, the Bureau of Public Roads, under the general authority of the Secretary of Commerce, is proceeding to undertake the study contemplated by H.R. 8853, in cooperation with the State highway departments."

"...Pertinent to future highway construction is the thought that has been advanced to delay construction of the Interstate System within urban areas so as to permit time for the construction of connections and for the improvement of city streets to accommodate traffic that will be "dumped" into the cities by the Interstate System. If such delay becomes a reality, the cities may want these connectors to be constructed with 90-10 Federal- State financing. Such connectors presumably would be constructed to Interstate standards, and considerable time would be required for their planning and design. It seems unlikely that this work could be accomplished by 1972, when the present Interstate system is scheduled for completion. I believe it is more appropriate for consideration of these type of facilities to be included in the study and possible program for highway

improvements after 1972, thus avoiding any delay in construction of the presently planned urban freeways before 1972 and giving consideration for the construction of connections with such freeways after 1972."

## **APPALACHIA**

"...This Act (The pending Appalachian Regional Development Act) would authorize the construction of a new 2,850-mile system of development highways and access roads in those portions of 11 States making up the so-called Appalachian Region. This program would be discriminatory against all portions of the Nation outside of Appalachia, for it would superimpose upon the long-standing and successful Federal-Aid Highway Program a completely new system of roads for benefit of the comparatively small Appalachian Region alone..."

"Appalachia may or may not be unique in some respects, but it is most certainly not unique in its lack of adequate highways. If an additional \$840 million is to be authorized and appropriated for the construction of a new classification of highways, it seems obvious that the best interests of the Nation demand that such funds be apportioned to all of the States, not a selected few, in accordance with equitable formulas or criteria, such as that now applicable to the existing Federal-aid highway program..."

### **Excerpts From the April, 1965 Issue of American Highways. 1965 AASHO POLICY STATEMENT**

#### **THE PARTNERSHIP**

"...The proven 'partnership' between the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads should continue to be utilized in the same manner as in the past in planning and constructing present and future Federal-aid programs."

"It is in the public interest that the major Federal effort in the highway field continue in the form of Federal-aid to the State highway construction programs."

#### **OPPOSE ANY REQUIREMENTS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE**

"That the State highway departments vigorously oppose any proposals that would require a particular type of organization and operation for a State highway department as a prerequisite for receiving Federal-aid highway funds, inasmuch as all State highway departments are official agencies of sovereign State governments and must have the latitude of determining the type of organization and operation preferred by the people and that best suited to the individual needs of the States."

"Neither should State highway department employees be required to undergo any Federal training program as a requirement for the State being eligible to receive Federal-aid highway funds."

#### **STATES DEAL ONLY WITH BPR**

"...That no Federal agency or official other than the Department of Commerce and its Bureau of Public Roads, should have the approval power over Federal-aid highway projects undertaken by State highway departments..."



## **DON'T LEGISLATE STANDARDS**

"That the development of controlling highway design and construction standards and highway signing and traffic control practices, and the selection of materials incorporated into highway construction, are engineering in nature and should never be established by legislation."

"That the Federal-aid funds provided by Section 307(c) of Title 23, United States Code, Highways, for planning, research and development continue to be available to the State highway departments as now provided by law and that the present use, matching and method of administering these funds be continued..."

## **AGAINST DIVERSION**

"That the Association opposes the use of any Federal Highway Trust Fund monies for any purpose other than now authorized by law."

## **RESTORE CONTRACT AUTHORITY**

"That the Contract Authority Procedure created by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1922, which gives a State highway department the right to initiate Federal-aid highway projects as soon as the official apportionment of funds is made, be restored at the earliest possible time and eliminate the modification imposed by the Reimbursement Planning Procedure that was installed as a temporary expedient in 1959, during the time a shortage in the Highway Trust Fund existed."

## **INCREASE FUNDING TO COMPLETE ON TIME**

"...That the Association petitions the Congress to provide the additional necessary financing so that the Interstate System may be completed on or before the scheduled date of 1972. Encouragement should be given to provide for the earlier completion in those States where such is possible, however, appropriate legislation should also be included to safeguard the interest of those States that might not be able to complete their Interstate program before 1972 in order that any speedup in some State might not adversely affect the scheduled completion in others."

## **A SMOOTH TRANSITION AFTER COMPLETION**

"The Congress should provide that no lag will occur in any State between the completion of the presently authorized Interstate program and the beginning of a new and continuing Federal-aid highway program. Any interruption in an orderly highway development program must be avoided because of the enormous highway needs of the Nation and the adverse economic effects of a slowdown of that magnitude."

## **A MINIMUM OF FOUR LANES DIVIDED**

"...That the American Association of State Highway Officials, in the interest of highway safety and motorist comfort, recommends that the entire 41,000 miles of the Interstate System be constructed as a divided roadway with a minimum of four lane design, and that it be recommended to the Congress that the additional

cost of changing the some 2,000 miles of Interstate roads, that had been planned as two-lane highways, to four-lane facilities be approved as part of the 1965 Cost Estimate."

#### **INCLUDE AASHO IN DISCUSSION OF NEEDS**

"That at any time the Federal Government should assemble a group to study and make recommendations in the field of transportation needs and policies of this Nation that includes persons outside of the Federal Government, it should include a representative of the American Association of State Highway Officials to present the expert viewpoint of the State highway administrator."

#### **REIMBURSEMENT FOR TOLL ROADS**

"That the American Association of State Highway Officials recommends any highway needs study and recommended continuing highway program that may be submitted to Congress give consideration to the matter of equitable reimbursement for toll and free roads incorporated in the Interstate System."

#### **STATES MUST REMAIN THE DECISIONMAKERS ON URBAN SEGMENTS**

"That the urban sections of the Interstate System are an integral and essential part of that System, which should be planned and developed by the State highway departments in close cooperation with the affected local government units and interested Federal agencies. The responsibility of initiation of projects must remain in the State highway departments, and final decisions regarding location and design must rest with the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads."

#### **CONSIDERATION OF MASS TRANSIT SHOULD NOT DELAY THE PROGRAM**

"The various modes of urban transportation should not be considered as competitive, but where conditions and needs warrant other modes of transportation in addition to highways, they should be planned to complement each other, and controversy over the merits of the various modes in regard to serving the needs of a particular part of the metropolitan areas should not be allowed to delay essential highway construction. Decisions should be based on factual data and needs derived from the transportation planning process and not influenced by emotional opposition or competitive promotion..."

Altogether, there were 33 resolutions in the policy.

#### **Excerpts From the October, 1965 Issue of American Highways.**

#### **HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION**

This issue presented the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 in detail. The parts of the bill were Title I, Control of Outdoor Advertising-Title II, Control of Junkyards and Title III, Landscaping and Scenic Enhancement. Also presented was Senate Report 709 and House Report 1084 in their entirety. Both were on the subject of beautification.

**Excerpts From the January 1966 Issue of American Highways-The Record of the 51st.  
Annual Convention, 10/4/1965.**

**M.L.SHADBURN**,Ga., The President's Address

**COMPLETION ON TIME POSSIBLE**

"...every Highway Department in the country says that they can complete the System by 1972 if adequate funds, both Federal and State, are made available...

"...However, the horizon is not unclouded. The last estimate on the cost required to complete the Interstate System, which was submitted to Congress early this year, showed an increase in estimated completion cost of 5.8 billion dollars, based on 1963 prices."

"This brought the total cost of the Interstate System to 46.8 billion dollars."

**MORE MONEY NEEDED**

"It will, therefore, be necessary to increase the funds going into the Federal Highway Trust Fund by one billion dollars each year to complete the Interstate System by 1972. Otherwise, we will face a stretch-out by two years."

"...It is hoped that the Congress will provide sufficient funds next year to supplement the Trust Fund in order to complete the Interstate System without any material stretch-out time."

**BEAUTIFICATION**

"Beautification: This is a word that has created a lot of excitement among the gentry outside the Highway field. Many look upon it as a big plum which they would like to pick, with no regard to present or future costs."

"This work also disturbs many Highway Administrators because we all believe in more eye appeal, in all things, and want our highways more pleasing to drive on."

"But no two people-highway or otherwise-agree just what constitutes beauty on and off the right of way of our highways."

"All highway officials earnestly want to back President Johnson in his idea to beautify our roads and roadsides, and make a more beautiful America."

"At the previous conference on beautification, the highway people were very much in the minority and were attacked from every side by practically every speaker."

"...Under it, we are to double the number of rest areas on our Interstate routes, and to make our rest areas considerably more elaborate than had been our plan, including sanitary facilities."

"We are also to develop plans for some rest areas on our Primary routes, with some of these also to include sanitary facilities, where justified."

"We are to give considerable emphasis to landscaping on future Federal-aid projects, and to the landscaping of our already-completed Interstate segments."

"The program provides for the purchase of extra right of way for purposes of landscaping, and for scenic overlooks and parking areas where justified."

"We have been further directed to embark upon a program for removing or screening of junkyards, borrow pits, eroded areas, abandoned buildings and other unsightly areas alongside our principal highways."

"Our problems are numerous."

"First, because modern highways, especially the Interstates, are designed to lower the water table, and because the cost of extensive, permanent roadside sprinkler systems would be prohibitive, we must beautify with flora which can survive with little water."

"...Further, safety considerations rule out the location of trees within 30 feet of the pavement edge and roadside planting must be planned and executed with machine maintenance in mind."

"...With regard to the elimination of roadside 'eyesores,' many of these cannot be corrected by Highway Department action alone."

"...So voluntary action by individuals is going to be vital to the ultimate success of our beautification efforts."

#### **AFTER 72 NEEDS**

"After 1972 Needs Study...The present directive for the needs study specifies January 10, 1968, for the information to be submitted which is late. It is hoped that this could be advanced to 1967."

"We are all geared for peak performance, and a sudden drop in our work load would be costly and tragic."

#### **A SMOOTH TRANSITION ESSENTIAL**

"In fact, it could materially affect the entire economy."

"The highway departments, the contractors, the materials suppliers, and the equipment manufacturers have all built up fine organizations which will fall apart if not kept busy, and traffic needs will continue to grow; therefore, the need for additional roads will still be a prime question."

"...The study is not just an exercise in paperwork-one that the highway departments must make only to satisfy requirements of the Bureau of Public Roads."

"It is part and parcel of what each State should have already been doing for itself and if not, ought to initiate immediately."

"...Such a task is big. But it must be done. The Interstate System is a good example of what can be accomplished with adequate planning and a firm financing commitment..."

**SEN. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, W.Va., Public Works.**

#### **HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION AND HIGHWAY SAFETY**

"...I desire to confine my comments to...Highway Beautification and Highway Safety."

"...President Johnson, as you recall, transmitted to our Congress on May the 28th, 1965, four bills...declaring 'And the roads that serve it are not ends in themselves,' as he spoke of our national economy. 'They are meant to serve the real needs of the people of this country and those needs include the opportunity to touch nature and to see beauty as well as rising income and swifter travel. Therefore we must make sure that the massive resources we now devote to roads also serve to improve and broaden the quality of American life.'"

"I introduced the administration's proposal as one measure, Senate 2084,...In the Senate, we gave careful consideration to the testimony presented and, as you know, in Mid-September, we reported an amended bill. This measure, I believe, may effectively resolve most of the issues that were raised by President Shadburn in his presentation."

#### **SHOULD NOT BE FINANCED FROM THE TRUST FUND**

"First, the Senate committee agreed with the position of AASHO, as did also our counterpart committee in the House of Representatives, that this program should not be financed from the Highway Trust Fund especially in the light of the impending deficit of some three billion dollars."

He went on to point out that the penalties and sanctions contained in the original bill for non compliance had been considerably watered down.

**SEN. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Ky.-Senate Public Works Committee.**

#### **INCREASED INTERSTATE COSTS**

"...As you know, the 1965 cost estimate for completing the Interstate System prepared by the States and the Bureau of Public Roads places the total cost at an increase of 5.8 billion over the previous estimate. Action on this cost estimate was postponed by the Congress and funds were authorized for only one year rather than for a two-year period. The report, in fact the legislation, said that Congress reserves the right to accept or reject the cost estimate but I think we'll have to meet this issue and if this increased cost estimate is accepted, it will be necessary to have available in some manner at least \$3 billion in additional revenue to cover the Federal share of the increased cost. I know this is a subject which you know very well and so when I say it's not new to you but three possibilities have been suggested and have been talked about in the Congress and particularly in our committees, on which Representative Cramer sits, as to what can be done about this deficit."

## **OPTIONS**

"One is to supplement the Trust Fund by general appropriation. In fact, last year amendments were offered on the Senate floor to do that, but I would doubt very much if the Congress will supplement the Trust Fund by general appropriation and while I cannot speak for anyone except myself, I would not favor this course. I think it's apparent that with our yearly deficit and with the great deficit which we will have next year because of the cost of the war in Viet Nam which could run to \$12 billion next year if it is not escalated, I just cannot see the Congress supplementing the Trust Fund by general appropriations."

"The second course is to then extend the completion date of the Interstate System and the third is to increase highway user taxes for the Trust Fund...I believe that the Administration has recommended that there could be an extension of the time for the completion of the Interstate System and some increase in user taxes."

"I don't need to tell you that strong opposition is already being expressed against the increase of user taxes..."

He predicted there would be a modest increase in user taxes and an extension of the time for completion. This is the first recorded retreat by the Congress from a firm position of completion of the Interstate by 1972.

**REP. WILLIAM C. CRAMER**, Fla.-Subcommittee on Roads.

## **SWEEPING CHANGES IN PROSPECT**

"...Some of the laws that were enacted during this session of the Congress, some that were not enacted, and the manner in which some of the legislation was handled, give me reason to fear that there may be sweeping changes in prospect for the nature and financing of the Federal-aid highway program and the traditional relationship between the States and the Federal government."

"As you know, highway legislation before the House Committee on Public Works has generally been handled in a bipartisan way. This session of the Congress began in that atmosphere. Shortly after the latest estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate system was submitted to the Congress, the able and respected Chairman of the Roads Subcommittee, Congressman Kluczynski, and I both introduced bills which would have approved the cost estimate for the purpose of apportioning Interstate funds, and would have authorized the appropriation of an additional \$5 billion to meet the increased costs of the Interstate System. Enactment of either of these bills would have provided for the completion of the Interstate System on schedule in 1972.

## **COMPLETION OF THE INTERSTATE BY 75**

"...However, it soon became obvious that the committee on Ways and Means had no plans to act on the bill despite the fact that in many States the highway program was being delayed pending apportionment of additional Federal-aid highway funds. As a result, it was necessary to act upon S.J. Res. 81, a Senate-passed measure which permitted apportionment of federal-aid highway funds authorized for fiscal year 1967 only, but did nothing to provide the additional funds necessary for completion of the Interstate system on schedule by 1972.

This bill was passed by the Congress as a stop-gap measure only, so that the highway program could continue to some degree, at least. If this course is pursued hereafter, the Interstate System will not be completed until 1975."

"We can attribute this lack of action by the Committee on Ways and Means to just one thing: failure of the Administration to provide aggressive leadership or encouragement to keep the Federal-aid highway program on schedule. This is completely unacceptable in view of the fact that completion of the System will result in an annual saving of 8,000 lives and \$11 billion in transportation costs."

## **PARTISAN POLITICS ON BEAUTY**

"I want to turn now to the so-called 'Highway Beautification Act of 1965,' which the Administration insists upon converting into a partisan political issue, despite the long tradition of the House Committee on Public Works to handle highway legislation on a bi-partisan basis. Why this is being done has never been explained."

"...When the first public hearings were held by the House Committee on Public Works on the President's highway beautification proposals in July of this year, it became obvious that there were a number of problems and unanswered questions and that the bills would have to be substantially revised in order to provide for a workable program. In view of this, it was the understanding of the Committee that action on the proposals would be deferred until early next year in order to give the members and the staff of the Committee an opportunity to fully explore the matter. Despite this understanding, a sudden and unexplained decision was made to reopen the hearings on the highway beautification bill in early September. From that time on, the subject was handled on a crash basis, with meetings scheduled both day and night and with the Republican Members being kept completely uninformed as to what arrangements and agreements were being made behind the scenes."

"The President of AASHO, Mr. M.L. Shadburn, and the Executive Secretary of AASHO, Mr. A.E. Johnson, appeared before the Committee and expressed support in principle for the President's program. I think most people favor a workable program to beautify our highways. Certainly most of the members of the Committee on Public Works, on both sides of the aisle, favor this. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that many people who support the program are simply not aware of the details of the President's proposal and the adverse impacts it will have."

He went to great lengths to point out the problems with the original bill and the problems that remained on passage:

"...In the Senate report on the bill, it is stated that:

"It is apparent from the testimony of the Administration and State highway officials that there is no clear and determinate knowledge regarding the impact of the proposed controls on the primary system."

"Aside from the fact that this is a recognition of the poorly conceived legislative proposals of the President, it highlights the fact that the financial burden of the States complying with the provisions of the Act may be substantial. In fact, I think it is entirely possible that some States, after estimating the cost of controlling

outdoor advertising and junkyards as provided in the bill and maintaining such control in the years to come may decide that it is better from an economic standpoint to simply lose a portion of their Federal-aid highway funds."

"...I do not believe that the Secretary of Commerce should be given the kind of authority he is granted under this bill without more adequate guidelines and limitations."

### **CRITICAL OF THE ADMINISTRATION**

"...The President has demonstrated his willingness to use Highway Trust Fund monies for purposes other than the construction of highways. He has done this by his original proposal to finance highway beautification out of the Trust Fund, and his proposal to divert one-third of the funds authorized for the secondary system for landscaping and to build 'scenic highways'- proposals which were rejected by the Congress despite extreme pressure from the White House. He has demonstrated his unwillingness to exercise aggressive leadership in providing additional Highway Trust Fund revenues so that the Interstate System can be completed on schedule. Despite the President's lack of action with regard to providing additional funds for the Interstate System, the Administration has submitted a legislative proposal to establish an additional trust fund to be known as 'the highway beautification trust fund.' This special trust fund would be supported by a portion of the Federal excise taxes on passenger automobiles and trailers, and I am informed that this source of revenue will produce between \$190 and \$200 million each year..."

"...As I stated at the outset, I am deeply and gravely concerned about the future of the Federal-aid highway program...The President's highway beautification proposals were put together by persons not expert in the field of highways, and without consultation with the State highway departments. The bill, as reported, violates the traditional State-Federal relationship in the Federal-aid highway program. Instead of the States initiating matters and submitting proposals to the Secretary for approval, under this bill the Secretary of Commerce will dictate to the States the steps which they will have to take to carry out his concept of highway beautification to avoid losing a substantial part of their Federal-aid highway funds."

"...Whether this bill passes or not may not be determinative of the future of the Federal-aid highway program. But I am fearful that it has already created an atmosphere, a direction, that may be seriously damaging to the program..."

### **Excerpts From the April, 1966 Issue of American Highways.**

**A.E. JOHNSON**, Executive Secretary of AASHO.

The address was to the Mississippi Valley Conference of AASHO in Chicago. He covered a number of subjects:

### **BEAUTIFICATION**

"The White House sponsorship is a very valuable asset that we must not waste, if we are to start on the monumental task of eliminating the growing ugliness along our Nation's highways. Many of you will remember that Federal-aid funds were made available for roadside beautification in the 1930's; however, that program was born out of a period of depression and when the funds available for



highways were grossly inadequate and neither the public, nor the State highway departments, were ready for such a program."

"The present program does have the public support and is born out of a period of affluency and it does have an excellent chance of success. I am concerned, however, with certain aspects of it. As far as the beautification program is concerned, as it relates to the highway right-of-way, I think that the program will be very successful."

"...With regard to the beautification program outside the highway right-of-way lines, it is my opinion that practically everyone is going to be disappointed."

"Those who expect a miracle overnight are going to be disappointed, for the program is to be accomplished over a five-year period. For those who want signs along the highway, there will not be enough. For those who do not want any, there will be too many; and for those who expect all of the junk piles and all of the eyesores connected with industrial layouts to be eliminated are going to be disappointed, for many are permitted to remain."

"One of the worst weaknesses of the program is that there is nothing in the law, or in the program, with respect to the upkeep and appearance of premises adjacent to the highway. The objectives of the beautification program are meritorious and it is up to the State highway departments to overcome legal and other obstacles that stand in the way of it being successful..."

## **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

"...The following assumptions are the basis for the current proposal for a Department of Transportation in the Federal Government:

1. "That in the next 20 years, transportation will double, and in the next 34 years, population will double and traffic will quadruple in the United States, and at that time 80% of our population will be residing in our urban centers."
2. "That highways cannot do the job, and it is time to take a revolutionary approach at planning a balanced transportation system and program, and a national transportation policy to set out the Federal Government's interest and participation in the matter of transportation."

"Under this concept, certain roles would be assigned to various transportation forms to create a balanced, integrated, efficient transportation system, and it appears that from the revolutionary approach, and not the evolutionary, that is being proposed, the matter of the public's desires or convenience may not be a dominant factor. On this basis, it would be a cold determination left up mainly to some transportation people from industry and universities, mainly with a background in regulated transportation forms or teaching careers."

"There have been some rumors and reports that have concerned highway people and these are as follows:"

1. "That there will no longer be highway programs, by themselves, but that the highway program will be a part of an overall transportation program, with an appropriate role assigned to highways and not a highway program based on highway needs studies as we know them."

2. "That transportation will be planned on the basis of the financial investment return criteria."
3. "That transportation funds will be pooled and will be used as various transportation forms might need them to fulfill their assigned roles in a national transportation policy."
4. "That highway officials are not going to have much to say about the future Federal-aid highway programs."

"We hope that these reports are not entirely correct, but we have heard them from several sources in various forms."

## **NORTHEAST CORRIDOR**

He described the Northeast Corridor program and some of the radical thinking and technology possibilities being considered there, including a tunnel from Washington to Boston as an example of what was in the wind.

## **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

"The expected increase in population and transportation, the expansion of our metropolitan areas, and the research and development proposals for the Northeast Corridor, constitute the main motivation for the current White House proposal for a Department of Transportation in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government."

"This new Department would gather in the rather fragmented transportation interests and activities of the Federal Government which is now spread over 35 different agencies and operations. It would make sense that such a Department should be given favorable consideration, however, too much latitude should not be left to the transportation planners within that Department, or to executive discretion."

"The Congress should continue to have the authority to approve and authorize programs that might be developed by such a Department."

## **RESERVATIONS**

"There is some concern that the draft legislation would allow national transportation policies, systems and programs to be planned on the financial investment return concept without much thought to the public's desires as to mode of transportation or to the public convenience. They seem to take the approach we must go for efficiency and planned, integrated systems on a revolutionary basis, instead of allowing the public to solve these things on an evolutionary basis. It is assumed that time is too short to allow the public to make the decisions."

"It is the AASHO position that the proper role of highways in the balanced transportation system should be based on supported factual highway needs, and not on some administratively determined role, which might arbitrarily subordinate highways and divert highway revenues to artificially fertilize the growth of some other transportation form."

"It would appear also that in the transportation councils of the Department, outstanding highway Administrators should be included in the make-up of any advisory committees that might be used."

"It would also appear that because of the magnitude and importance of highway transportation, that the man who heads the Federal Bureau of Public Roads should have easy access to the Secretary of the Department without having to go through intermediate administrative levels, and that he should continue to be a Presidential appointee, and be an outstanding highway administrator-engineer who has a good background in, and knowledge of, the Federal-aid highway program, and who is well known to, and respected by, the State highway departments. We believe this is important because of the cooperative nature of the Federal-aid highway program."

"There seems to be a growing tendency that in cooperative programs there be more Federal Government influence in the planning and administering, even though they are still called a partnership venture. We want to be sure that such things are in perspective and the partnership does not become that of the 'master' and the 'slave'."

"The reasons for more unilateral planning and the application of the 'big stick' penalty, such as the withholding of Federal funds in certain situations, are laid to alleged inconsistencies in the practices of the States' apathy or stubbornness, unresponsiveness to needs and changes, or that the States are in a rut or that pressure must be applied to change archaic practices and laws."

"We indeed have a mobile public in the United States in this day and time and it will continue to be more so. Indefensible inconsistencies from State to State in things that affect the public interest and irritate the public must be corrected at the State level or there will be more and more Federal influence exerted."

## **TRAFFIC SAFETY**

He said that the highway fatality rate in 1925 was 17.5 per hundred million miles. It bottomed in 1962 at 5.2 and began to climb again. Why? He said that the highway departments were open to criticism in building unsafe signs and guard rail and so on but were beginning to see the light. He advocated much more research in driver behavior and training and enforcement and said that the highway departments must take the lead in that.

## **WHAT IS IN THE FUTURE?**

"One of the major concerns of all State highway departments, at this time, is what will happen after the completion of the presently authorized Interstate highway program. There are some strongly supported proposals that the next highway program be another big Interstate program..."

## **TWO VIEWS**

"There seems to be emerging two completely different philosophies on Capitol Hill as to what the future Federal program is to be. Both have powerful sponsors. One is that starting with the submission of the 1968 Highway Needs Report, that we should merge into and continue with a highway program without any

interruption of any kind and that the program would be along the lines of the present operation with maybe some slight modifications."

"The other philosophy would be that the Federal Government exert more influence and do most of the planning with highway programs being developed on a regional basis, each customized to what might be determined as the major highway needs of the particular area, based on Congressional hearings and staff work aided by consultants."

"In other words, a highway program based on a series of regional programs similar to Appalachia..."

He encouraged the States to go all out in preparing the 68 needs report and outlined some of his own views of the future. He saw an increasing need for urban programs but not too many freeways. He saw a great future for joint development and even exclusive truckways. He saw a need for an urban primary system based on classification instead of merely extensions of the rural primary. He saw increased attention to off-street parking and to traffic control programs.

"It is hoped that the 1968 Congressional Report on highway needs and a recommended program will be one cooperatively developed by the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments, and one that AASHO can jointly support with the National Administration, and I know of no reason why such cannot be the case."

"If, however, for any reason, we find that it cannot be done, the State highway departments, through AASHO, should prepare their own, and have no hesitancy in presenting it directly to Congress."

**NOTE:** AASHO presented its own reports and recommendations directly to the Congress beginning in 1967.

"...Give thought to the changing scene and the transportation transformation that is taking place...Above all, hold on to the proper role of the States in the highway program."

"This arrangement is unique in the United States, for in the rest of the world, most of the highways are under Federal control."

### **Excerpts From the October 1966 Issue of American Highways.**

#### **THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1966**

The Act, approved Sept. 13, 1966, was printed in its entirety. It revised the authorizations for the Interstate System in line with the revised cost estimates.

For the first time, the Congress recognized that the Interstate would not be completed by 1972 by extending the completion date one year.

Highway Beautification was mentioned but it was made clear that Trust Fund monies were not available for paying for it.

#### **THE HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1966**

It was passed on Sept. 9, 1966.

### **THE NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND SAFETY ACT OF 1966**

Passed on Sept. 9, 1966. It dealt with the motor vehicle Safety Standards, Tire Safety, Accident and Injury Research and Test Facility and the National Driver Register.

### **THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT**

Passed on October 15, 1966.

### **EDITORIAL**

"The State Highway Departments in Urban America"

This was a thoughtful piece on how the highway departments must learn to deal with the complexities of urban America. It reviewed the criticisms that had been leveled at the highway departments going back to the Hartford Conference in 1957. It was at that conference that Lewis Mumford threw down the gauntlet that the urban Interstate should not be built unless and until it was derivative to comprehensive urban plans.

The editorial reviewed the Sagamore conference in 1958 and the recommendations that came out of that. It then moved to the Williamsburg Conference held in 1966 in which objectives and "Resolves" for the urban transportation planning process were spelled out.

The editorial was silent on the passage of the "3 C" planning process requirements in the 1962 Highway act and the deadline for its implementation in 1965, which is surprising in view of the thoroughness of the review.

### **A NEW ROLE FOR HUD**

"Recently (August 11, 1966) the President of the United States, by Executive Order, took action to give the initiative in insuring better coordination at the Federal level to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development."

"While the order does not alter the responsibilities of the several Federal agencies or the State highway departments, it does fix the responsibility of taking the initiative in coordinating Federal programs in urban areas."

"The State highway departments must not allow any of their urban responsibilities to become a void to be filled by the next higher level of government or for a clamor to arise that a city-Federal arrangement take over State highway responsibilities in urban areas."

Though not said, there was concern that the new Federal DOT, the new HUD, and the Administration would use the plethora of new legislation just passed to drastically alter the Federal-State partnership.

**Excerpts From the January, 1967 Issue of American Highways-The Record of the 52nd Annual Meeting Held on 11/29/66.**

**C.E.SHUMATE**, Col., The President's Address.

### **PROGRAM CUTBACKS**

"...We are all cognizant of the serious financial problems present in the progress of the Interstate System."

"While not totally unexpected, the cut-back a few days ago in the Federal fund apportionment to the States most certainly will have a serious effect on the nation's highway planning and development."

"We, as highway officials, are fully aware of the tremendous financial demands being placed on the Federal budget by the Viet Nam conflict and other obligations. We are also fully cognizant of the apparent need to slow down our so-called 'overheated economy'."

### **URBAN HIGHWAY CONGESTION**

"...The results of studies now under way, or completed in practically all the States, are pointing out even more forcibly than before, the major need for expanded and new highway transport facilities in our urban areas."

"...The subject of mass transit is one which is being given serious consideration in many areas of the United States."

"Your Association has never voiced opposition to mass transit, whether it be by surface rail, subway or rubber tire on the street and highway system."

"In fact, in many areas of our country the individual States are working closely in cooperation with others in an attempt to coordinate the various forms of transit. Your Association supports this cooperative effort to the utmost."

"We do feel, however, that any form of transport should stand on its own merits and capabilities. We do not believe that the highway users who pay for the construction and maintenance of the highways of the nation should be called upon to support other modes of transportation."

### **THE U.S. DOT**

"...In the closing days of the last Congress the Cabinet Post of Transportation was adopted."

"In the hearings before the committee your Association supported the creation of the Department of Transportation..."

"We did, however, vigorously oppose one provision of the original legislation creating the Department..."

"As we understood, this particular provision...the highway user taxes collected at the Federal level could have been placed in serious jeopardy."

"Our interpretation of this particular section of the Bill indicated that it would have been possible for an administrative decision to be made which would permit those Federal user taxes to be diverted to those forms of transportation other than streets and highways."

"...Another phase of the proposed transportation bill with which we were concerned was that which dealt with the status of the Bureau of Public Roads in the new Department."

"We pointed out that the 45-year State and Federal partnership which had created the greatest highway system in the world was still a viable progressive partnership and should not be altered."

"A review of the recently published staffing pattern of the new Department of Transportation indicates that our recommendations were accepted..."

**ALAN S. BOYD**, Under Secretary of Commerce.

### **THE NEW DOT**

"...the Department will bring together most of the scattered Federal agencies which have been dealing for years with various aspects of transportation on a compartmented basis. The Department's creation reflects an awareness throughout the government, the industry and the Nation that our transportation problems have outgrown the fragmented approach which we have relied upon in the past. While the program-oriented organization has given us some remarkable accomplishments when viewed primarily from a modal standpoint, it clearly has failed organizationally, administratively and from the program standpoint to develop the kind of systems approach to transportation that our future needs demand."

"...As you know, the Federal Highway Administration will include the Bureau of Public Roads and the newly created National Highway Safety Agency, which was recently established...The inclusion of the traffic safety program in the Federal Highway Administration represents a reorganization to accommodate expanded highway functions and new responsibilities, somewhat similar to the creation of the Office of Highway Safety in the Bureau of Public Roads a few years ago."

### **THE DUTIES**

"...It will...be the duty of the Department to study transportation systems, develop new information and knowledge, and make recommendations to the Congress. In this task, as I have indicated, the Department must take the broad view. It must think beyond the narrow limits of a particular mode and focus the efforts of all interests on our common goals, which are greater efficiency and economy in transportation generally and coordination of entire transportation systems- and all this within the context of economic and social policies."

"...The Federal-aid highway program is characterized by:

1. its dedication to the continuous, systematic improvement of the highway plant;

2. its well-established tradition of Federal-State cooperation in administering an aid program;
3. its reliance on user charges to finance the Federal investment; and
4. its responsiveness to change, both technological and social."

## **HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS PIONEERED IN PLANNING**

"...One of the outstanding contributions of the highway program has been its pioneer work in the field of transportation planning..."

"...This early effort paved the way for the planning and now the construction of the Interstate Highway System. Later it led to the establishment of the urban transportation planning process in some 230 urban areas...Certainly, never before have...elected officials been brought face to face with planning. And since the very first step in the planning process is the determination or estimate of future land use in each individual community, the requirement for joint planning for transportation is bound to have a far-reaching effect on general planning in metropolitan areas, since land use is the basis of all planning."

"Now, drawing on these years of highway planning experience, we are going to undertake the planning of our total transportation system. This is really the heart of the Department of Transportation program."

"...Within the past week you have been informed by the Bureau of Public Roads that the Federal-aid highway program is being limited to \$3.3 billion in total project obligations during fiscal year 1967. This is \$700 million less than the nearly \$4 billion obligated in fiscal '66."

"...I would remind you that inflation is a very real problem for State highway departments, and each of you has a stake in holding it in check..."

**REP. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, III.**, Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads.

The speech was delivered by Mrs. Audry Warren, Staff, House Committee on Public Works.

## **OUR PRIORITIES**

"...I am worried about the validity of our priorities as a nation..."

"...We have several major policy problems to deal with in the coming two years...There will be review of the proposed regulations under the Highway Beautification Act...The handling of relocation problems...If we fail to act wisely and affirmatively on this problem, we could very well doom highway construction and a balanced transportation system in our dense urban centers. There is the urgent need to arrive at an early and reasonable method of financing advance acquisition of rights of way. One way or another we must resolve the problems arising from our toll roads and bridges. There are safety, future highway programming, and the multiple problems of the cities."

"...All of these programs are important, and all of them demand your immediate and continuing attention. I would like to discuss, particularly, three of them, safety, future highway programming, and the cities."



## **SAFETY**

"...It is, I know, a great temptation to put as much money as possible into some aspect of the safety program that, from a publicity standpoint, will 'look good' immediately. It's an enticing trap. Please don't fall into it. Build first and with all possible speed the tool we need the most- an accident reporting system that will tell you what's really happening out there, and how, and why. Then you will be able the more rapidly to do something about it."

## **FUTURE HIGHWAY PROGRAMS**

"...About a year from now the Public Works Committee expects to receive your recommendations on highway needs for the future. In making those recommendations, I would ask you to bear in mind that from conception to completion, it will have taken us 34 years to get the Interstate System, 17 years to get it approved and 17 more, at least, to build it..."

"No matter how hard we work, there will be some lag between the time you submit your report and the time a program is approved. Thus, it is all the more important that the 1968 report be a truly comprehensive presentation of what it will take to serve potential new areas, older areas where we must be prepared to reconstruct thousands of miles to safe and more useful standards..., and urban areas where we must...solve the problems of what highways and where, but at the same time...relocation, housing, congestion, and coordinated transport. Repeatedly we in the Congress have heard rumblings that the 1968 report is going to be superficial; words to meet the deadline and not much more. As the Chairman of the Subcommittee which will receive that report, let me suggest that if the rumors are true, 1968 may turn out to be an unusually interesting year, because as far as I am concerned, if we can't get the kind of report we need through the present processes, we may very well undertake to get it ourselves, State by State, city by city, in Room 2167 in the Rayburn Building."

"In arriving at your report on highway needs, you have an excellent opportunity to put comprehensive planning into action. The cities and counties must inevitably become truly active members of our Federal-State partnership in highway planning and construction. Now is certainly the time to bring them fully in, if they aren't already there. And that brings me to the problem of the cities."

## **CITIES**

"You have been urged to become more and more directly involved in comprehensive community planning, and you have certainly done so...Books and magazine articles and studies and committees and commissions are pouring forth floods...We are impressed with 'in depth analysis,' and...I'm beginning to feel that the only deep thing we get from it is deep stacks of paper...no given plan is ever put into action...Communication is a very desirable thing, but there does come a time when talk must end and action begin...As regards the cities, right now we seem to be in the continuing process of talking it to death."

"I have lived all my life in a great city. Living in the city has been and can still be exciting, but at the rate we are going, the excitement will shortly become hysteria. We cannot go on stacking more and more human beings on top of each other in ever more compressed city areas. If we do, they will eventually cease to be human beings, simply because it will be physically and financially impossible to

provide them with the facilities and services and protections that are essential to civilized living."

"I have become convinced that in trying to deal with the problems of the cities we have persistently started from the false premise that there is something sacred about the city structure, particularly the so-called inner city structure, that it must not only be sustained but that it must keep growing to ever greater and greater heights-heights of buildings, heights of numbers of people, heights of industry, heights of profit, heights of culture. If there is anything to be had, apparently the inner city must have it, in large quantities. As a consequence, we are expending mammoth amounts of time and energy and money trying to find ways to make these masses of men and material habitable, beautiful, mobile, profitable, workable, and controllable. We wind up talking wistfully about a scientifically created automated life."

### **SKEPTICAL**

"...Americans aren't going to allow themselves to be trapped indefinitely in increasingly congested, noisy, strangling, ill-serviced cities, and they aren't going to allow anyone to turn them into robots who move around when and where and how they're told, and they aren't going to give up their cars. We would be foolish to expect it, and even more foolish to want it. So let's talk about realities, about people and space for people and development of the space."

"It makes no sense to me that most of our population growth now takes place in 20 metropolitan areas which occupy only 1.4 percent of the nation's land. Our problem is not how to jam more people into the cities; it actually is how to get some of the people out of them. There is plenty of space for development in this country. The critical factor in bringing about its rational use is a diversified transportation system that will link new areas to the older areas with speed and comfort and convenience."

"In the long run, I believe the old inner cities would benefit from such an approach. They have assets it would take decades to duplicate in newer communities, if it could be done at all. They are already industrial, transport and cultural centers, so the newer communities will always be dependent upon them. But they will have to learn to be content with the amount of industry they can handle on a tenable basis, and a population that can live with some measure of decency and safety."

### **WHAT MUST BE DONE**

"How will they learn? The States will have to teach them. The State governments will have to use the legal powers they have and the strength available to them, or abdicate both the power and the strength to the cities and to regional coalitions of counties."

"State industrial development boards, instead of trying to entice more and more new industry into the cities, will have to start concentrating on rebuilding only so much as the city can reasonably handle, and putting the new industry into the other 98 percent of the countryside, where there is room to build the plants, and the homes, and the schools, and the service industries and facilities, and where the quantities won't be so unmanageable that the financial structure can't

possibly support the policemen and teachers and firemen and hospitals and other service and protection systems that our people must have."

"...Central city planners will have to accept the fact that all their face-lifting will be in vain unless they come to agreement on a transport system sufficiently varied to be acceptable to the people whose talent, labor and money they seek."

"Highway planners will have to be transportation planners, accepting the fact that meeting our transportation needs can no longer be accomplished only by building more and more miles of running space for cars. We will need that, but we will also need specially constructed running space exclusively for specially designed express bus systems, sometimes covering fairly long runs. We will need subway or other transit systems, dovetailed with our traditional highway systems and bus systems. We will need parking facilities at terminal points along the way and in the inner city areas. And we must plan to have adequate highways when the new communities are developed, not ten years later when the agonies of relocation are already built in."

### **URBAN RESPONSIBILITIES MUST REST WITH STATES**

"It is with the State governments that responsibility must rest, for it is in the hands of the State governments that the unfragmented power to act resides. I think we have the laws on the books and the decisions from the courts to make this approach feasible. Virtually every power that local government has, it derives from the State. If scattered local power will not come together voluntarily, State power will have to bring it together. Not sometime in the future, after we've talked away some more years, and spent our substance on too many projects directed more to drama and history than to people, but now."

"And therein lies the question of our national priorities. If the States, acting in concert with their local government units, must grasp the reins of decision and action, then the Federal Government, which reaps the lion's share of the taxes, must invest the lion's share of the cost."

"...I do believe that it ill becomes us to pronounce the urgency of programs for the rehabilitation of our cities, or the expansion of our educational systems, or highway safety or good road construction, or water pollution control, or air pollution control, and then proceed to finance those vital programs with so little actual money that nothing constructive can possibly be accomplished."

### **WE MUST MAKE CHOICES**

"Obviously, we cannot finance everything and everyone everywhere at the same time. If our military and our international positions preclude our financing much of anything at home, then let us say so clearly and without equivocation. The American people never have failed to meet that situation before, and there is no reason to doubt our willingness and ability to do so now."

"But if our position permits us to make choices, then surely we should have the courage to make them in the greater long-term public interest at every level of government. If we do, it seems to me the possibilities for individual and collective enrichment all across this land are almost endless. If we don't, our descendents will probably conclude that while we may have been geniuses, we were also cowards."

## **THE AFTER 72 REPORT**

"To the end that we may not be so regarded, I hope that you will sustain and expand the best in your long and splendid record of highway development. I hope you will be first, if necessary, to insist that plans for future development in your State represents a synthesis of the expert views from the many disciplines which today's problems demand. And in submitting your recommendations to the Congress, I hope you will bring us an uncompromised report. If we have the advantage of starting from a base that represents your best, we will have a much better chance of ultimately getting both good programs and the money to back them up."

**REX M. WHITTON**, Federal Highway Administrator.

He spoke about the tremendous changes to the highway program just during his tenure as being far more than the rest of the 50 years of the program combined. He then looked ahead with the admonition that "you ain't seen nothin yet". He stressed the urban transportation problems, joint development, and traffic management strategies. He predicted expansion of the urban primary and express bus programs. He stressed that something would have to be done to provide assistance for off-street parking to successfully deal with the urban problem. He gave no hint of his impending resignation.

**RESIGNATION OF WHITTON, Dec. 30, 1966.**

**BRIDWELL APPOINTED FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR BY LBJ 1/17/67.**

**F.C. TURNER NOMINATED TO BE DIRECTOR OF BPR 1/17/67.**

**Excerpts From the January 1968 Issue of American Highways-The Record of the 53rd Annual Meeting- Oct.16,1967.**

**E.M. JOHNSON**, Miss.,The President's Annual Address.

## **CONGRESS' VIEW OF THE PARTNERSHIP IN 1915**

"...It seems appropriate at this point to review some of the original concepts of Federal Aid for highways. Excerpts from a document of the 63rd Congress, House of Representatives, entitled, 'Federal Aid to Good Roads-Report of the Joint Committee on Federal Aid in the Construction of Post Roads' dated January 21, 1915, ably express the concerns and goals of the Congress as follows:

'Federal aid to good roads will accomplish several of the objects indicated by the framers of the Constitution-establish post roads, regulate commerce, provide for the common defense, and promote the general welfare. Above all, it will promote the general welfare.'

'Systematic efforts and cooperation of Nation, States and counties will make American highways the best in the world, bring remote agricultural lands within practicable hauling distance from railroads, materially raise the value of farm property, enhance the margin of profit on farm products, vastly increase the average standard of rural education, make the motor truck an economical vehicle for American farmers, lighten the labors of American horses, save wear and tear on harness and wagons, and add to the comfort and happiness of all rural residents.'

'That Congress should avoid criticism of the character above mentioned is no more important than that it should make careful provision for such administration

of the Federal Highway participation as will protect the several States in their right to control their local highway affairs and guard against dictatorship from a Federal bureau in Washington.'

'To make State highway commissions or State highway engineers subservient to a Federal bureau would be disastrous. It would stifle initiative, discourage original research, and cause all State highway officials to await the action of the Federal authority.'

'Instead of establishing one Federal bureau with all others subservient to it we should encourage the highway commission of each State to surpass, if possible, the Federal bureau itself in the efficiency of its work and the excellence of its accomplishments. The desideratum is cooperation between the highway officials of the several States and of the Federal Government and not subserviency of one to the other.'

The rest of his speech was essentially viewing with alarm the recent highway legislation dealing with everything from safety to beautification and the formation of DOT.

**SEN. JENNINGS RANDOLPH**, W. Va., Chairman, Public Works Committee.

#### **THE VIEWS OF CONGRESS IN 1956**

"...When the program to construct the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways was enacted in 1956, Congress enunciated the following policy: 'It is hereby declared that the prompt and early completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways,..., is essential to the national interest and is one of the most important objectives of this Act. It is the intent of Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over the period of availability of the thirteen years' appropriations authorized..., and that the entire System in all States be brought to simultaneous completion. Insofar as possible in consonance with this objective, existing highways located on an interstate route shall be used to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable, and feasible, it being the intent that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce.'"

"A number of goals are clearly stated in this policy declaration but as the program has progressed, it has become apparent that they are not necessarily compatible. I believe that by and large Federal and State officials have done their best to accommodate these sometimes conflicting objectives."

"For example, the 'prompt and early completion' of the system is receding farther and farther over the horizon. I remind you only for the purpose of setting the context, that as originally envisioned, this program was to be completed at a cost of \$27 billion. We now know that the program will cost in the neighborhood of \$50 billion. While we expected that the work would be accomplished over a 13-year period, evidence now points to a construction period more closely approximating 18 or 19 years."

#### **THE GREATEST PROBLEM**

"The policy declaration which has caused the greatest problems, however, is the requirement that insofar as possible local needs be given equal consideration."

"The urban portions of the Interstate System are a vital link in our national network...however, these segments which represent one-half of the effort as far as money is concerned and one-half of the traffic expected to be carried, comprise only 15% of the total miles. Judging from the news stories and editorial comments concerning the controversy surrounding the urban portions of the Interstate System, they seem to represent far more than their share of the unhappiness caused by the implementation of the program."

#### **THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S VIEW**

"On August 24, 1967, the Comptroller General of the United States filed a report with the Congress dealing with the Interstate Highway Program in major metropolitan areas. The first paragraph of his covering letter states, 'As the accompanying report on our examination discloses, timely and economical completion of the Interstate Highway System may be hindered by unresolved route location and design problems for segments in major metropolitan areas.' Comptroller General Staats goes on to say that the cause of this situation stems from an inability of Federal, State and local officials to reach agreement on suitable specific route locations or design features."

"We are all aware of the outspoken opposition to highway locations which has been encountered in connection with various urban segments of the Interstate System."

#### **THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL VIEWS**

"The Senate Committee on Public Works is very much concerned that such opposition, much of which may well be justified, will create an intolerable situation and cause the failure of this important public works program. The importance of giving consideration to local views on highway location has been recognized by the Congress. The Congress has enacted provisions of Title 23 designed to enable communities affected by highway construction to give voice to their views. Section 128 requires a public hearing for any Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of or the going-through any city, town or village. Section 134, enacted in 1962, requires the development of continuing comprehensive transportation planning carried on cooperatively by State and local communities."

#### **IS THE SPIRIT BEING FOLLOWED?**

"Federal approval of projects is conditioned on each of these requirements being met. While I have no doubt that those responsible for administering our highway program have lived up to the letter of the law, there exists serious doubt that the spirit of these provisions has been given its due regard."

"...Our Nation is not the same demographically as it was in 1947 when the system was first begun. It is not even close to what it was in 1956 when the program was accelerated. The most profound social and economic changes that our Country has experienced in the past 100 years have taken place in the last two decades. Our economy today has soared beyond the expectation of the most optimistic post World War II forecasters. These changes have had their effect

and their impact on the highway program. We have been subjected to substantial increases in the cost of construction. The competition for materials and men and money from other public programs and from private efforts has intensified. But most importantly, we have only recently come to the full awareness of the impact of highways themselves."

### **HIGHWAYS ARE A CATALYST**

"The highway is a catalyst, changing all it touches. This is true in rural America as well as urban America, but the urban highway, by reason of the density of the population and the concentration of economic and social values, has a far greater effect on the environment of the city."

"We have reached that point in time when we must carefully examine the processes of highway planning to insure that meaningful account is taken of the social, economic, ecologic, demographic and other factors which constitute the total environment and life of the city."

"Following the urban riots this summer, investigators seeking the why's and wherefore's of these great catastrophes found that highway construction in the core city was a serious point of complaint. Among those factors which most disturb the residents of the ghetto are urban renewal and freeway construction. The highway portion of this complaint must in part relate to the method by which the public hearings requirement of Section 128 has been met. It must also, of necessity, relate to the way in which the comprehensive transportation planning provision of Section 134 has been implemented. Again, without ascribing fault, it is time to review how projects are being done and why they are being done that way. We must know if we are really affording people the opportunity to be heard and have their views considered or whether we are merely going through the motions of listening to their complaints, comments, and criticisms. It is their city through which the highway is to be built. The full range of their interests must be understood and served if we are to give local needs the equal consideration which the law requires."

### **GREATER LOCAL INVOLVEMENT IS NECESSARY**

"...It is more and more apparent that greater local involvement in decision making is necessary, that local officials must assume their share of the burden."

"...we are faced with the necessity at this time of reexamining our approach to the highway's impact on urban growth and its stake in urban planning and urban transportation policy."

### **HEARINGS TO BE HELD**

"To this end, the Committee on Public Works will open a series of policy review hearings during the month of November. Starting on Tuesday, November 14, we will begin a general investigation relating to the opportunity and problems of highway transportation in urban areas."

"...One of the questions which must be examined is the adequacy of existing Federal-aid requirements..."

He stressed that the urban planning process would be carefully investigated.

**REP. GEORGE H. FALLON**, Md. Chairman, Public Works Committee.

### **AASHO REPORTS TO CONGRESS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION**

"...AASHO's Special Committee on a Continuing Highway Program appeared before the House Public Works Committee on June 7 to present its preliminary report to us. This presentation was made in executive session, but the material presented was of such great interest that we agreed that the hearing record should be published and made a matter of public information. I assume that all of you are familiar with the preliminary report and that many of you have read the House Committee Hearing Record, which includes the questioning and colloquy."

"...As you know, the Administration's report on future highway needs is scheduled for submission to Congress in January."

"...Spokesmen for the Department of Transportation have stated repeatedly that we must have a continuing highway program at least as large as the present program for at least the next 20 years in order to keep pace with the growing demands of highway traffic in this country."

### **PUZZLED BY THE CUTBACKS**

"...This brings us directly to the puzzle of the cutback."

"...It is very hard for me to understand how we can consider a proposal to reduce the highway program by one-half, or even by 25 percent..."

"...Last November, you will recall, the announcement of the cutback made prominent reference to the war in Vietnam and the importance of deferring domestic programs which might detract from our effectiveness there. There was also a reference to inflationary pressures in the economy which might be reduced by deferring some Federal spending programs."

### **INFLATION**

"...Then, at last the Administration's position emerged. It became evident that the cutback was made (and here I quote the statement of the Federal Highway Administrator) 'for the purpose of reducing inflationary pressures at a time when there was virtually full employment, when construction equipment purchase prices were at an all time high and rising, when the average number of contractors was decreasing, and finally, at a time when the construction price index for highway construction work had increased at an abnormal rate for three successive quarters.'"

"It was related, in other words, to an Administration finding that there had been abnormal inflation in the highway construction industry over a nine-month period. The relationship to the total economic picture and the military situation in Vietnam was quite indirect."

He thought the Administration was quite discriminatory in singling out the highway program for cutbacks.



## **BOYD ASKS THE GOVERNORS**

"...In his October 8 telegram to the Governors of the 50 States, Secretary Boyd said, 'It is my desire to receive from you as rapidly as possible your comments as to the impact this will have upon the programs of your State as well as on your economy.'"

"...I assume that all of the State highway departments have consulted with their respective Governors and have provided information on the impact of a cutback. If you have not done so, you should do so at once..."

**REP. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, III.**, Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads.

## **A FREEZE**

"...Last year we were facing a 'freeze' on highway funds when you met. This year we're facing the prospect of one. We've been told this year's proposed ceiling is to meet the Congressional demands for economy, so that the federal deficit will be less. It makes great newspaper copy, but the plain fact is that cutting highway construction funds won't improve the federal deficit situation by a single dime."

"We are also told, as we were told last year, that this proposed ceiling is to combat inflation. I have some doubts about how effective it is likely to be on a short term basis, and I am sure that over the long haul, it would be pretty poor business..."

## **ILLEGAL**

"...It is also my personal opinion, for whatever it's worth, that these freezes, ceilings, or whatever, are illegal. The law says quite clearly that these funds shall be made available to the States. It doesn't seem ambiguous or discretionary to me, and it never has."

## **HEARINGS ON FUTURE HIGHWAY NEEDS**

"...You will recall that in my message last year I said that if the official highway needs study report wasn't going to be adequate, the Subcommittee on Roads would get the information it needs direct from you. I am confident that I am not being in the least premature in announcing now, so that everybody will have plenty of time to get ready, that as early as possible in January, the committee will begin full-scale hearings on what the future highway needs are going to be, on what's creating all the trouble with the highway programs in the cities and what can be done about it, on relocation policies, on corridor development, and what it's all going to cost and where the money is going to come from..."

## **Excerpts From the October 1968 Issue of American Highways. AASHO REPORTS TO CONGRESS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION IN 67**

The complete title was "A Preliminary Presentation of the AASHO Special Committee for Planning a Continuing Federal-Aid Highway Program-1967."

"Before the Senate Public Works Committee June 5, 1967-Before the House Public Works Committee June 7, 1967."

This activity was carried out in secrecy. There was no indication that this activity was going on within AASHO and the presentation here documented was made in executive session in the Congress in 1967, over a year before being published in American Highways. The reason for the direct reporting to Congress was undoubtedly attributable to the uncertainty of both AASHO and the Congressional committees as to whether the new Department of Transportation would reliably represent the AASHO point of view and policies. Two reports were documented in this same issue of American Highways, the first was given to the Congress in 1967 and the second, labeled a progress report, in 1968. The proposals were for a post- Interstate program:

"Three years ago it was decided by the American Association of State Highway Officials that it was a proper time to give serious consideration to developing a continuing Federal-aid program recommendation for the consideration of the Congress, if the Congress was to have adequate time to consider the matter and to take action in time to assure continuity in highway development without interruption."

It is clear that the biggest problem on the AASHO members minds was to insure that the highway program continue at the current or greater level without interruption after completion of the Interstate and that was the principal reason for the report. That theme recurs throughout.

"We believe that it is academic and indisputable that highway improvement and the role of highways in any so-called balanced total transportation system must be based on documented highway needs and upon the public's desires in regard to transportation."

*"We do not believe that highway development can be based on some arbitrarily assigned role of highways in relation to total transportation as developed solely by a theoretical financial investment return concept which would artificially retard highway transportation and artificially fertilize other modes."* This statement was obviously an expression of apprehension about rumors of how the new Federal DOT would operate when it was formed. They noted that AASHO had embarked on a \$285,000 research program to sample all levels of society and the economy to find out what the public preferences were. The research was being done through the Highway Research Board (the NCHRP program).

## **CONCERN ABOUT THE NEW U.S. DOT**

"...Under the new Department of Transportation, it is not clear to us exactly in what manner Federal highway program recommendations are to be developed, or whether or not the State highway department officials will be consulted or be asked to serve in an advisory capacity."

"At the present time, it appears that the State highway departments will not be asked to work with the Federal officials; in fact, we are concerned that the job is apparently in the hands of non-highway policy people and that the experienced highway people in the Federal Government will be in more the operating role than in policy and planning."

"We have some concern that the concept of pooling transportation funds may be involved."

## **DISTRUST OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO SPEAK FOR THEM**

"It would appear, therefore, that in all probability two different highway program recommendations will be coming to the Congress. This could be beneficial, inasmuch as you would have two separate viewpoints for consideration in developing the next program."

"...It is our opinion that the Federal Government should continue its highway activities, which is the expression of the Federal interest in highway transportation, in the form of Federal-aid to the States. The program must continue to be handled in the same cooperative manner that has been so outstandingly productive for the past 50 years."

They noted that they had been working on the project internally for three years. "Before we are completed with our assignment, we expect to consult with an advisory committee made up of officials of local governments as well as an advisory committee made up of appropriate highway user and industry representatives, who can give completely objective and constructive advice to us."

"After today's appearance, it is our plan to report to you early in 1968, on the public preference research project, and to bring to you, in more complete form, our thinking on the next highway program."

"Early in 1969, we hope to bring to you our final package for your consideration..."

"...From analysis of the States' questionnaires and the needs brochures (individual State reports), it appears that there is need to add some modest mileage to the present Interstate System and to upgrade some of the sections of that system."

## **GREATEST NEEDS ARE IN URBAN AREAS**

"However, the greatest needs of the next program are brought on by the continuing urbanization of our cities and expanding suburbia..."

"...Inasmuch as funds are not currently in sight to complete the Interstate program by June 30, 1973, the only logical assumption is that the program will be completed by a stretchout of the Trust Fund and its financing." This was the first real admission that the Interstate would not be finished as scheduled.

"...Based on an analysis of the States' questionnaires and other pertinent information and a review of the possible financing during the 1975 to 1984, inclusive, ten-year period, the committee has developed a tentative and preliminary program outline, based on current information and thinking."

## **WILL REPORT EVERY TWO YEARS**

"The State highway departments feel that they would like to have some congressional statement of intent that the 10-year program will be a continuous one. However, they would like to make periodic progress reports to the Congress and justify continuing authorization on a biennial basis."

## **THE PROPOSALS**

Their tentative proposal was a \$54 billion program (Federal share) for the ten years ending in 1984. The State matching was \$18 billion. The ABC match would be 1/3 State and 2/3 Federal. They spoke of the rapidly rising Federal requirements and threats of penalties. "If the threat of penalties continues and more complications are introduced, it might cause a reappraisal of the desirability of Federal aid in our highway programs, especially in some of our larger States."

The proposal called for the continuation of the Trust Fund, transfer of the Forest Highway and Public Lands program to the Trust Fund, ten percent of the program to be devoted to limited additions to the Interstate at 90-10, a new urban system to be selected cooperatively by the States and the urban areas involved funded at 30 percent of the program, 40 percent to go to the Primary System, 20 percent to the Secondary System.

## **THE SECOND REPORT**

A Progress Report was also published in the same October 1968 Issue that was presented to the Congress in June 1968 and labeled the 'After 75 Program'. AASHO noted that two advisory committees had been formed. They were the Local Governments Advisory Committee and the Industry and Users Advisory Committee.

"We have decided that the completion of the presently designated Interstate program is not so imminent that final action must be taken by Congress this year, so, therefore, this presentation is a progress report which makes some definite recommendations that will be constructive and reflects the thinking of the State highway administrators and lays the groundwork for action by your Committee next year."

## **AASHO ASKS FOR STUDIES TO BE DIRECTED**

"...We would like for you to direct the Federal Highway Administration, and/or its Bureau of Public Roads, in cooperation with the State highway departments, and with appropriate discussions with local government officials, to make certain studies and recommendations and report back to the Public Works Committees no later than January 15, 1969."

"We refer particularly to apportioning formulas for the Federal-aid Primary and Federal-aid Secondary Systems, a functional classification and redesignation of the existing Federal-aid Primary and Federal-aid Secondary Systems, and an agreement on those areas that should be reserved for the Federal Government, and those that should be the responsibilities of the State highway departments in administering a Continuing Federal-aid Highway Program, if the partnership concept of the joint venture highway program is to survive."

## **COMPLETION SLIPS ANOTHER THREE YEARS**

"...With the new and increased 1968 Interstate Needs Estimate complicating matters further (than the uncertainties already existing), coupled with the uncertainty that has been injected into the program by cutbacks, it appears that the presently designated Interstate program will not be completed prior to 1978,

unless substantial amounts of additional moneys might be added to the Highway Trust Fund, which we think is highly unlikely."

A very sophisticated report was presented, replete with charts and artists renderings and statistical presentations.

"There are many contemporary philosophies regarding total transportation and the role of highways in that total transportation picture. One of the major ones is that transportation policies, systems and programs be developed on the basis of 'cost effectiveness' or the 'investment return concept' with the dollar sign being the major ingredient in such an approach."

## **A PUBLIC POLL CONDUCTED**

"...AASHO established a research project in its National Cooperative Highway Research Program...The purpose...was to get factual data regarding the public's preferences as to transportation and to determine those factors that mold these preferences, such as various types of land use, population, densities, availability of other transportation modes, income, size of family, etc."

"...In designing the interview questionnaire, the investigators purposely introduced some anti-highway questions in order to bring out the opinions of the persons interviewed if they had any subconscious criticisms of highways, motor vehicles, or the highway program."

"...From the results of the research, it indicates the continued popularity and need for adequate highway transportation. It established highway transportation as a universal and basic transportation form throughout the United States, both in rural and in urban centers, even the most densely populated ones."

"...The research study established beyond a doubt that there is no reason for combining transportation programs, nor for pooling transportation financing. Appropriate and completely adequate coordination of the various modes, that might be involved, can be accomplished through the Cooperative Continuing Planning Process, and through the administration and operation of the transportation facilities involved."

"It is established beyond any doubt that the Federal-aid highway program can continue as a separate and major public works program and that other major transportation programs involve a relatively few areas of the most densely populated States."

A summary was given of the responses to the questionnaires. Also, a summary report by NCHRP was appended.

## **AASHO RECOMMENDS REPLACEMENT HOUSING**

In addition, a very detailed AASHO report was also appended justifying the recommendations already given in detail. Some additional recommendations were for a program for replacement housing and relocation without specification as to amount or how it would be administered and an advanced acquisition of right-of-way program funded by a \$100 million revolving fund. They endorsed programs for fringe and downtown off-street parking but stopped short of

advocating the use of the Trust Fund to pay for them. The report emphasized throughout that the "3C Planning Process" was the vehicle for working out all the urban problems. Also recommended was a provision for allowing segments of the Primary System that were upgraded to Interstate Standards and connected logically to the Interstate System to be signed Interstate.

## **THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1968**

### **MANY NEW PROGRAMS**

The Act revised the Interstate authorizations through 1975, provided \$20 million from the general fund for beautification, established a right-of-way revolving fund in the treasury and authorized \$100 million per year from the Trust Fund to operate it. It established the TOPICS program and authorized fringe parking in connection with mass transit. It authorized 1500 additional miles to be added to the Interstate and added a section to Title 23 preventing the transfer of administrative funds from the Federal Highway Administration for the use of any other agency. This was obviously aimed at attempts to assess some of the costs of operating the Department to FHWA, i.e., the Trust Fund, and to pay HUD for services rendered in the DOT/HUD agreement which contained a clause requiring payments to HUD for services in their role as coordinator of all urban programs as set forth in President Johnson's executive decree.

The Act provided for routes on the Primary system constructed to Interstate standards and connecting to the Interstate to be designated as Interstate without mileage charge. It required a nationwide highway functional classification study to be reported to Congress in 1970. It incorporated section 4(f) of the DOT Act having to do with preservation of parkland into Title 23. The Congress ordered the District of Columbia to proceed with the construction of all Interstate projects approved in the cost estimate and to study others specified. It specifically ordered construction to proceed on the Three Sisters Bridge, the Potomac River Freeway, and the North Leg within 30 days after passage of the Act.

Chapter V was devoted to a very comprehensive highway Relocation Assistance program.

### **Excerpts From the January 1969 Issue of American Highways-The Record of 54th Annual Meeting held on 12/3/68**

**JOHN O. MORTON**, N.H., the President's Address.

#### **AN APPEAL TO CONGRESS**

"...I would like to address a substantial part of my remarks this morning to our congressional friends..." He went on to describe the highway program, the Federal-State partnership and the complexities of the program and the dedication and thoroughness with which highway department personnel carry out the communication and coordination with the public and the lesser units of government. He described how cordial the relations were with local officials.

"...I would point out that with the experience gained from conducting thousands of public hearings, highway officials know that certain objections will always be presented at a public hearing. Such objections may be valid, or without basis, or the result of misunderstandings...The chief administrative officer of a highway department has always had to recognize that in carrying out the execution of a

program of the present magnitude, there comes a time when he must make a final determination and decision. Such decisions have been honestly and courageously made...supported by factual data and..carefully evaluated judgments..."

"...Our new interstate highways are anything but the atrocities the voices of opposition would have the public believe them to be...We have a right to take pride in our past accomplishments...recognition of our past accomplishments and the favor in which the highway program is held by the American people, are reflected in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968. Highway officials applauded the passage of this 1968 act and considered it a progressive and outstanding piece of highway legislation. The act preserved the integrity of the highway trust fund. It recognized the fallacy and waste created by ill-conceived cutbacks and took a positive position in opposition to future cutbacks. It provided urgently needed funds for added highway improvements within our urban areas. It increased funds for work on the federal-aid primary system. It gave additional support to the highway safety program and attempted to clarify the intent and to define the procedures to be followed in the equal employment opportunity program. Further, it provided a means of correcting existing deficiencies in the right of way acquisition program as it is currently being administered by the Federal Highway Administration."

#### **OBJECTS TO NEW FEDERAL REGULATIONS**

"Now, in the past month, the Federal Highway Administrator has published in the Federal Register, voluminous regulations regarding the future conduct of public hearings and covering the location and design approval format that must be followed by the respective states in connection with the right of way acquisition program. These regulations, if permitted to stand, will have the effect of bringing about a complete stoppage of the highway program in many of the states. They will have the effect of taking the highway program out of the hands of the states and the state highway departments, and instead thereof, placing it under the direct supervision of an ever-expanding federal bureaucracy. These regulations developed by Washington bureaucrats are in dire contradiction to the experienced judgment of the staffs of the various highway departments. They far exceed the intent of the 1968 Federal Highway Act that was so ably developed by Congress..."

"Contained in the regulations is a provision that would allow a single individual appearing in opposition to a highway project, to effectively tie up the project for an indefinite period of time. It is impossible to comprehend the adoption of a regulation which has been so devised that the desires and needs of an overwhelming majority of the people as presented at a public hearing, could be overridden by the action of a single individual, responsible or otherwise...If this is permitted, domination of its (the nation's) economy will also rest in the hands of this same irresponsible minority group."

"From the viewpoint of highway officials, this represents our first experience in the fifty-two year history of the federal-aid highway program, where a federal agency has taken over and flaunted the intent of a piece of highway legislation developed by the Congress. We know that people high in authority in the Department of Transportation have in the past made reference to the fact that the mentality of the highway departments should be changed..."

#### **SHOCKED AND ALARMED**

"I can say to the members of Congress that we, as highway officials are confused, shocked, and alarmed at such a power grab. We join with the governors of our states and with the highway users of this nation in seeking your assistance in bringing about corrective action..."

"...In the months that lie directly ahead, I urge you to join in a united action to obtain relief from a domineering bureaucracy. You must insist on a future course of action that will employ only an absolute minimum of government red tape. You must work for realistic controls capable of providing an expeditious, honest, and intelligent execution of the highway program."

"Should, in the weeks ahead, it become necessary for more drastic actions, do not be hesitant about taking them. The highway user groups and the American public are cognizant of the attempts to dominate the program at the federal level and they offer strong support in your efforts to seek corrective measures. Even though we are a powerful nation, we cannot survive the dissipation of our money, talent, and energy that is sought by a minority group presently working under the shelter of a federal bureaucracy."

**SEN. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, W. Va. - Chairman, Public Works Committee.**

Senator Randolph led off by telling a joke to illustrate the times: "...I recall that a minister united in holy wedlock two hippies, and at the end of the ceremony he turned to them and said, 'Will one of you please kiss the bride?' And so these are the periods of transition; these are the times often of misconceptions and misunderstandings."

"...Mr. President...I recall to you the occasion of your convention last year when we were beginning to think in terms of the economic social and environmental development of our country, particularly as highways are involved."

**HEARINGS HELD**

"...I announced that we would initiate a series of hearings which would deal particularly with the problems of urban highway development in all of its phases in this country. At that time I stated 'We are all aware of the outspoken opposition to highway locations which has been encountered in connection with various urban segments of the interstate system. The Senate Committee on Public Works is very much concerned that such opposition, much of which may well be justified, will create an intolerable situation and cause the failure of this important public works program...'"

"...These hearings began in November 1967 and were concluded in May 1968...The witnesses who appeared before us represented almost every facet of interest, profession and concern with highways and our urban areas."

"...The testimony presented in our urban impact hearings was most impressive and as a result, a number of provisions were added to our basic highway law by the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1968..."

**IMPORTANT CHANGES**



"That Act...includes a number of important changes which will enable the Highway Program to meet our expanding concern for social, cultural and environmental values...a full fledged relocation assistance program for those who suffer private injury through disruption and dislocation as a result of highway construction...equal employment opportunity...all public hearings (must) consider the social and environmental, as well as the economic, impact of a proposed highway location..."

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS NOT ADEQUATE**

"The report of the Senate Committee...stated: 'The public hearings held by the States...have been less than adequate in performing the intended functions of informing the public and allowing those affected to adequately voice their opinions, recommendations, and suggestions.'"

"One of the major problems raised before the committee was the inordinate amount of time that often transpires between the date public hearings are held and the date construction begins. Based on an examination of the situation in nine urban areas, the average timespan between public hearings and the start of construction is about 8 years..."

#### **FEDERAL PROCESS REVISED**

"The policy of the Federal Government has been merely to require the states to certify that a public hearing was held. The Committee is informed that consistent with the recommendations of the Senate this policy is being revised to require two hearings. One hearing will be held for the general public and another, to be held at a later date, called highway design hearings, for those people who are directly affected. We believe this revised policy will provide the mechanism for more timely and effective public hearings."

"Properly publicized and conducted public hearings are important so that those who participate in the hearings have confidence that the views they express will be considered and weighed in decisions relating to highway location and design. These hearings are intended to produce more than a public presentation by the highway department of its plans and decisions."

#### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS TO BE INVOLVED**

"In order to emphasize the importance of these hearings, the Congress adopted the additional language relating to public hearings and the matters which must be considered in the decision making process. These additional factors will require greater involvement not only by other State and local government officials and agencies but by private individuals and groups as well."

"The importance of the involvement of local officials in route selection, the public hearing process, and the resolution and establishment of community goals and objectives cannot be overstated. Many of the controversies which were related to the committee during its urban highway hearings could have been ameliorated, if not eliminated, had local officials been brought into the discussions at a sufficiently early stage in the hearing process."

#### **CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT**

"...The great controversy currently surrounding the highway program is directed toward the proposed regulation concerning public hearings. In view of the strong position taken by the committee during its consideration of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968, Senator John Sherman Cooper, the ranking Minority Member, joined with me in a letter to Federal Highway Administrator Bridwell in which we expressed our views on the proposal:"

"We wholeheartedly commend the substance of the proposal requiring a highway corridor hearing and a highway design hearing. While we do not subscribe to all the details of the proposed regulation, we believe the basic content of the document is materially the same as that which you described to the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works during our hearings on urban highway planning, location and design. We believe it is absolutely essential to the proper execution of our national highway program that interested persons be involved as early as possible in the decisions which affect the future of the communities in which they live."

"We have received requests to make known to you our views with regard to the proposal. These communications have requested that we explain our position with respect to the regulations so that you might have the benefit of our thinking. It makes little difference to us whether the hearing requirements are published as regulations or whether they are set forth in a policy and procedure memorandum. There are advantages to both forms and it is our understanding that there is little difference in their legal effect. Of course, the regulation does have the advantages of wider public notice than does a policy and procedure memorandum; however, regulations, because of their formality, do not lend themselves to flexible administration. We are certain that you will carefully examine all the comments which you receive with respect to form and respond by adopting what you consider to be the most propitious arrangement."

#### **AGAINST APPELLATE PROCEDURES**

"Most importantly, we are concerned with the "Appellate" procedure laid out in Section 3.17. It is our strong belief that such procedure will invite unnecessary appeals to the Federal Highway Administration and to the Courts. Highway location decisions are really legislative in nature."

#### **NOT A MATTER FOR THE COURTS**

"This authority has been delegated by the Congress and the Legislatures of the respective States to the United States Department of Transportation and the State Highway Departments. Other than to assure that the rules have been fairly applied, there is no contribution which any Federal Court could make to the decisions relating to location and design. Decisions relating to location and design are based on judgment rather than on facts and law and it is our feeling that assuring fairness is the responsibility of both the State and Federal Administrators."

"We earnestly request that the final version of the public hearing requirements, however they may be published, be published without any "Appellate" procedure at all. We believe that you, as have your predecessors, review a number of these decisions in line with the basic provisions of Title 23. We believe the decision of the Federal Highway Administrator should be final in all respects unless there is,

in fact, a violation of law, in which case normal legal procedures would still pertain."

### **MUST BE EXPEDITED**

"It is the goal of greater public participation which these rules seek to achieve, and this goal has the support of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate. It is a goal which should be achieved as soon as possible. Adjustments of the proposal, as we have suggested, will facilitate the successful implementation of this important matter of public policy."

### **SUPPORTS BRIDWELL**

"...Mr. Bridwell has informed me that he intends to personally review the record and to base his decision on its contents. I think that all of us who are concerned with the highway program and its place in our National, State and community efforts, owe a great debt to this gentleman who has served in a very difficult position with dignity, dedication and determination. Many of the new provisions contained in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 and many of the innovations in procedure and operations have been implemented under his direction or with his active support. I am sure that the decision which he makes with regard to public hearings will reflect his outstanding performance as Federal Highway Administrator."

### **POLITICAL DECISIONS**

"...Many of the decisions which you will be making are not merely technical. They will be political decisions in the highest sense since the facilities you build are built to serve people. While it is a difficult task to satisfy large numbers of people, such difficulty can never be an excuse for retiring behind the wall of professional expertise."

"The provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968, reflect the growing understanding on the part of many members of the Congress that the people must be involved to the maximum extent possible in the making of the basic decisions relating to these important public facilities. During the recent presidential campaign, it became obvious that there are indeed large groups of people not all of whom are poor, and not all of whom are young, who are terribly concerned by the fact that they have little to say about what happens to them. It is our hope that the changes which we have made will, at least with respect to highways, correct the situation and that alienation will give way to participation."

### **SUPPORTS TURNER**

"...What I have said about Lowell Bridwell I can say with equal validity as to Frank Turner. The man-who stands alongside of Lowell Bridwell."

"Some choose the high way, some the low, while in between on the misty flats the crowds drift to and fro; but every highway builder has the responsibility for which way his life shall go."

**LOWELL K. BRIDWELL**, Federal Highway Administrator.

## **PLAGUED BY PROBLEMS**

"...our programs seem sometimes to be plagued by problems...problems of irate citizens and neighborhoods, and problems of antagonism between highway professionals and professionals from other disciplines. Change has seemed to come too fast, too disordered, and too little anticipated. Public recognition and appreciation for the program's past achievements have seemed to dwindle in direct proportion to the increases in its problems."

"To state it another way, highway programs and highway professionals are being confronted, with no immunity, by the same social and community forces that today confront every other basic national undertaking, whether in transportation, conservation, education, or the art of government. We and our programs are very much a part of, and participant in, the complex world which is America in 1968."

"...One option not available is to disassociate and insulate our activities from the sweep of events in America today. To pretend otherwise would be the depth of self-delusion. Nor, in many cases, are we masters of these events. Our decisions must reflect our realistic awareness of this."

## **COMMON THEMES OF UNREST**

"...Each new event, every developing confrontation contains these common themes, although sometimes they are twisted so badly as to be hardly recognizable."

"They are themes of involvement-of the new aspiration of the so-called 'average citizen' to fight the tides of impersonalization, specialization, and population which seem at times to threaten his individual identity, and to wage his war by demanding a greater say in the shaping of forces and programs which influence his world, his community, and his family."

"There are themes of the new quest for environmental excellence-of concern over the injurious impact of man-generated changes in the environment upon man's health, his esthetic needs, his senses, and his relationship to nature."

"There are themes of community self identity-of a conscious commitment, particularly by densely populated urban areas, to give top priority to retaining and improving the social and economic ingredients which welded a group of individuals into a town or city in the first place."

## **DIFFICULT CHOICES**

"The present is a time of difficult choices...matched, and possibly outweighed, by the opportunities available to us today to select...directions which will produce...beneficial results for the future."

"We have...begun to move along some of these directions, partly to forestall public animosity toward our programs and partly...in recognition of new potentials in highway development for achieving emerging social goals..."

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

"We have taken steps along the road to expanded public participation in our programs..."

"...The demand of a growing number of citizens, individually and communally, to have their views considered and reflected in our program's products is irreversible."

"Complex and time-consuming though it may be, the democratic process of citizen participation in the affairs of government is going to apply with full and vigorous force to all government programs, whether through some kind of hearing requirement or in other ways. It is the task of the highway professional to make that process work as effectively and efficiently as possible. To do less will be to imperil the usefulness, as well as stability, of the program itself."

### **JOINT DEVELOPMENT**

He described the new concept of joint development and that instructions would soon be out encouraging that.

### **THE URBAN IMPACT AMENDMENT**

"...The Highway Act of 1968 is a clear indication of directions which the highway program can and must pursue in meeting its obligations to communities and their values in the future. One provision of the Act, known as the Urban Impact Amendment, directs that highway programs consider the social effects, environmental impacts and relationship to community goals and plans of highway location alternatives."

"...It can only be fulfilled by a fundamental reshaping of attitudes toward highway development in relationship to urban goals."

"The concerns reflected in the Urban Impact Amendment call for cooperation and teamwork between highway professionals, urban planners and programs, architects, private investors, and community representatives-teamwork exemplified by the multi-discipline design concept teams which have worked on highway planning in Baltimore, Chicago, and other cities...they call for objective development and presentation of alternative locations, designs, and joint uses-alternatives able to be discussed in public at well-publicized, well-attended hearings."

### **AN UNDESIRABLE ALTERNATIVE**

"...There are simpler, less constructive options available."

"There is the option of frustrating the development of comprehensive planning and meaningful public participation in highway program decisions. The short-term outcome of that choice is to sweep the complexities and challenges of the democratic process under the rug, all in the name of 'eliminating delays.' The longer-term outcome is the annihilation, at the hands of a dispirited public, of the program as we know it today."

"There is the option of resting on our laurels. The highway professional who selects it will be content to cite the admittedly impressive accomplishments of the

program in the past-and to insist with dulling regularity that nothing is new under the sun. To select that option is to ignore Bismark's warning that, 'History is simply a piece of paper covered with print: The main thing is to make history, not to write it.'

### **A COLD WAR OPTION**

"Finally, there is the option of conflict-of fighting the program's opponents with every means at hand. To choose this option is to enter into a prolonged cold war in which reasonable discussion is replaced by name-calling and anyone who questions the program becomes, at once, an enemy."

"...To resist the attraction of simple reactions to difficult challenges requires maturity, self-assurance, and perspective."

"...it is incumbent upon the highway professional and the highway administrator to know his market and, where possible, reshape his product and his way of doing business to reflect the new demands of the public. We cannot analyze the market by ignoring it. We cannot respond to its needs by wishing them away."

"On his desk, Thomas Edison kept a sign which read, 'Pioneer or Perish.' for the Federal-aid highway program in America today, there can be no more fitting a watchword."

**SEN. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Ky., Member Public Works Committee.**

The speech was delivered by Bailey Guard, Public Works Committee staff.

### **GREAT CHANGES**

"The years have brought great changes-changes in the life of our country, and changes in the practice and art of road building. The political structures with which you work-local and regional as well as State and national-are also changing. For example, you now deal with a Federal Highway Administration which encompasses the safety and beautification authorities as well as the Bureau of Public Roads, within the Department of Transportation. This broader Federal structure is one of the signs of your wider responsibilities. For I think it is clear to all who have thought about the problem that highways cannot properly be conceived in isolation, that they must be considered together with inter-city air travel and rail transportation, and with mass transit in urban areas-the entire circulatory network. And beyond the sheer movement of people and goods, your work is now more clearly seen as not only responsive but creative, for a highway made necessary by change is also generative of great change. As a result, you are drawn ever more deeply into fields only lightly touched a few years ago."

"Certainly, these broader concepts are increasingly recognized by our Committees, the Congress and the public...I know that implementing these provisions (the 1968 Highway Act) will require time, effort, and expense. But I believe they deal with problems which must not be ignored-problems which, if not met in the spirit of our changing times, would indeed endanger the steady progress of the highway programs."

### **SUPPORTS TWO HEARINGS**

"Now you are presently concerned about the proposed regulation calling for two hearings on Federal-aid highway projects. I am for two hearings. I believe a corridor hearing at an early stage, before the general highway location is fixed, with a later hearing on specific location and design, will be helpful in securing public discussion and better understanding, and in bringing the issues into focus at a time when alternatives may still be open as a practical matter. I think it desirable also to have the assurance proposed in the regulations that there be full coordination with urban planning, and the opportunity at an earlier stage for all interested bodies to comment; that the hearings take place within three years of approval of route location or final design; that greater information be made publicly available; and that State Highway Departments submit to the Bureau of Public Roads a report on the alternatives they have studied together with support for their decision. I believe these steps will contribute to more informed decisions, and help reduce the lack of understanding, frustration and repeated delays which now occur and which otherwise may increase."

"With respect to that portion of the proposal specifying an appeal procedure, I note that its legal and practical effect is in dispute. Serious concern has been expressed that the provision might change the Federal-State relationship, or shift the responsibility for the determination of highway location and design. While I assume that such a result was not intended, the appeal provision does raise basic questions apart from the substance of the hearings proposal, and I believe should be separated from it. For that reason, I have been glad to join with Senator Randolph in his request that the appeal procedure be dropped from the proposed regulation."

#### **NO TURNING BACK**

He noted that the Public Works Committee had held 12 days of hearings on the urban problems before passage of the 68 Act. He further predicted that there would be no turning back the rising concern for the impact of urban highways.

**From the April 1969 Issue of American Highways.**  
**TURNER SWORN IN AS FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR**  
**RALPH BARTELSMEYER APPOINTED DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS**  
**Excerpts From the July 1969 Issue of American Highways.**  
**RALPH BARTELSMEYER, Director, BPR to WASHO.**

Most of his speech was devoted to the virtues of the Federal-State partnership. He said that it was spelled out in law in 1916 and must be preserved.

#### **NO INCREASE IN FEDERAL DOMINATION**

"I personally don't believe that under Secretary Volpe and Administrator Turner there will be any attempt at greater domination of the highway program by the Federal government. As to the matter of dealing with individual cities instead of the State highway departments, there are both legal and practical arguments against such a type of operation, even if the Federal agencies wished to undertake it."

He pointed out that by law the Federal Government could only deal with the States on highway matters and that dealing with all the metropolitan areas directly would be too much for the Federal bureaucracy to handle.

"...Nevertheless the partnership continually faces new challenges, either because of social changes or legislation or both. The ever-increasing emphasis on human environmental and esthetic values poses difficult and time-consuming problems for the State highway departments, especially in the urban areas. The enlightened goal is to provide urban traffic facilities that will not only accomplish the principal function of moving people and goods, but will also become beneficial parts of the total urban environment, preserving the best of community values and integrating the various modes of transportation. Contrary to what some of our critics say, these concepts are not new to the highway engineer, but he has been restricted historically-both legally and financially-as to how far he could go in his consideration of human and social values."

#### **NEW VALUES HERE TO STAY**

"However, Congress and the general public have become increasingly concerned with these values and anyone who considers this concern to be a passing fancy is living in a dream world. The trend is toward ever-increasing attention to what might be called the 'fringe benefits' of highways-to joint corridor development, to the provision of better housing for those displaced by highway construction, to reasonable beautification projects, to the development of a great many more rest and recreation areas, to many other items in the realm of human values."

#### **NEW POLICIES TO BE DEVELOPED JOINTLY**

"...It is our intention in the Federal Highway Administration-in connection with all of the important new policies or procedures which may be needed henceforth-to consult with AASHO and the State highway departments and to provide the fullest opportunity to States to react to such proposals before they are put in final form. In this way we hope to implement to the fullest both the letter and the spirit of the Congressional intent for the Federal-State partnership in the Federal-aid highway program. The partnership is a two-way street and we intend to keep it that way."

"I have dealt at some length on the Federal-State partnership in this, my maiden speech as Director of Public Roads, because I believe its preservation is probably the most important overall goal we have before us. You know as I do that certain forces have been at work to undermine it and that we must present a united front if it is to be preserved in the same traditional form that we have known it. That does not mean that there is no room for dissent within the partnership. Frank Turner expressed this idea very well on another occasion when he was Director of Public Roads."

"He said, and I quote:'

'A partnership composed solely of "yes men" would soon fall of its own weight because any successful venture requires the stimulus of dialogue, discussion and divergence of thinking and approach to preserve interest and action.'...

#### **Excerpts From the October, 1969 Issue of American Highways.**

**J.C. DINGWALL**, Texas, to the Governor's Conference.

#### **THE NEW PUBLIC HEARING REGULATIONS**



"...Recently there has been much discussion of the new Federal regulations requiring two public hearings on highway locations. In Texas we were having hearings on such projects for several years before the Federal regulations were announced-sometimes one hearing, but more usually two hearings for complex urban projects."

#### **NOT OPPOSED TO TWO HEARINGS**

"And while the Federal regulations do require more formal documentation than had normally been provided, there is no definitive indication that the additional paperwork enhances the intended result."

"It is true when the Federal Highway Administration last year proposed to publish in the Federal Register regulations governing public hearings on all highway projects in which the U.S. Government was to participate, the Texas Highway Department did put up a terrific howl. But we were not opposed, as we stated before Congressional Committees, to the 'two hearing process,' as the regulations were commonly identified in the press."

#### **OPPOSED TO RED TAPE AND DELAY**

"Our objections centered on the fact that the regulations were to be printed in the Federal Register making them inflexible and equivalent to Federal law by administrative dictum. And we strongly objected to the appellate procedures which would permit anyone-land speculator or individual dissident-to hold up a badly needed project for almost an unlimited time."

#### **CONVERTED TO A PPM**

"As you know, the appellate proposals were withdrawn. Also, the regulations became more negotiable when they were made a part of the PPM process-Policies and Procedures Memorandums-between the Federal Highway Administration and the individual State Highway Departments."

"So our concern was to avoid unnecessary delays in the development of needed highway projects, and not to prevent any citizen from having his 'say' in the development of this or any other State highway project. We also were interested in preserving the half-century-old tradition of Federal-State cooperation in the highway program. We believe this to be no time for unilateral decrees handed down from Washington, far from the people who are paying for their own highway system and whom the system is expected to serve. This is particularly so when here in Texas the Federal Government actually is a minor partner to the extent of about 40% of overall highway expenditures."

He talked about the status of urban planning in Texas and the new concept of the "design concept team":

"We agree with Secretary Volpe's position and believe the employment of 'Design Concept Teams' should be left to the discretion of the individual agencies-city, county or State-who, in the last analysis, are the ones to be held responsible for the cost and successful conclusion of the project."

#### **NEW FEDERALISM**

"Also, we heartily concur with President Nixon when he spoke to the people on the evening of August 8, 1969. Although he was speaking of his new welfare proposals he spelled out a changing philosophy of government...what he called 'applying the principles of New Federalism.' Let me read what he had to say:

"...Administration of a major established Federal program would be turned over to the States and local governments, recognizing that they are in a position to do the job better.'

'For years thoughtful Americans have talked of the need to decentralize government. The time has come to begin.'

'For a third of a century, power and responsibility have flowed toward Washington-and Washington has taken for its own the best sources of revenue. We intend to reverse this tide, and to turn back to the States a greater measure of responsibility-not as a way of avoiding problems, but as a better way of solving problems.'"

### **Excerpts From the January, 1970 Issue of American Highways-The Record of the 1969 Annual Meeting.**

#### **ROUND TABLE**

This was a round table discussion chaired by President Stapp. The participants were John Fugate, the President elect, Senator Spong, Va., Cong. Fallon, Md., Cong. Kluczynski, Ill., Cong. Harsha, Ohio, Sen. Gurney, Fla.

The questions were rather routine but at the conclusion **REP. HARSHA** had some important observations:

#### **1970 WILL BE A CRITICAL YEAR**

"...Let me make these observations. I think that the federal aid highway program is having its problems. Certainly by one of the previous questions by the chairman to Senator Gurney and Congressman Kluczynski it was indicated that you no longer enjoy the universal support that you did in 1956 when the present highway construction program was funded by the Congress. In fact, the program in recent days has been strongly opposed by many people in groups that are quite articulate. So in my opinion, 1970 is going to be a highly critical year for the future of the highway program. In fact, it may be one of the most important years for that program since the inception of federal aid highway construction."

#### **SUPPORT IS ERODING**

"...Again, permit me to caution you that public support for extended highway programs is eroding and you can no longer afford to sit idly by and say that things will take care of themselves. The opposition is not sitting idly by. It is articulate and it is persuasive, and your role as highway officials and department heads in the states should reflect the needs and the public attitudes in all of the states. You will be called upon to play a major role in the formation of any legislation next year. Your role in meeting this responsibility will be a most important one, and let me caution you that you must meet this challenge aggressively, effectively and thoroughly. If you fail or shirk in exercising this responsibility, others will accept it and you may not be happy with those results."

## **THE FUTURE IS IN DOUBT**

"I sincerely believe the future of the highway program as you conceive it hangs in the balance, so again let me urge you to play the role that is yours in meeting these challenges which confront the Congress next year."

**ROSS G. STAPP**, Wy.-The President's Address.

## **DIVERSION**

"...Diversion of Highway Trust Fund monies is one of the most pressing current and long-range problems that AASHO and the highway industry faces. AASHO must devote its resources to maintain the integrity of the Highway Trust Fund.

"If the money continues to roll in through the federal gasoline and other highway user taxes without being used, we increase the possibility that these funds will be diverted for use other than on the highway system."

"It is distressingly simple but alarmingly catastrophic that if these raids on the Trust Fund, this highway robbery, is allowed to succeed we simply cannot have any long-range programs."

## **SOUND PROGRAM NEEDED**

"...In order to circumvent this possibility, I strongly urge AASHO and each of the states to become a full partner with the federal government and the Department of Transportation in developing a method for the continuation of a sound program."

"By the same token, this federal-state relationship must be met with more than mere approval by the powers that be in Washington. They too, must welcome the opportunity to accept the suggestions of highway administrators."

"Too often in the past, suggestions and objections for federal action have fallen on deaf ears and have gone unheeded. The states, and the Department of Transportation should resume a full partnership in highway programs, and federal-aid should be released at orderly intervals in predictable amounts."

"...Once we are assured of the continuation of the highway Trust Fund, which, incidentally, will be no mean task, we must then concentrate all our endeavors for a continuing highway program."

"On August 22 and 23 (1969), the AASHO Committee for a Continuing Highway Program met in Denver to formulate a proposal to be presented to the Executive Committee and in turn to the Chief Administrative Officers...I think it is a valid and timely plan which considers all areas of our country."

## **GREATER FUNDING MUST GO TO URBAN**

"It is obvious that there will be a greater portion of highway user revenues allocated toward solving highway transportation problems in metropolitan areas than there has been heretofore."

He spoke about the need for an Equal Employment Opportunity Program, Scenic Highways and Beautification.

### **MASS TRANSIT**

"...Mass transit and congestion in metropolitan areas are becoming increasingly difficult problems, and we must not be hard-headed in learning to accept new ideas in this regard...It is just as important to emphasize that...the Highway Trust Fund must be utilized exclusively for solving highway problems."

### **FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION**

"Functional Classification of our highway program is another of the pressing needs of the industry. Each state should, in the very near future begin to implement facts it has found from studies it is already working on for the Functional Classification of Highways. AASHO has long since established criteria which should be used for the continuation of the federal-aid system with regard to matching ratios...The allocation of funds to the respective states will be controversial, I am sure. This allocation, however, should probably be resolved after the completion of the Functional Classification Study."

### **A DEEPENING CRISIS**

"Because of attacks from every quarter on the highway program and because of the jeopardy the Highway Trust Fund has been placed in, it is evident there is a deepening crisis in the highway program. Our mission in AASHO and in the highway community is not just to live with the crisis, but to exert every effort toward reversing the trends considered not to be in the best public interest."

### **PUBLIC SUPPORT IS ESSENTIAL**

"...We must, if we are to continue to build our highways, gain the public support. I'm happy to say we have made some definite strides toward this end through such endeavors as National Highway Week and other instances whereby we have been able to call additional attention to ourselves and the job we are doing."

"...The highway industry is supported by a silent majority of the people in the country...Unless we can get some real support from this silent majority of highway users, certain influences could so slow down the highway improvement program to a degree which could result in an inadequate highway system for an ever increasing demand within a few years."

### **OUR IMAGE**

"We should do everything within our power to dispel the image we have, unfortunately and inadvertently, assumed in the eyes of some of the public. That is the image of the autocratic highway builder who builds with little or no concern for the urban dweller, for the suburban dweller or the rancher or the farmer or whomever is affected by our highways...."

**Excerpts From the October, 1970 Issue of American Highways.  
MISSOURI TO TEST CUTBACKS IN COURT**

## **EDITORIAL**

"During its recent meeting at Lake of the Ozarks, Missouri, the National Governors Conference adopted several resolutions affecting highways. One of these read in part: Funds from the Highway Trust Fund should not be suspended or withheld; and we hereby request the Executive Committee to take the necessary steps to provide that court action be undertaken to challenge the authority of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government to withhold distribution of Highway Trust Funds."

"The State Highway Commission of Missouri has now filed a complaint against Secretary of Transportation John Volpe and Director of the Office of Management and Budget, George Schultz, in the District Court of Missouri."

## **BASIS OF THE SUIT**

"...That under the existing provisions of law, the plaintiff is entitled to obligate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the sum of \$112,322,400 but has in fact been advised by the Defendant Volpe that it cannot expect to receive its authorization and apportionment lawfully due but will in fact be limited to an obligation for said fiscal year of \$86,100,000."

"...That the action of the Secretary of Transportation in so withholding the right to obligate the sum of \$26,222,400...is wholly without authority...and made wholly without the existence of the one situation in which he is authorized to reduce such allotment, namely, advice from the Secretary of the Treasury that funds are not and will not be available in the Highway Trust Fund to make reimbursement to the states in accordance with said obligation..."

"...That the unlawful decisions and determinations aforesaid have been made on the basis of purported public statements for the purpose of cooling the economy when in fact said economy in the State of Missouri is now well 'cooled' with unemployment at a record high, bankruptcy occurring at a highly accelerated rate, and all other indications by which the state of economy could be determined being definitely 'cooled'..."

## **Excerpts From the January, 1971 Issue of American Highways-The Record of the Annual Meeting on 11/9/1970.**

### **PANEL DISCUSSION**

This was a panel discussion held at the annual meeting. It was chaired by President-elect W.J. Burmeister and moderated by President Douglas Fugate. Participants were Sen. Everett Jordan, N.C.-Sen. Mike Gravel Al.-Sen. J. Caleb Boggs, Del.-Rep. George H. Fallon, Md.-Rep. John A. Blatnik, Minn.-Rep. John c. Kluczynski, Ill.-Rep. James C. Wright, Tex.-Rep. Fred Schwengel, Iowa.

### **UNCERTAINTY OF APPORTIONMENT**

**FUGATE:** "There was a time when State highway departments could plan on highway legislation being cleared no later than July and the apportionment of funds being made to the highway departments in late summer or early fall."

"Last year, the 1971 fiscal funds were received at the eleventh hour of the year, due to an Administration effort to slow down the highway program as one means of combating inflation. This year the highway bill will not clear Congress and go to the White House until almost the eleventh hour to where we will be getting the 1972 apportionment late."

"The uncertainty of when apportionments will be made seriously complicate the administration of the highway program in scheduling projects and in arranging matching funds among other problems."

"Do you believe that we will ever again get to the point that we will be able to anticipate, with any certainty, as to the time of the year that we will receive Federal-aid highway apportionments and not be surprised from time to time with the announcement of highway program cutbacks?"

**SEN JORDAN** replied that the problem lay entirely with the Executive Branch and read a letter from Sen. Randolph to the President protesting the impoundments.

#### **TOLL ROAD REIMBURSEMENT**

**FUGATE:** "Proposed 1970 highway legislation before the current Congress addresses itself to toll road problems to a certain extent, and there are approximately 2,200 miles of toll roads incorporated into the Interstate System."

"In your opinion, what will be the final action of Congress with regard to upgrading standards on such toll roads and reimbursing them for any outstanding debt as a prerequisite for making them a part of a free network of interstate highways?"

**SEN. BOGGS:** "...The legislation has passed the Senate, contains a provision changing the existing law and providing Federal support for improving toll roads now designated as part of the Interstate System..Highway funds...could be utilized for repaving and improving these roads. To qualify for such funds, a State would have to agree that the highway would become toll-free when the existing debts are liquidated."

#### **THE ADMINISTRATION BYPASSES THE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS**

**FUGATE:** "There seems to be a current tendency by the Administration to deal directly on Federal-aid highway matters with elected officials at State and local government levels and often times the State highway administrators are the last to learn of the issuance of Federal-aid highway apportionments or the release of quarterly allotments. This is a distinct departure from the manner in which contacts have been handled in the last fifty years."

"In your opinion, is the State highway commissioner or commission form of operation, or even State highway departments as we have known them, obsolete?"

**FALLON:** "...Any attempt to alter this relationship will be opposed by the Committee on Public Works and I am sure the Congress itself. As for procedures relating to information between the Federal Highway Administration and the State

highway departments, I would hope...would be expedited as rapidly as possible from the Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration to the various State highway departments."

### **SMOOTH TRANSITION AFTER COMPLETION ESSENTIAL**

**FUGATE:** "During the next three to five years, some of the States will substantially complete their portion of the Interstate program with the result that the Federal-aid program in those States will be reduced drastically."

"What recommendations do you have for compensating for such a reduction and would some interim transition into a post-Interstate program be in order?"

**BLATNIK:** "Off hand, we cannot suggest too much right now... We are continuing to study the problem, and will have a full report by 1974..."

### **TOTAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING**

**FUGATE:** "From those opposed to highway improvements for various reasons, we hear that highways must be 'deemphasized' that here is a threat that everything is going to be covered with asphalt and concrete, and that we must turn our attention to other modes of transport, and that the Highway Trust Fund should be turned into a Total Transportation Fund..."

"...In your opinion, is there any probability that Congress will yield to the anti-highway pressure and start cutting back on the program with highway revenues being diverted to finance other modes of transportation, and if there is to be a total transportation fund, will revenue sources from other transportation modes, in pro rata amounts of the respective needs, go into such a trust fund?"

**KLUCZYNSKI:** "...I do not believe that Congress will yield to anti-highway pressures..Down the road we may have a so-called total transportation fund. If such develops, however, I would believe that the programs placed in it...will retain their separate identities and that the Highway Trust Fund would continue to exist as a separate entity in a total transportation fund..."

### **BLOCK GRANTS**

**FUGATE:** "Do you think there is any likelihood in the immediate future of States getting block Federal grants for highway development and being given the authority to expend those funds in accordance with the State's interpretation of its highway needs, such as the division of funds between the various types of highway systems?"

**JORDAN:** "...I think there should be such an arrangement, but only after the Interstate is competed..."

### **AASHO PARTICIPATION IN TRANSPORTATION POLICY**

**FUGATE:** "...The Department of Transportation is developing and it intends to submit early this coming calendar year, a National Transportation Policy. Later on, in 1972, a Transportation Needs Study and Functional Classification Study are to be submitted to Congress, along with a National Transportation Plan."

"The State highway officials of this country, who have the official responsibility at the State level of highway transportation policy, have not participated directly in the development of this National Transportation Policy, even though highways are the backbone of transportation in this country, and any National Transportation Policy, undoubtedly, will affect the highway program in the future."

"In your opinion, is Congress likely to take a close, analytical look at whatever is submitted, and will an opportunity be afforded in hearings to comment on any of these submissions to Congress?"

**KLUCZYNSKI:** "I can say that whatever the Department of Transportation will submit to the Congress covering either a transportation needs study, a functional classification study, or a national transportation plan, it will be scrutinized very closely by the Congress and by the Committee on Public Works..."

"In legislation now pending before the Congress we have also included recommendations that the individual State highway reports be submitted to the Congress and that their views will be considered along with the Department of Transportation..."

#### **DOUGLAS B. FUGATE, Va.-The President's Address.**

He traced the history of highways, the automobile, AASHO, and the highway program.

#### **THE 1970 ACT**

"...AASHO has attempted to aid the Congress in developing a 1970 Highway Act...Particularly gratifying is the absence of a proposal for additional Interstate mileage and the increased emphasis which both House and Senate bills place on primary, secondary and urban needs."

"The five-year extension of the Trust Fund provided...in the House Bill is far less than the fifteen-year extension recommended by AASHO, but under the circumstances, should be considered...as quite acceptable..."

"It is hoped that...the House and Senate will quickly resolve their considerable differences and proceed with enactment..."

#### **AN ASSAULT ON THE TRUST FUND**

"However, this should by no means be taken for granted, for the latest news from Washington is that a last minute assault on an extension of the Trust Fund is shaping up by powerful forces. I believe Congress will enact a satisfactory bill despite this trend, but the time to relax is not at hand."

"The 1972 apportionments are already late and must, by law, be made before the end of the year. In fact, if a highway bill is not passed before the end of 1970, chances are there would be no Federal-aid highway program next year."

"There is also disquieting news that consideration is being given to further withholding of highway funds appropriated by the Congress to the States. The excuse would be to make the budget deficit look better."



## **REVERSING THE TREND TO FEDERAL DOMINATION**

"...Each new Federal-aid highway act sees a renewed assault on State policy and control of State highway affairs. This increasing federalization is supported by withholding Federal-aid funds which rightfully belong to the States. The acceleration of Federal dictation together with the threat of Federal-aid Highway Trust Fund diversion, has led to support for a policy first suggested as a possibility by the Highway Commission of our host State of Texas-a suggestion that if federalism continued to accelerate that Federal-aid be reduced to the relatively minor role it occupied in the highway program prior to 1956. Those who advocate this course would abolish the four-cent Federal tax on gasoline at completion of the Interstate System so it might be re-enacted at the State level."

"Many of us would have serious misgivings about supporting such a policy, but it should serve as a warning that the States are determined to retain control over their own State highway programs..."

**E. L. MATHES**, President, WASHO-Oct. 1970

"...Most of you-I assume-are aware of Secretary Volpe's official statement on S.4260 and his answers to questions posed by the Senate Subcommittee on Roads...you may recall...the Secretary emphasized four points:

### **SECRETARY VOLPE'S STATEMENTS**

1. That the Department of Transportation was developing a comprehensive National Transportation Policy Statement;
2. That his Department had embarked on a project to devise a 1972 National Transportation Plan;
3. That his Department is looking at various funding concepts-including a single transportation trust fund; and
4. That the Department of Transportation had initiated a thorough review of the urban transportation planning process..."

"...Apparently the Secretary has no intent-or desire-to use the unique and most satisfactory Federal-State arrangement this country has ever known for the development of programs of this kind-that of the Federal-aid Highway Program."

### **THE NEW LEGISLATION**

"...The legislation itself gives much cause for concern. Both S.4260 and H.R. 19252 contain some features which resemble-in some way-Federal-aid legislation of prior years. But-as you know-it is also proposed that a number of new programs-totalling six hundred plus million dollars-depend upon the particular bill-now be financed from the Highway Trust Fund."

### **AUTHORIZATIONS NOT BUDGETED**

"...ARBA President Ralph Heffner recently pointed out in a letter to Transportation Secretary Volpe that a most discouraging feature has been-and is-the fact that full amounts authorized are no longer even budgeted. Congress is the legislative body which takes the action on both these matters."

## **WITHHOLDING**

"Then-to top things off-administrative reductions from budgeted amounts for the highway program have become a matter of routine policy at the Federal level. The appropriated rate of progress is treated as little more than a theoretical concept."

## **STATES MUST STABILIZE THE PROGRAM**

"There may be at least two possible courses of action available to accomplish this objective."

## **BLOCK GRANTS**

"The first...would be Federal-aid highway legislation to provide for a so-called 'block grant' approach to the distribution of funding to the States..."

## **GO IT ALONE**

"A second approach would be to remove the Federal user taxing structure which now exists and then enact State legislation to re-establish this funding at the State level..."

"...Some of you may have had the opportunity to read the remarks of Mr. Richard J. Whalen, an author-journalist-lecturer, from Washington, D.C.-which were given at the AASHO-ARBA Public Information Workshop at St. Louis in May of 1969."

## **PEOPLE AND HIGHWAYS**

"...I truly believe some of his observations concerning people and highways are worth repeating here."

"Mr. Whalen said that he liked highways when they served his needs and disliked them when they encroached upon his territory. He spoke of the challenge of facing those who plan, build, and promote highway development. 'The challenge,' he said, 'is change.'"

"He commented that we are easily the most successful group of worried people he had ever seen."

"The American people-by and large-love highways, he commented, and can't get enough pavement to realize their ambitions to be on the go. The American way of life is an automobile centered way of life."

"Mr. Whalen then observed that 'up until a decade or so ago it was possible to speak of the American public, as though it were a fairly homogeneous mass of citizens generally agreed on what they wanted and the way they wanted to see it done.'"

## **A POPULATION DIVIDED**

"Now, he says, we are fundamentally and bitterly divided in this country. We cannot overlook this fact or sweep it under the rug."

"Mr. Whalen comments that road builders and those of us who explain highways now face several different publics-all of whom seem to be angry."

## **POWER**

"Often the highway is only a symbol of the problem. What the battle is really about, he says, is power-the power to enforce one set of social values over another."

"Mr. Whalen then suggests that road building cannot go forward in isolation from the divisions within society. He comments that we cannot defend established procedures simply on the grounds that they are established. It is not too early, he says, to entertain the new idea that established policies can-and probably will-be deestablished in the next decade and thereafter..."

### **Excerpts From the April 1971 Issue of American Highways.**

**W.J. BURMEISTER**, President of AASHO, to AHONAS on 3/10/1971

## **NEPA, 4F, AND PROJECT DELAY**

"Many of you are aware that on Friday and Saturday, February 19 and 20, the Chief Administrative Officers met in Denver for the purpose of discussing the 1970 Federal Aid Highway Act, the Muskie Bill, and the Environmental Quality Act of 1969. The Federal Highway Administrator and his staff were on hand to discuss the Highway Act. Joe Cohn of the Office of Management and Budget discussed the Muskie Bill and Mike Cafferty presented the Environmental Quality Act, with particular emphasis on the Environmental Statement and 4(f) provisions..."

## **PROJECT DELAY**

"Mr. Cafferty spoke in a rather positive manner about the ability of his office to process Environmental Statements and the ability to clear 4(f) statements. In this latter instance, however, he could give no assurance of speedy approval of 4(f) statements by the office of the Secretary since he has reserved for himself the exclusive right of approval. Personally, I am not so sure that the Environmental Statements will move rapidly through the many areas of required clearance. Mr. Turner anticipates that the clearance of Environmental Statements could easily extend the lead time for projects by as much as six months. I think even this is a conservative estimate of the time required for some of the more controversial projects. One administrator informed me that he anticipated a need to clear with 43 different State and Federal offices before the final Environmental Statement could be filed..."

## **AN ENVIRONMENTALIST**

"... Within the past few days, I read the account of testimony given by an individual who was criticizing our Division of Highways for the location of an Interstate route between Milwaukee and Green Bay, and challenging even the need for such a highway. He lives in the Kettle Moraine area, but commutes daily

to Milwaukee, a round trip of approximately 80 miles. He makes a considerable point of wanting to live in isolation in the Kettle Moraine, which is considered as a part of the National Ice-Age Park. Yet, he must drive into the City of Milwaukee each day on highways which are presently constructed and adequate to serve his particular purpose. I contend this is an irresponsible, antagonistic attitude toward an improved highway in the area, and if he is really conscientious about not despoiling the environment and ecology, and not contributing to the pollution, then he ought to live closer to his place of employment...This is the kind of determined opposition we face today in attempting to build the highway system we know will be needed tomorrow..."

### **THE PENDULUM**

"...In closing, I would like to make a further reference to the Environmental Policy Act of 1969. I am sure that the provisions of this Act as applied to the Federal Aid Highway Program will very materially retard the approval of projects, and, in some instances, may completely preclude such approval. Perhaps the extreme activity of some of the most ardent defenders of the environment and ecology have overplayed their hand to the extent that the public interest will suffer rather than be benefited by their activities. Perhaps the pendulum has swung too far in one direction. I do believe and I would sincerely hope that in the not too distant future, the pendulum will swing back to the center and we can jointly arrive at decisions which can be accepted by those who are now antagonistic toward the Highway Program..."

**A.E. JOHNSON**, Executive Secretary of AASHO to the Mississippi Valley Association on 3/12/71

### **A VOID**

"...In order for the (highway) administrator to properly carry out his official responsibility as a public servant, he must keep the public completely informed as to highway needs, the condition of the system, financial requirements, etc., so that the public can make the necessary decisions regarding the program. Therein lies a void at this time!"

### **EDITORIAL NOTE**

This is the first time I have seen the view presented from within AASHO, that the public should decide highway matters.

### **PUBLIC SUPPORT AND APATHY**

"It is the history of all public works programs, that when a basic need is so overwhelmingly evident in the beginning, you have strong public support and activity. However, long before the program completely satisfies its primary and basic function, a number of years pass and during that time a level of tolerable service is usually achieved and another generation or two have come upon the scene, and they begin to take the great accomplishments of the program as a matter of fact and the public support lags and becomes apathetic."

"In addition...others want to get into the act, sophistication and appendages are added to the program ostensibly to improve it or better it for various reasons most of which are rather expensive and time-consuming, but sometimes of questionable value."

"After the public becomes apathetic and turns into a tacit force, the critics, motivated by various reasons, then are able to establish their identity because they are articulate, aggressive forces, and, in time, they gather supporters and it can become a fad to oppose the program and disenchant the public with it."

### **THE SPOT WE ARE IN**

"That is the spot we are in right at this moment."

"Usually, the cycle is completed by the level of service of the program becoming so inadequate that public interest is rejuvenated, and the pendulum swings again. This could take a long time with effort on your part."

"Much of the situation that we face today is a direct product of highway officials not adequately educating and informing the public that they serve."

### **THE NEW LAW**

"...We just got a new highway law signed at the eleventh hour on December 31st, 1970, which gave us some of the tools we needed for coping with some of today's present problems, and giving us some assurance of this needed continuity that is so essential."

### **REVENUE SHARING**

"Just recently, the Administration has proposed revenue sharing which has an awful lot of political attractiveness and appeal about it, but it certainly introduces a high degree of uncertainty into the future of a Federal-aid highway program."

"...Until we get some indication as to whether or not we are going ahead on an orthodox Federal-aid highway program, or we are going to get some type of revenue sharing, we cannot make many plans..."

### **URBAN RESENTMENT**

"...I find a disturbing degree of resentment against highway departments by many city officials and generally it is because the highway program has been so successful and cities underfinanced. Many resent highway administrators on the grounds that they are not elected officials."

### **SHOCKED**

"...I am shocked at the headway that the anti-highway movement is making, and the recent unanimous Supreme Court decision passed on the I-40 location through Overton Park in Memphis, Tennessee is going to give those anti-highway activists an even stronger tool to use against the highway program,. A unanimous decision is so rare as to create a sensation within itself."

### **EIS REQUIREMENTS**

"...The environmental impact requirements now being made for the highway departments can well be the straw that breaks the camel's back in stalling the highway program. We have college professors all over the country analyzing the

itemized checklist in the environmental requirements of the highway program and developing instructions for bringing litigation and stalling highway projects with injunctions."

### **FEDERAL-AID MAY FALL**

"...the Federal-aid highway program, irregardless of the uncertainty about its continuation on the conventional basis or becoming part of a revenue sharing operation, is becoming so involved in detail and red tape that it may fall of its own weight."

"...I have been very concerned with urban problems since 1941, when Chief MacDonald outlined play-by-play and line-by-line the urbanization that has actually occurred in this country. He was about 20 years ahead of his time, but he definitely made an impression upon me."

### **ECONOMIC GROWTH CENTERS**

He cited the 'Economic Growth Center Development Highways program in the 1970 Highway Act as the means for reversing the urbanization trend. He went into great detail to make the case that large urban areas have become ungovernable and requiring an inordinate share of public resources to provide the necessary public services, repair decay, and to keep them running.

### **DECENTRALIZATION**

"The decentralization of population and industry is justified alone by national defense considerations."

"...Through the use of the tax incentive programs, encouraged decentralization of industrial expansion, Federal-aid and Federal transportation programs, public building programs and, presumably, works programs in the near future, we have an opportunity to select appropriate sites, and to create some new cities, complete within the meaning of a complex city, far enough away from existing high-density concentrations that they would not be influenced nor absorbed. Most all of our cities are like Topsy-they just grew."

### **NEW CITIES NEEDED**

"...We have suburban versus central city problems and the metropolitan area containing a multiplicity of separate municipalities with no really adequate area-wide process of government. In the creation of a new city, this problem would be eliminated by starting with an overall area-wide government concept from the beginning."

"...The highway portion of a new cities program would have to be one of the very first operations. Besides completing the Interstate System and modernizing the obsolete sections of our other road systems which cannot be delayed too long, I hope your role in the 1970's might also include some leadership and activity in a new cities program for growing America. In the old reference to the chicken or the egg coming first, the highway service might well be the egg that produced the new city."

**Excerpts From the July 1971 Issue of American Highways.**  
**RED TAPE TESTIMONEY on 6/15/71**

**W. J. BURMEISTER**, President of AASHO, and **ALF JOHNSON**, Executive Director, presented testimony to the House Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight of the Public Works Committee. They were accompanied by Dave Stevens of Maine and J.C. Dingwall, Texas who were members of the AASHO Red Tape Committee.

**THE RED TAPE COMMITTEE**

"...There are six other AASHO members...The other side of the 'Red Tape Committee' is composed of key Federal Highway Administration personnel, with Deputy Federal Highway Administrator **R.R.BARTELSMEYER**, and myself, serving as the Co-chairmen."

"The Red Tape Committee operation is strongly supported by Mr. Bartelsmeyer and by Federal Highway Administrator F.C. Turner."

"The Committee was organized in 1970, to be constructive and to offer the experience of the State highway people in reviewing tentative or draft memoranda or regulations for the highway program in advance of their being implemented, and to review existing procedures."

**MUCH RED TAPE COMES FROM CONGRESS**

"...First of all, we realize that to a certain degree the Federal people, as a result of past Blatnik Committee hearings into highway practices in some of the States, have become convinced that Federal procedures and directives must be very detailed and rigidly enforced. This is some of our problem, but not all, since much of the increasing red tape comes from Congress itself."

**HAVE WE REACHED THE LIMIT?**

"...under the stress and strain of the big highway program, with changes in administrations and personnel not only in the Administration, but in Congress, red tape has proliferated to the point that the States must take a good look as to whether or not Federal-aid is getting too unwieldy, and encroaching on the official prerogatives and responsibilities of the State highway commissions to the point that it might not be desirable, and even to the point that the program is becoming so top heavy that it could fall of its own dead weight."

**A HISTORICAL VIGNETTE**

"...We are reminded of an experience that our Director, A. E. Johnson, had in 1953, when he was participating in the formative stages of what is now the Interstate highway program. The National Governors' Conference had just adopted a resolution opposing any more Federal-aid for highways, about the time the sponsors of the big highway program were wanting to make an announcement at the Governors' Conference, and seeking support for the proposed stepped up and unprecedented (Interstate) highway program."

"Mr. Johnson was assigned to contact the Governors' conference Highway Committee to explain the new program and its needs and benefits, and to attempt to get the resolution rescinded."

"Governor Walter Kohler of Wisconsin chaired the Highway Committee of the Conference at that time, and he voiced his objections to Federal-aid for highways, in substance, as follows: If a highway project in Wisconsin is financed with State funds, it can be awarded in six months. If we decide to take Federal-aid, it would be a year and six months, and that was entirely too much lead-time for the benefits."

"Eventually, the resolution was rescinded, and then Vice President Richard M. Nixon explained (for President Eisenhower) the proposed Interstate program to the Governors at Bolton Landing, New York."

"Things have certainly changed since the time of Governor Kohler's statement, and highway departments that have made a study of it, think that the lead-time is at least twice now what it was in the middle 1950's, and even during the first few years of the big Interstate program."

"However, lead-time requirements naturally vary from State to State, depending on the density of population, and other controlling and complicating factors. They run from three to six, seven or eleven years now."

### **THE 3C PLANNING PROCESS**

"...The 3C Planning Process, Section 134 of Title 23...was developed by the AASHO-National League of Cities Joint Committee, and was recommended to Congress by AASHO."

"We wanted this process so that it could bring together in one place all of the proposed or ongoing programs within urban areas for coordination purposes, and we wanted to bring into the planning, decision-making and implementation process of a highway project the appropriate elected and appointed officials at the local levels of the affected governments."

### **DUPLICATION BY CONGRESS**

"In other words, we wanted to be sure that any project we built in a metropolitan area fit into the transportation needs of the city, and all of the matters affecting the interaction between highway transportation and desirable urban development were considered. Some of the Federal legislation since 1962 duplicates or adds embellishments to the 3C Process that gets into questionable detail."

"...if you will take a look at Sections 132,135,136, and 142 of the Act of 1970, you will see added detail and requirements being added by Congressional action, most of which are already covered in considerable detail in previous legislation or in directives controlling the highway program. This is the trend about which we have to be concerned."

"Section 136 adds considerable detail requirements to those included in Federal Highway Administration PPM 20-8, which has to do with the double hearing



process, and many related items, and specifies 22 different and distinct requirements that must be considered in the public hearing process."

### **A STEP TOWARD NATIONALIZATION**

"Originally, in the draft memorandum that was prepared, it even gave the critics of the project the appellant right, over the State highway commissions, directly to the Secretary of Transportation. It also prohibited forever the use of Federal-aid funds in the future on any section of highway that might be involved in a State-financed project if the directive were not followed in detail. This has been softened somewhat, but it still could be in effect in some cases. This would, in effect, have taken from the States their own highway program, and it would have no longer been a Federal-aid program to the States, but would have been a big step towards nationalization."

Burmeister covered in great detail the Federal requirements and commented on each. Also exhibited were procedural flow-charts and physical piles of documents as evidence of the requirements.

### **Excerpts From the January 1972 Issue of American Highways-The Record of The Annual Meeting held December 6, 1971.**

#### **CONGRESSIONAL PANEL**

The Panel was composed of John Kluczynski, Ill.-James C. Wright, Tex.- William Harsha, Ohio-Sen. Jennings Randolph, W.Va., represented by Barry Meyers-Sen. J. Caleb Boggs, Del., represented by Bailey Guard.

Each Congressman made an opening statement. Some of Congressman Harsha's remarks follow:

**HARSHA:** "I want to talk a little more about the general subject that Jim Wright discussed with you and elaborate on some of the problems that are facing those of you in the highway industry, as I see it."

#### **HIGHWAY CRITICS**

"As Jim pointed out to you, highway critics seem to be growing not only in intensity and volume and activity but they are also developing rather ingenious methods with which to invade the Highway Trust Fund. They have also developed techniques with which to make marked, if not significant changes in the highway construction program as you and I have known it over the last several years."

#### **1972 WILL BE A CRUCIAL YEAR**

"I think that the year 1972 is going to be a very crucial year for the Federal-aid highway program. I say this not only because of the incidents with the media that Jim Wright alluded to, but because of the various attacks on the highway program that are coming from other segments of our society; because members of congress who have not been aligned heretofore with the anti-highway coalition, now seem to be aligned with it for various and sundry reasons; and because of some of the recommendations of my own Administration in Washington."

## **A YEAR OF RECKONING**

"This has led me to believe that the year 1972 is to be the year of reckoning insofar as a so-called 'after '75 highway program' is concerned."

"If we do not enact an 'after '75 highway program' next year then, in all probability, we may have merely an innocuous extension of authorization's for the present program for two years. That means that it would be at least two more years, if not longer, before we could write the framework for the 'after '75 highway program'."

"As you know, the highway needs report for 1972 is due in January...it will indicate that we have need for almost \$600 billion of highway improvements for 1990 traffic."

## **WILL THE ADMINISTRATION ACT ON YOUR NEEDS STUDY?**

"...I sincerely hope that the Department of Transportation, the Office of Management and Budget, and the White House will approve recommendations for an adequate 'after '75 highway program.' However, this may not be the case. The Federal Highway Administration's recommendations may become lost or misplaced, or be completely rewritten."

"I wouldn't be at all surprised if the Administration failed to submit any meaningful recommendations to the Congress next year."

"If that is so, then legislation would have to be based upon other recommendations and testimony and particularly upon that of AASHO..."

"...I think you have everything to gain and nothing to lose by making highway safety a very strong portion of your recommendations to the Congress."

"...I want to comment on some of the recommendations that have been made, not only by members of the Congress but, by the Administration, which I think may be in serious conflict with the 'after '75 highway program' you are contemplating."

"One is revenue sharing. I will allude to that later in the panel discussion."

## **REORGANIZATION OF DOT**

"In addition, the Administration has submitted recommendations to the Congress for substantial reorganization of the Executive Branch. These recommendations include eliminating the Department of Transportation and transferring the Federal Highway Administration to a new Department of Community Development."

"We created the Department of Transportation in 1967 and further reorganized the Federal Highway Administration in 1970. I really do not see anything to be gained by reorganizing it again..."

"I do not see the logic of putting the Federal-aid highway program in the same agency with housing programs merely because roads and streets provide access to housing..."

He commented on the Bicycle Transportation Act of 1971 as another ingenious plan to raid the Highway Trust Fund.

"These are some of the things I see that point to the fact that 1972 is going to be a very, very difficult year and a very, very pertinent year insofar as highway construction is concerned."

### **TIME IS RUNNING OUT**

"...We have the votes now or next year, I am sure, to enact an 'after '75 highway program.' The longer we delay the more difficult it is going to be."

"As I say, if we do not do it next year it may be two or more years before the legislation can be considered, and this gives the opponents of the highway program an opportunity to enhance their ranks and to increase their arguments."

### **SUPPORT FOR BLOCK GRANTS**

**MEYER FOR RANDOLPH:** "...Of particular concern to the Senate Committee is the issue of public participation in the highway program. It is a matter of record in the most recent federal aid highway act that the Senate Committee on Public Works has been encouraging more and more opportunity for public participation at a much earlier stage in highway program development so that it is not at the very end, when the decisions have been made that the public has its opportunity to react and, in too many instances, to react in a negative fashion."

"...Senator Randolph believes that we should give serious consideration to streamlining the Federal-aid program and to loosening state and local government from the present ties with Washington."

"He suggests that with a few special exceptions-the Interstate system, bridge replacement and the federal domain roads-most existing categories of roads should be joined together."

"Instead of separate A,B,C and D programs, we should adopt a modified block grant approach."

"...Completion of the Interstate program is still a good six or seven years away. Although thought must be given to the post Interstate era there is no critical urgency to completing the revamp of the Federal-aid program. It would, in fact, be unwise to attempt to do so now..."

### **ECONOMIC GROWTH CENTERS**

**HARSHA:** "...We have also authorized, on a demonstration basis, the construction of economic growth center development highways, which, if properly administered can provide methods of solving many of our transportation, economic, and social problems...The expansion of construction of this type of highways could eliminate many of the problems and many of the critics that we now have. It would enable the use of development highways to stop, or at least minimize, the migration from the rural areas into the urban areas. Migration into urban areas has created large concentrations of people in small geographical areas, which, in turn, creates problems of unemployment, education, welfare,

crime, and impairment of the environment, and leaves rural or less populated areas in economic stalemate."

**W.J. BURMEISTER**-The President's Address.

### **FUTURE OF THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM**

"...I would like to make a few comments as to my opinion of the future of the highway program...It is obvious to even the most casual observer that the philosophy with respect to highways, particularly by those who are extremists in ecology and the environment, is changing rapidly. We have all experienced extreme opposition to highway improvements in both the urban and rural areas...obviously, we need to pay more attention in our highway design to the matters of environment and ecology than we have previously...As engineers with a great interest in the future of this country, we must work toward minimizing these undesirable effects of highways..."

### **SERIOUS CONSIDERATIONS**

"The Association will be faced with serious considerations in the next few months. The Congress, no doubt, will be actively considering the structure of the 1972 Federal Aid Highway Act. There will be the alternative of an act merely authorizing continuing funding, or of an aggressive forward-looking act with amplification of some of the provisions in previous acts and the possibility of the injection of completely new provisions. These new provisions may deal with: Further considerations with respect to environment and ecology; the continuing highway program; financing the urban system and an accelerated primary program; changes in the annual amount of financing available for the Interstate system and determination of its probable completion date; financing for highway-related features of transit systems; combining of the various categories of Federal aids now available for various purposes and respective systems; as well as other completely new subjects. No doubt the Association will be requested to take a position on revenue sharing and perhaps even on government reorganization as it might affect the Federal-aid Highway Program."

### **ALF JOHNSON RETIRES**

"...Our Executive Director, Mr. A. E. Johnson, has already announced that he will be retiring from that immensely important position on November 1, 1972..."

**JOHN VOLPE**, Secretary of Transportation.

### **LOCAL OPTION ON INTERSTATE PROJECTS**

"...there is no doubt that the interstate program must be completed and must be completed as rapidly as possible, except in those instances where local or state officials decide they just do not want them. I do not think we are going to force it down their throats."

**EDITORIAL NOTE:** This is the first sign that construction of Interstate projects might be optional with State and local officials.

### **SUPPORTS REVENUE SHARING**

"I am convinced, for instance, that the President's Special Revenue Sharing program will result in the greatest good for the greatest number. I believe it will help you in your states to utilize transportation funds where they are needed most and the decisions will be made at the state level where the needs are understood best."

"Similarly, I wholeheartedly endorse the proposed re-organization of the Executive Branch."

"Certain essential elements of the Department of Transportation would become a part of the Department of Economic Affairs. However, two other key elements of our shop will go into the Department of Community Development."

The rest of his speech was a pep talk on the environment, mass transit and 4F.

**F.C. TURNER**, Federal Highway Administrator.

### **THE 3C PLANNING PROCESS**

His entire speech was devoted to the planning process. He traced the history from the beginning of the planning surveys in 1934. He stressed that from the very beginning, local officials were brought into the process.

"...Now we have come a long way and have done a good job in planning since its beginnings in the late '20's. But we have still a long way to go and must constantly strive to keep abreast-in fact keep ahead of-the rapidly changing public valuemets. The things I have mentioned herein are part of this effort. There is no need, as some are suggesting, to tear down the whole structure built to date and start all over anew. Indeed, to do so, is certainly to waste our already inadequate resources."

"Neither can we operate effectively if we bodily separate the planning process from the program and operational process as some people are proposing because proper planning cannot be done in the vacuum which such a divorcement from our constantly evolving program activities would create. There is constant feedback between these twin responsibilities of the manager which cannot be separated."

"There is an imperative requirement for coordination of highway planning with other program planning. This coordination can most adequately be achieved within the program operational area by not separating all the planning out to itself just to make it a function apart. Planning for planning's sake alone is something that we just cannot afford...Planning cannot and should not be separated from construction anymore than construction itself can be done without regard to appropriate planning."

**EDITORIAL NOTE:** I think that the above was a reference to the proposals being made by the Office of the Secretary of Transportation and OMB that the 3C Planning Process be administered in the Office of the Secretary since it was multi-modal.

### **CHANGE IS INEVITABLE**

"...For in this era, as in each one before us, as well as those ahead of us, change is certainly the order of the day. You and I must be alert and responsive to it in the planning process which is the fundamental base on which we build the program, not only in highways but as highways are a part of the total transportation. It must be strengthened. It must be understood by the public. And you must defend, explain, and show to the critics that we are doing transportation planning that recognizes all of the modes and all of the needs; that planning is not dominated by the highway program and people for the selfish and narrow purpose of insuring that the decision at the end will come out in favor of highways..."

**Excerpts From the April 1972 Issue of American Highways.**  
**AASHO POLICY COMMITTEE**

**THE PLANNING PROCESS**

"...The Committee on Policy also took the following action concerning the role of the member departments in the transportation planning function:

'It is the position of AASHO that the State highway departments must be active participants in any major transportation planning function, that has a major impact on the highway program that is their responsibility, and that it is impracticable to separate the planning function from the State highway departments responsibilities for planning, building, maintaining and operating an adequate highway system for the public and budgeting financing for same.'

"...There have been some rather strong efforts made to take the planning responsibilities or participation away from the State highway departments and the Federal Highway Administration, and to lodge it in an Assistant Secretary's office in DOT and in urban area planning organizations, or regional planning organizations."

"We do not believe that the State highway departments can become 'operating agencies' only, subjugated to the planning, programming and implementation of some other separate agency or consortium of planning agencies that do not have the basic highway responsibility."

**REVENUE SHARING**

"...It is felt that many of the objectives in the 'Special Transportation Revenue Sharing' concept can be accomplished through a combination of existing allocations and transferability between allocations to create flexibility, all of which can be accomplished within Title 23, U.S. Code, without jeopardizing or eliminating an essential, adequate and continuing Federal-aid highway program."

**THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND**

"It is the position of the American Association of State Highway Officials, with respect to the Federal Highway Trust Fund, that it should be continued to be dedicated to highway development with flexibility to include 'highway - related activities' where and when indicated and justified by comprehensive, cooperative transportation planning to be in the public interest, and for the best method of relieving traffic congestion."

## **REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH**

"...AASHO considered the proposed Federal Executive Reorganization plan as it pertains to the highway program, and is not opposed to any attempt at any level to achieve a more efficient organizational structure best suited for attaining national goals and objectives, however, AASHO does oppose any reorganizational proposal that would result in the fragmentation of a single, identifiable, integrated, multi-modal Federal transportation agency, and such agency must include an identifiable and adequate highway unit, that concerns itself both with national highway transportation systems and community development transportation systems."

### **Excerpts From the July 1972 Issue of American Highways. PRESIDENT DINGWALL'S SENATE TESTIMONY on 5/11/72.**

"...This is the fourth time that we have presented recommendations to you that were developed by our 'After 75 Committee', and balloted upon by our Member State highway departments. This presentation supplements the previous presentations made to you in May 1967, May 1968, and May 1970."

## **TWENTY TWO RECOMMENDATIONS**

"...Attached to this Statement are 22 Recommendations...developed through our 'After 75 Committee'...and balloted upon by our Member State highway departments at a Special Meeting on March 14, 1972, in Chicago."

"It was during this Chicago meeting that we first learned of the contents and recommendations of the Department of Transportation's so-called 1972 National Highway Needs Report."

## **DISAGREES WITH THE NATIONAL NEEDS REPORT**

"Although the basic material, upon which it was to have been predicated, was supplied almost entirely by the several State highway departments, we have to take issue with the recommendations, and the manner in which our basic data has been interpreted."

"In our review of this 1972 National Highway Needs Report at Chicago, it was apparent that it was primarily intended to divert highway revenues to other purposes, and to incorporate in the Federal-aid highway program a version of the Administration's Revenue Sharing Plan."

## **ALLOTMENT CONTROLS**

"...We fervently hope that your Committee can help us eliminate the quarterly allotment controls over the Federal-aid highway funds."

"These quarterly allotment controls were injected into the highway program in 1959, by the Budget Bureau, when at that time, there was some danger of overdrawing the Trust Fund balance..."

"This condition no longer exists, so there is no need for the quarterly allotments, which are being used to throw uncertainty into the program..."

"When one adds up the four quarterly allotments, for the year, either for a single State, or for all of the States, it is less than the total authorized apportionments, thereby adding to a manipulated balance in the Highway Trust Fund."

### **SOME RECOMMENDATIONS**

**DAVE STEVENS** from Maine presented AASHO's 22 recommendations excerpted as follows:

1. The ABCD authorizations should be increased such that the total program at the new 70-30 match would be the same as at the 50-50 match and to pull down the Trust Fund balance.
2. Change from two-year authorizations to four.
3. Continue the Interstate program at the \$4 billion level and extend the Trust Fund appropriately.

### **THE 3C PROCESS**

4. \$1 billion for the urban system at 70-30.
5. Planning and Research moneys be increased by 1% to "help assure adequate planning in urban areas...through the 3C Transportation Planning Procedure...and the language be strengthened to make it clear that the State Highway Departments continue to participate in such cooperative planning...It is further recommended that there be no language included in...legislation that would impair or encroach upon the authority of State Highway Departments over...system extensions...in urban areas..."

### **AN AREAWIDE CONSORTIUM**

6. "That urban areas...be encouraged to provide an effective areawide official 'authority' or 'consortium' to represent the urban area...in the 3C Transportation Planning Process, and that such an 'authority' or 'consortium' have the power to commit the affected local governments...in the implementation of...highway improvements...approved by the State Highway Department..."
7. Full use of the Trust Fund balance and the end of cut-backs or impoundments.

### **RURAL REDEVELOPMENT**

13. "That Congress call for studies...to emphasize rural redevelopment, the latter to help reverse the present pattern of urban migration...The highway network performs both the skeletal and circulatory functions of a city...and can do much to...supply the basic highway transport accessibility as a necessary prerequisite for new city development."

### **TOLL ROAD REIMBURSEMENT**

14. "That Congress give attention to an equitable reimbursement to the States for the toll and free roads, including toll bridges and toll tunnels that are incorporated into the Interstate highway system, with the goal of



all sections of this National network...being free of tolls to the public upon the final completion of the Interstate program."

#### **RESOLUTION OF CONTROVERSIAL PROJECTS**

15. "That it is essential that the intent statement of Congress of 1956 regarding the early completion of the Interstate program be carried out, and in order to accomplish this goal of completing a connected nationwide network that 1972 Federal-aid highway legislation direct the appropriate responsible officials at all levels of government having any official interest or responsibility for any section of the Interstate program, where the location and design remains unresolved as of July 1, 1973, make a sincere and recorded effort to negotiate a compromise solution satisfactory to the Secretary, that will satisfy the intent of Congress of completing a connected system..."

#### **LITIGANTS SHOULD POST BOND**

17. "That language be included in the Federal-aid highway legislation for 1972 that would protect the substantial Federal and State interest in the Nation's highway programs, against legal action that would cause costly delays or interruptions in a Federal-aid highway project, by requiring the plaintiff in such injunctive proceedings to post a bond of sufficient amount to show sincerity of purpose and responsibility of action, and to discourage any irresponsible harassment and delaying tactics..."

#### **CONTRACT AUTHORITY**

19. "That Section 118...be strengthened and clarified to express the original intent of Congress regarding the contract authority concept in the Federal-aid highway program, and eliminate the administratively imposed issuance of quarterly obligational authority...Federal legislation should make it clear that the apportioned funds are to be used for the programs and purposes in amounts specifically authorized by the Congress."

#### **SYSTEM REALIGNMENT**

21. Had to do with system realignment based on functional classification and needs, setting the mileage in each system at a size that could be improved with the funds available.

#### **POST INTERSTATE**

22. Urged the Congress to establish the post-Interstate Federal interest and level of funding such that the transition to non-Interstate could be made smoothly and without interruption.

#### **FRANK TURNER RETIRES ON 6/30/1972**

**Excerpts From the October, 1972 Issue of American Highways.  
ALF JOHNSON'S RETIREMENT SPEECH**

The title of the speech was "A Commentary on My Years in Washington." It was presented at the Regional Highway Association meetings during 1972.

"...It is my intention to fully represent the State Highway Departments to fullest of my abilities until 5:00 p.m. on October 31, 1972, at which time I retire."

"It will complete almost 46 years of continuous service in the Highway Program; 27 and two-thirds years in my native State Highway Department of Arkansas and, lacking two months, 18 years in Washington as Executive Officer of AASHO."

### **SOME LITTLE KNOWN HISTORY**

"...In commenting on my years in Washington, I will cover a 20-year period, inasmuch as while serving as Chief Engineer-Director of the Arkansas Highway Department in 1953 and 1954, I spent a considerable number of the work days in Washington working on the formative stages of what is the Interstate Highway Program, at the request of the Bureau of Public Roads Commissioner, Francis V. du Pont and Sherman Adams, Special Assistant to the President at the White House."

"I chaired an informal Drafting Advisory Committee that put together the format and the highlights of what was to be the Interstate highway program to be sponsored and promoted by President Eisenhower. The Committee's recommendations were made to Commissioner du Pont."

"The people who have to be credited with the concept of our Interstate program were Chief Thomas H. MacDonald and his deputy, Herb Fairbank of the Bureau of Public Roads. However, those credited with actually taking the reports off the shelf and turning them into an action program are Francis V. du Pont and Frank Turner."

"I was asked to name the informal drafting committee, and it included Bert Tallamy of New York, George McCoy of California and General Frank Merrill of New Hampshire, and General Jimmy Anderson from Virginia..."

"I was also asked by Mr. Sherman Adams to work with the Governors Conference, inasmuch as that group had just proposed a resolution opposing any more Federal aid for highways."

"I was given the task of getting the Governors Conference to rescind that action, so that the then Vice President, Richard Nixon, could appear before the Governors Conference at Bolton Landing, New York and brief them on President Eisenhower's proposed grand highway plan and obtain their support." (Nixon was substituting for the President who could not be there because of an illness in his immediate family.)

"I ran into a little difficulty with the Chairman of the Governors Conference Highway Committee, Governor Walter Kohler of Wisconsin, who objected to the additional lead time it required to put a Federal-aid project under contract."

"He indicated that if he could go the State route he could get a contract underway in less than a year. If he took Federal-aid it would require an additional year. An

additional year does not appear too serious at the present time when Federal-aid projects average 77 months or more, and it is one of our major problems in the program."

"I had a good friend, Governor Kennon of Louisiana and Chairman of the Governors Conference, who at that time invited me and the governors making up the Highway Subcommittee to meet with him at his mansion in Baton Rouge."

"I am happy to report that I was successful in getting the Governors Conference, through the efforts of Governor Kennon, to withdraw any opposition that they might have to the new Interstate Highway Program."

"The informal drafting committee which I have referred to previously reviewed the Interregional Report coming from the Delano Committee of 1941, which was put in official form and submitted in 1944, which treated several different systems or mileages as possible programs, ranging from 20,000 up to 77,000 miles. We recommended 40,000 miles. (Actually, 40,000 miles was established by the Congress in the 1944 Highway Act.) We recommended complete control of access roads and the building of any major bridges as might be required instead of making the Interstate routes cross existing bridges as some of the more conservative people in the highway activity had wanted to do. We also after much study recommended the 90-10% matching ratio to insure the participation of every State, which was deemed essential."

"All of these recommendations and the first highway needs study made by the States together with considerable information gathered by Frank Turner, who was made staff man, was considered by the Clay Committee in 1954."

"In 1954, I had the privilege of serving as special advisor to the Clay Committee, which put the frosting on the cake of the new program, but it changed our recommendation from a Highway Trust Fund, financed with largely highway user imposts, to a bond program which Congress in its good judgment laid aside in favor of a Trust Fund in 1956."

"I also had the opportunity of giving the State Highway Departments in 1954 at the Seattle AASHO Annual Meeting, while having the honor of serving as AASHO President, the first knowledge that they actually had as to the kind of program that was being envisioned."

"I advised that I did not know exactly what time the proposal would become a reality, but that it was gaining momentum and we would have an Interstate Program, which was so badly needed in this country because the Primary highway system was no longer capable of handling the normal traffic assigned to it, plus the increasing amount of high speed, long-haul highway traffic."

"I indicated that the need for this class of road was being manifested by the toll road era in the United States at that time."

"I also advised the State Highway Departments that if we undertook the program as a partnership with Federal-aid financing, it involved some calculated risks because of the amount of money involved and the kind of program, but that if we did not undertake it, the big highway program would be done by another group wishing to have it as an expanded civil works activity."

"One of the elder statesmen in the Highway Departments at that time was Commissioner Sam Hadden of Indiana. He was not opposed to the program per se, but he was concerned that it was so big and there was so much money involved that it would cause many problems in the future and might even cause the demise of AASHO, and lead to the federalization of the Highway Program. He indicated that when you 'hang up the meat, the wolves will gather under it.', and the money we were talking about was a lot of meat. However, the Highway Departments did decide, if and when the opportunity came along, they would undertake the job."

"We had a great deal of creative guidance from Frank du Pont. He had vision and was in a position to get things done, since he had been a major money raiser for the new Republican administration."

"In a meeting with the informal drafting committee, he made the statement that he could envision the Federal contribution to such a program running to \$40 to \$50 billion, whereupon some of the mouths flew open in shock and astonishment."

"He replied that the program was expensive, but it would be more expensive not to have it, and to 'aim at the moon because it wasn't any harder on the gun, and someday somebody was going to hit it.'"

"Frank Turner's dedication in those years was a great factor in getting the program underway. I have known Frank Turner personally for 40 years, starting at the time he came to my home State as a young and extremely well-liked Bureau of Public Roads engineer, where he and I learned to respect each other professionally and personally."

"...At the Seattle annual meeting, AASHO's Executive Secretary, Hal Hale, submitted his resignation, which was not expected."

"A Search Committee was named, and I was asked to take over the AASHO executive spot. I indicated that I would consider it only if I were acceptable to each and every State Highway Department, which I was, and on December 31, 1954, I moved to Washington."

"...After the Clay Committee had finished its report, it got hung up in the Budget Bureau of the Executive Branch of Government, which is not uncommon. And there were some hard feelings on Capitol Hill by some of the Republican highway leaders who had not participated in the development of the 'Grand Highway Plan'." (This was the term used by President Eisenhower in the speech to the Governors delivered by Vice President Nixon.)

"One of the first things I had to learn in coming to Washington was that the Budget Bureau is the Executive Branch and that everything in Washington is over organized and over-complicated, and generally tied up in a neat bundle of red tape."

#### **EDITORIAL NOTE:**

I have compared notes with Frank Turner on these events having to do with the launching of the Interstate System. He corroborates Alf's recollections and adds some of his own. According to Frank, du Pont came to his job as Commissioner

of Public Roads with a very clear intention of developing a program to finance and build the Interstate. This was not unusual because he was Highway Commissioner of Delaware for some 25 years and knew the program very well and the critical need to up-grade the deteriorating highway system. He was very influential in high Republican circles and in the business community as well as in the highest social circles. His father, Coleman du Pont, was very influential in the creation of the Federal-aid program in the first place having been the Chairman of the National Highway Association which advocated a National Program in the early part of this century. He also built, at his own expense, a divided median parkway from Wilmington to Dover beginning in 1913.

In order to get the program going, Commissioner du Pont had to have the support of the Administration and the States. Alf has documented the interactions with the Governors. Access to the Oval Office was developed through General Merrill, head of the New Hampshire Highway Department. (He led the famous Merrill's Marauders in many heroic feats in World War II and so was not unknown to President Eisenhower). After the war, he was assigned to a high post in the Philippines at the same time Frank Turner was putting the highways back together there. They developed a close working relationship.

General Merrill was appointed to head the New Hampshire Highway Department by Sherman Adams when he was Governor. They developed a close relationship. It was through those channels that complete access to the Oval Office was established when Sherman Adams was Eisenhower's chief of staff.

AASHO elected General Merrill President at their New Orleans annual meeting in 1954. He died on the way home. We all know the man who succeeded him as President. Rex Whitton.

#### **ALF JOHNSON:**

"Almost immediately after taking over the AASHO job, I received a call from the office of the Secretary of Commerce under whom the Bureau of Public Roads operated at that time. I was requested to permit them to review and edit any mailing I made before it was mailed to the Member Departments."

"I very forcefully indicated that such a privilege would not be extended, and if it ever came to pass that AASHO letters had to be approved that there was no need for the American Association of State Highway Officials. That was the last time I had such a request."

"The Chairman of the Senate Roads Subcommittee at that time was a good friend of mine, Albert Gore from Tennessee."

"Albert knew that the President's Grand Highway Plan was tied up in the Budget Bureau, and he introduced an Interstate Highway Bill on his own, which actually treated the Interstate Highway as an addition to the Federal-aid Primary system. He did this on February 5, 1955, and it jarred loose the Administration's Highway Bill from the Budget Bureau."

"The Bill was defeated in Congress that year, and the post mortem of that defeat was indeed very interesting. Some rather diverse groups had a great deal to do with the defeat. Some were pro-highway and some were anti-highway."

"George Fallon of Maryland was the Chairman of the House Roads Subcommittee, and he took the defeat rather seriously. It was only through the efforts of some of his friends that he introduced the Bill again in 1956, at which time it was successful, with Title I being the program and Title II the funding, and the creation of the Trust Fund."

"...Almost immediately upon going to Washington, I received a letter from Jere Cooper of Tennessee, of the House Ways & Means Committee, to serve as a highway finance advisor, which I was happy to do."

"Later, when Congressman Cooper died, an old friend of mine, Wilbur Mills, became Chairman of that extremely important Committee, and our long friendship has been I think very much in the public interest. Chairman Mills is very informed on highway matters."

#### **EDITORIAL NOTE:**

Both Frank Turner and Alf Johnson knew Wilbur Mills when he was a judge in Arkansas. If one is given to philosophizing, one can speculate on what would have happened to the highway program if all of these great and talented personalities had not come together at that particular time.

#### **ALF:**

"I have usually had excellent relations on Capitol Hill and with Congressional staffs. And I am reminded of a comment that was once made, 'To some of us you are a straight-laced conservative, but we realize to some of your own State Highway Departments, you are probably a raving liberal, so you are probably on the right track.'"

"...in 1959, I learned that there was going to be a deficit in the Highway Trust Fund, and the Administration intended for it to become a surprise to the Highway Departments, and they in turn would have to carry about \$400 million on the cuff for several months."

"As a result, in contacting the Executive Branch and the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee we were able to get an amendment making \$400 million available to the Program from the General Fund."

"And it was added as an amendment to the Foreign Aid bill, since it was in the waning days of the Congressional session, too late to start any separate action and, as the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations committee said, he would add it to a bill that the Administration couldn't veto, and that he always kept the Foreign Aid Bill on his desk until the last days for such purposes."

"...As a member of the National Advisory Council on Urban Transportation, I was named the chairman of a special task force to review the National Transportation Study of 1972. I was somewhat concerned over the general fabric of the report, such as:

- a. Describes the highway needs estimate as the 'Highway Want List'.
- b. Criticizes the Highway Departments for use of geometric standards as a basis for computing their needs.

- c. Attempts to determine priorities in transportation almost wholly on the cost-benefit ratio or cost-effectiveness approach, without considering the public's wishes or desires.
- d. Low rates rural highway priorities by using a per capita measurement in which only rural population is used, whereas most of the traffic on a rural primary highway comes from urban areas..."

"...In 1972, AASHO testified in the House against a new Department of Community Development, which would transfer the Federal-aid Highway Program into a reorganized and expanded HUD. The Administration proposed such a switch by citing highway transport as a community matter and rail and air as national transportation systems."

"...I have maintained a very low profile. I assumed this low profile in 1955, after there was some talk of investigating my influence in Federal highway legislative activities. And I do not think it is proper for the State Highway Departments, agencies of sovereign States, who have the major basic highway responsibilities to the public, to operate through a lobbyist. I further believe that my Hill activities should never adversely affect the best interests of the States."

"...I was kicked out of one executive session of the House Public Works Committee, when Congressman Buckley of New York was its chairman. Congressman Buckley only spent four or five days in Washington each Congressional session and, as a result, Congressman Fallon always chaired the meetings, and he asked me to attend the session. This was one of those few days that Mr. Buckley showed up. He took the chair and wanted to know what I was doing in there, and he kicked me out. While I was in the hall licking my wounds, out came Frank Turner who had suffered the same indignity, so I didn't feel too badly."

"After the death of Chairman Chavez on the Senate side, a new staff for the Public Works Committee was retained. I was called to the Hill and advised that they were federalists and that there was going to be a decline in the role of State Highway Departments in influencing highway legislation, and they would not be looking either to the Federal Highway Administration or to AASHO for highway needs, estimates, etc. but intended to hire a consultant periodically who could get the sort of information on short notice that they would need to draft their programs."

"They had in mind breaking the Federal-aid Highway Program into a group of regional programs and holding hearings around the country at frequent intervals, presumably to get more political mileage."

"When Jennings Randolph became the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, this matter cleared up as those staff people left Capitol Hill. This did, however, cause me considerable concern at the time."

"...Many of you may remember the NBC-TV presentation entitled 'The Great Highway Robbery' and in my opinion it brutalized the highway program and then Federal Highway Administrator, Rex M. Whitton. I had information that the two sponsors of that show had a preview of it before it was shown to the nation, and they should have known it had the potential of damaging the character of some very fine highway officials, as well as leaving untrue impressions regarding the program on the public mind. The next morning after the showing, I wrote the

State Highway Departments a confidential letter which was leaked by someone, and as a result I was threatened with a sizable personal lawsuit by an attorney of one of the sponsors."

"I immediately contacted the members of the AASHO Executive Committee for authorization to retain some legal assistance and they declined, saying that this overall issue was something that they could not individually become identified with by association or any other way, which left me hanging in mid-air."

"Finally, one of the Members of the AASHO Executive Committee made his own general counsel available, and after some discussions with the sponsor's attorney, the threat of litigation against me disappeared. I am of the opinion that neither the sponsors nor the network wished to risk a legal challenge as to whether or not the ubiquitous disclaimer clause generally used would actually save harmless the sponsor. However, I learned a lesson and from that day I have kept myself protected by a liability insurance policy, and I strongly recommend that my successor do the same..."

This was a very long speech and covered a lot of ground. I have heavily excerpted it. It is recommended reading in its entirety for those who want deeper insights into the highway program.

**Excerpts From the January, 1973 Issue of American Highways-The Record of the 58th Annual Meeting, November 27, 1972**

**J.C. DINGWALL, Texas, The President's Annual Address**

"This past year has brought a changing of the guard in the leadership of the highway program in the United States the likes of which we have not seen before."

"...The year has brought with it retirements and departures from the halls of Congress of many of the statesmen who participated in the revitalization of the Federal aid highway program in 1956."

"Among them were leaders in the establishment of the Highway Trust Fund. Among them were authors of the legislation that brought the Interstate Highway system into being. These are giants, unafraid to dream big dreams and then work to bring those dreams to realization."

"...The changing of the guard is perhaps best exemplified by the retirement of our friend and colleague, Mr. Alf Johnson, the executive director of AASHO."

"...At the Federal level also, the muster rolls are missing the name of another great captain, Frank Turner - a longtime trusted friend. I can truly say that he is a man who is dedicated to principle always over expediency. Frank was a protege of Thomas H. MacDonald, the man generally acknowledged as originator of the Interstate system concept. I predict that history will record that the student, in Frank Turner's case, exceeded the achievements of the coach."

"...it seems that for most of the year, we spent most of our time preparing for or appearing before Congress about one matter or another."



"To understand this, I think one must understand what's going on in our society. Highways are under attack from all directions. I think that this is so because there is a substantial protest subculture in the United States whose chief targets are the successful elements of the so-called Establishment. There is an amazing lack of protest over the failures of other programs. But show me a successful program, or organization, or institution and I'll show you a target for these attacks."

"...We must tell the story like it is, and we must be certain we are chipping away at everything that doesn't really look like our particular elephant."

"Let me give you an illustration or two of what I mean."

"First, and probably most noteworthy, the State of Missouri on its own filed suit against the Secretary of Transportation and the Office of Management and Budget, contending that the withholding of funds authorized by Congress is illegal. The federal district court said the State was correct and the funds were order restored. Even though the case is now on appeal, it is evident that one State's willingness to take a stand has turned an apparently hopeless situation into a possible victory."

"At the same time, Senators Randolph and Bellmon together with others in the Congress have spoken out loudly and clearly on this procedure by the OMB. In this way, the situation has reached the front pages..."

"...Now, as we all know, the proposed 1972 highway legislation died in the waning hours of the 92nd Congress."

"Without blaming anyone or any group, without pointing the finger, and without rancor, let's all talk to our congressional people and see if we can't get this going again in the very early days of 1973..."

**RALPH BARTELSMEYER**, Acting Federal Highway Administrator.

### **TROUBLED TIMES**

"...We meet here today in a troubled time. As we all know, Congress did not pass any highway legislation this year, and you are, I am aware, deeply concerned. I understand and sympathize with your concern. Undeniably, there are some dark clouds hovering over us at the moment. However, AASHO has met in troubled times before, and adversity - of whatever nature - has always been overcome. This crisis, too, will be resolved. As Shakespeare phrased it, 'The morning steals upon the night, melting the darkness.' Our dark hour will also pass."

"...I am aware that several key members of Congress will appear on the program here this afternoon, and I believe it is proper to defer to them concerning a probable Congressional timetable on the needed legislation."

### **THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION POSITION**

"...I think I should explain, however, the Department of Transportation's position on the type of legislation we feel is needed. As you know, we supported the provision in the Senate Bill which would have permitted \$800 million annually

from the Highway Trust Fund to be allocated on a 'pass thru' basis to urbanized areas - and which would have permitted local officials to help decide how the money would be spent, whether for highways, mass transit or a combination of the two."

"There will be no retreat from that general position. The Department will hold firm on that. It will support and seek similar legislation in the coming session."

"When the Department submitted draft legislation to Congress early this year, it recommended that some Trust Fund monies be made available for urban mass transit facilities, both rail and highway oriented."

"We thought then that this was desirable and necessary. We think now that it is desirable and necessary."

### **LOCAL DECISIONMAKING MUST BE PERMITTED**

"...The local officials should be permitted to make these vital decisions. Ample Federal approval provisions will remain to assure that local decisions represent sound and viable programs."

### **THE ENERGY CRISIS**

"...Even if the congestion problem did not exist, there would be another compelling reason for providing our cities with adequate mass transit facilities. That is the critical fuel shortage this Nation faces in the near future. This is a most serious problem - one that must concern all of us deeply - and it is imminent. Obviously, one of the necessary remedial measures is to reduce fuel consumption; and this can be done, in part, by significantly reducing the use of private automobiles in urban areas during rush hours, and using, instead, mass transit systems."

### **A NEW ERA**

"...We must accept the fact that the Federal-State highway program has entered a new era - an era in which the role of highways is a changed one, but not a diminished one..."

### **AN APPEAL**

"...You, the members of AASHO, are being given the opportunity - now - to assume the leadership in this total transportation challenge. If you do not accept it, someone else surely will! I say let's accept this challenge eagerly and enthusiastically;.."

"Let this, the 58th Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, be a historic one. Let it be remembered as the occasion when America's highway officials moved on a new course of total transportation responsibility, with highways remaining that important common factor upon which all other modes depend to a great degree for success in the Nation's total transportation scheme."

"Thank you."

## CONGRESSIONAL PANEL DISCUSSION

Panel members were Rep. John C. Kluczynski, Ill.- Rep. James C. Wright, Texas-and Rep. Don Clausen, Cal. All were members of the House Subcommittee on Roads. President Dingwall moderated the session.

**DINGWALL:** "Since the failure of the 1972 Federal-aid Highway Act, Secretary Volpe in a speech before the New York Board of Trade indicated that one of the objectives of the Administration in 1973 will be to again urge upon the Congress to permit the utilization of the Highway Trust Fund for urban public transportation with local option on how funds should be spent. Given the estimated needs for an adequate highway transportation system at work (network?) obtained in the 1972 National Transportation Needs Study, what is your position on this matter?"

**KLUCZYNSKI:** He pointed out that the needs study indicated a \$570 billion highways need with about \$300 billion of that to come from the Federal Government. At that rate, the Highway Trust Fund would have to be doubled just to meet the highway needs, much less pay for transit. He remained unalterably opposed.

**DINGWALL:** "...Is the new highway construction effective tool to develop new economic growth centers and to provide a better way of life by eliminating some of the problems of the old city?..."

**CLAUSEN:** He gave a lengthy answer. The essence was that he had advanced a demonstration project on economic growth centers in 1970 and that a \$150 million on-going program had been accepted by the conferees on the 1972 Act. He felt that too much past emphasis had been placed on population and traffic counts as the indicators for the allocation of funds instead of paying attention to where people ought to live. He felt like the idea was going to catch on.

He felt that the way out of the legislative deadlock was to create a transit trust fund and then follow the highway pattern of an intensive inventory of transit needs and then hold extensive hearings to determine the funding levels and the allocation methods of the legislation.

**DINGWALL:** "...In the proposed 1972 Highway Act as it emerged from conference containing a greatly expanded safety program tied to it, could you highlight that part of the Bill for us and what would it mean in terms of new, added dimensions to the safety program?"

**WRIGHT:** He described the intense interest in the Congress for reducing the number of highway fatalities in the years ahead.

"We included a total of some \$436 million of authorizations for fiscal year 1973, approximately \$1.1 billion for fiscal '74 and \$1.5 billion in all of fiscal '75." He expected any bill passed to contain at least those levels. He cited safety as a good reason that the highway program would pass in 1973 without transit diversion.

**DINGWALL:** "In the Conference Committee when the 1972 proposed Federal Highway Act was being discussed, was there any general agreement that general funds be provided to meet the needs for mass transportation?"

**KLUCZYNSKI:** "...I would like to make it perfectly clear at this point that the 1972 Highway Act, as it came out of Conference, was not only a great Highway Act, but Title III of that proposal contained the largest and most comprehensive transit program ever to come before Congress. It contained an additional - just get this - an additional three billion dollars over and above the \$3.1 billion authorized in the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970. It also contained for the first time operating subsidy authorization of a hundred million dollars for 1973 and three hundred million dollars for 1974. All of this would be under contract authority as in the highway program, but it would all come from the general fund."

"Can you imagine a highway bill with such a big boost for mass transit? If the bill had passed in the House on the final date of October 18th, it would be a law today. Of course, that assumes it would have escaped President Nixon's big veto stamp. That is a pretty uncertain assumption to make these days, but at least we did our part in the conference to produce such a bill."

"I might add as a direct response to your question that there was not general agreement in the conference that general fund monies should be used for transit. You highway administrators know this only too well because you all received, in a move unprecedented to my knowledge in the history of Congress, a telegram from seven of the Senate conferees which indicated the thinking of some of the Senate conferees implying that they had given in on the Cooper-Muskie proposal to take mass transit funds from the Trust Fund. What they neglected to say was that the only reason they wanted a one year extension of the ABCD (highway) program instead of the two years which was in both bills, was to insure that the subject would have to be treated again early in the next Congress. As it turned out, of course, we have no bill and not even a one year extension, so those people got their way anyway."

"It certainly is my hope that we can address ourselves to this problem in the next session by recommending a third Trust Fund for mass transit and leaving the Highway Trust Fund and the Airway Trust Fund alone...Of course there are many people who profess to be in favor of a transit program, but are in reality simply opposed to highways..."

**DINGWALL:** "Congressman Clausen...In the 1972 proposed Federal-aid Highway Act, there was developed a program of a 10,000 mile priority primary system to connect with the Interstate...Could you give us some of the background..."

**CLAUSEN:** "...I would like to allude and read from the committee report as it came out of the House, and I think it best details essentially what we were attempting to get at. As a result of this needs study, they made a recommendation that as the Interstate highway system reaches a point of completion in this country, and as Mr. Wright has stated so eloquently, the very serious problem of unsafe highways, unsafe bridges throughout the United States, that there was a need for a follow-on program. There was much in the way of support in the Congress to expand the Interstate highway system after the '79 completion date..., the Interstate highway system having reached about 80 percent of completion. But in the wisdom of the committee itself, it felt that what should be done is to go back to that needs study report and come forth with a 10,000 mile intermediate highway program based upon priorities that would come from the States in cooperation with the local units of government."

"...This supplemental system in conjunction with the Interstate system would provide accessibility to over 90 percent of all urban population, and nearly all urban places over 50,000 population, as well as to the rural regions through which it would pass...data from the '68 Needs Report was utilized to arrive at the figure of 10,000 miles..."

**DINGWALL:** "Now I would like to ask the Congressmen if they would like to make a closing statement, and we will begin with Chairman Kluczynski."

**KLUCZYNSKI:** "...You didn't get your normal highway bill in 1972, and your program is slowly grinding to a halt in many States." He encouraged them to pull out all of the stops next year and present the hard facts to the Congress.

"I understand that the President has ordered everybody to resign down there and in the same breath has asked them how the whole outfit should be reorganized. I also understand he may not fire anybody at all, just shift them around to a different job. Maybe we will see Henry Kissinger in charge of the highway program and Ralph Bartelsmeyer advising the Russians and the Chinese..."

**CLAUSEN:** He warned them that they could no longer depend on the Congressional Committees having jurisdiction over highways to get the job done. The Congress was taking on a whole new complexion and the committees would not possess the power that they had in the past. He felt that the future of the highway program would depend more on public sentiment than anything else.

**E.J. PELTIER**, President, American Road Builders.

#### **REVENUE SHARING LEGISLATION**

"As a starting point, let me suggest to you that historians may note that enacting the general revenue-sharing bill was the most important action taken by the 92nd Congress. It will have that kind of historic impact if it sets a trend for future actions. If it fails to set a trend, historians will tag it as a mere aberration - a small kink in the thread of history.

#### **THE ADMINISTRATION WILL PRESS FOR IT NEXT YEAR**

"...While \$30 billion is a lot of money, the significance of the legislation...is that the Administration will press the fight next year for the enactment of six special revenue-sharing proposals, including Special Transportation-Revenue Sharing."

"This is what John Ehrlichman, special assistant to the President for domestic affairs says, and I quote:

"The philosophy of general revenue sharing is pervasive in the President's approach to domestic policy, and we expect that the real test will come next Congress when we press for the six special revenue sharing reforms..."

"...Some of you, perhaps, have forgotten about Special Transportation Revenue-Sharing. The proposal, which the President first made in his State of the Union Message in January, 1971, has lain dormant in Congress. In essence, it involves a pooling of the revenues from the Highway Trust Fund, the Airports and Airways Trust Fund, and funds appropriated for the urban mass-transit program. This

pool of money was to be distributed to State and local governments for application to any transportation program whatsoever, including maintenance and operating costs."

### **VOLPE'S PROPOSAL**

"The program presented last spring by Secretary Volpe, which centered around the proposed single Urban Fund, is a step in the direction of Special Transportation-Revenue-Sharing."

"The Cooper-Muskie Amendment to the 1972 Highway Act (to open the Highway Trust Fund to mass transit), which the Administration supported in the closing weeks of the 92nd Congress represents a much smaller step in the same direction."

### **THE EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION PLAN**

"One more proposal needs to be mentioned to put the situation in proper context. The Executive Reorganization Plan would, among other things, abolish the Federal Department of Transportation. DOT's highway and urban mass- transit functions would be assigned to a new Department of Community Development. DOT's Airport function and national transportation policy function would be transferred to a new Department of Economic Development."

### **THE END OF FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT**

"...the Cooper-Muskie Amendment represented only a very small fraction of the Administration program for transportation. In its totality the Administration plan would result in...the end of Federal involvement..."

"In this broad context, the matter of opening up the Highway Trust Fund for some diversion to support the urban mass-transit program is only a detail. The real issue is whether we want to abandon the Federal role in transportation development."

He discussed the pros and cons of the Federal role in some detail.

### **SUPPORTS CONTINUING FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT**

"There are more substantive reasons for continuing the Federal-aid program, the most important of which is that a strong Federal position is going to be required if we, as a Nation, are going to meet the most urgent of our transportation needs."

He talked against operating subsidies for mass transit at some length but defended Federal involvement in capital outlays for major transit improvements:

"...the Federal Government does have an interest in developing modern efficient urban public transportation systems. The Federal Government, properly, is the leader in accomplishing the research and development work which is essential to the building of better transit systems. Furthermore, since these systems require large capital outlays, it seems proper for Federal assistance to be channeled in this direction."

## **SUPPORTS USER TAXES**

"...it is basically sound to support these transportation development programs from special taxes which are related to the use of the transportation facilities and which are levied on the beneficiaries of the programs as equitably as possible."

"The 93rd Congress, which convenes January 3, will be considering new authorizations for highways, airports, and urban public transportation. There is an opportunity, as these authorizations are discussed, to broaden the discussion to cover the total, multi-modal, transportation problem of this country."

"We need that kind of discussion."

## **SUPPORTS INCREASED TRANSPORTATION FUNDING**

"We need to make it understood that the highway, airport, and urban mass transportation programs are all underfunded."

"We need to emphasize that the Department of Transportation has a responsibility to relate its legislative requests to the needs of the programs."

"Concurring in the belief that local transportation decisions can be made at the local level, we also need to clarify whether the Federal government also has a responsibility to exert leadership in developing a national transportation system..."

**VOLPE STEPS DOWN AS SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION-12/72**  
**CLAUDE BRINEGAR APPOINTED SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION-12/72**  
**WILLIAM DUNN**, Executive Vice-President, Associated General Contractors.

## **GOOD ECONOMIC PROSPECTS**

He expressed optimism for the future because of the success in holding down inflation and the stimulation of productivity which would result in economic growth:

"...What does all this euphoria, this optimism, mean to us if there is no highway program?"

## **SUPPORTS AASHO RECOMMENDATIONS**

He supported the AASHO recommendations for a separate transit trust fund and no diversion from the Highway Trust Fund:

## **OPPOSES THE U.S. DOT**

"The Department of Transportation believes that it is indeed proper to permit urbanized areas to use some Highway Trust Fund monies to obtain needed transit systems - even if they happen to be rail oriented - because, after all, anything that we can do to eliminate or reduce congestion is beneficial to the highway systems of those areas, and the motorists who use them. We oppose this without reservation..."

## **NORBERT TIEMAN APPOINTED FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR-5/73**

At the 59th Annual Meeting held in Los Angeles Nov. 12, 1973, the Policy Committee approved the change in name from the American Association of State Highway Officials to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. At the same time, a new Constitution was approved which broadened the purpose of the organization to include mass transportation and to include representation of transit officials. Minor changes in geographic representation were also made.

At the same time, the official journal of the organization was changed to the American Highway and Transportation Monthly instead of the traditional quarterly publication. The new format was more oriented to news reporting than the old publications.

### **Excerpts from the March, 1974 Issue of the American Highway and Transportation Monthly-The Record of the 59th Annual Meeting.**

**THOMAS F. AIRIS**, D.C.-The President's Address-Nov. 12, 1973.

"...The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 was signed into law by President Nixon on August 13th and it is old news now. As Governor Tieman, Federal Highway Administrator remarked in a recent speech, 'it is a complex and significant piece of legislation.'"

"For a matter of fact, some of its provisions depart from traditional practice to the extent that in spite of a number of explanatory bulletins by various organizations, we State officials still don't know fully all of its far-ranging implications. Even now, the AASHO staff, plus four AASHO Task Force Committees, are still consulting with Federal Highway Administration officials in an attempt to solve some knotty problems of interpretation..."

"...One thing for certain. The States do have a Highway Act. We anticipate it would be adequate for the next two to three years. This, alone, is very much a plus over last year..."

"The single feature of the Act that made headlines, of course, was the compromise in Section 137 that permits, under certain conditions, equivalent amounts of general funds for construction of non-highway public transit including fixed rail in lieu of authorized Interstate projects, local and State Governments no longer consider necessary. This is a novel feature, but the provisions dealing with priority primary routes, the urban high density traffic programs, economic growth center development highways, public mass transportation studies, the special earmarking of urban funds, and the addition of the extensive Title II Safety Act provisions, from a practical standpoint, are also equally new and novel and no less significant..."

"...I would like to conclude by philosophizing just a little bit. We hear a great deal nowadays about changes or innovations in the transportation field - about total transportation. Yesterday the glamour term was 'balanced transportation,' and Governor Tieman, our Federal Highway Administrator, spoke recently of the 'The Quiet Revolution.' This indicates, I think, that in urban areas, particularly those of the Northeast, there is unrest over our present mix of modes; there is too much traffic congestion on city streets and highways caused, to a sizable extent, by commuters' preference for their private vehicles on the home-to-work, work-to-



home movements. There is the feeling that something ought to be done about this situation."

"The corrective action, I think, is going to require some 'real doing' in the form of furnishing the large metropolitan area commuter a better alternative - a 'better mousetrap' if you will. We need better coordination between existing modes, and perhaps someday, even new modes."

"...Too often nowadays the tried and proven principles are unpopular simply because they are not new."

"When to stand firm and when to adopt innovative approaches is where good judgment apparently has no substitute."

"It appears to me that top administrators dealing with urban areas need not only to be intimately familiar with all the facts, but also sufficiently nimble to avoid losing their heads over unpopular positions on inconsequential matters. On the other hand, I don't think, since we are, after all, professional people, we stand to gain much respect or popular support by emulating the ethics and practices of the world's oldest profession and have no principles at all."

**CLAUDE S. BRINEGAR**, Secretary of Transportation

"For nearly 60 years the American Association of State Highway Officials has held a position of leadership in supplying public highways in response to public demand..."

"But now, 3.8 million miles of highways and 100-plus million automobiles later, we have come to a turning point. Clearly, our long-term concentration on cars and highways is no longer appropriate. The four big problems of urban congestion, pollution, safety, and now, perhaps the most important of them all - the energy shortage - demand a rethinking of direction and a shift of emphasis..."

The rest of his speech was devoted primarily to the energy crisis and the need to limit automobile travel.

In the same issue, comments on the 1973 Highway Act were presented by the Secretary, the Federal Highway Administrator and the Urban Mass Transportation Administrator.

**CLAUDE BRINEGAR**

"You will find that the chain of command has changed a little under the 1973 Amendments to Title 23, but only in the sense that either the Federal Highway Administration or the Urban Mass Transportation Administration will exercise Federal responsibility over transportation projects, depending on their nature. The delegations of authority for implementing the 1973 act will appear this week in the Federal Register and will reflect that new chain of command..."

**NORBERT TIEMAN**

"The changing State-local role which is evolving out of the '73 Act may be causing you some uncertainty - but I really do not believe that it should. On the

Urban System local officials will now have the responsibility for initiating projects - but they still must have the concurrence of the State highway department. We feel that our urban areas should have responsibility for determining their own futures with respect to transportation systems, and that local officials working through metropolitan organizations, should stand up and be counted, and make tough decisions on transportation issues. But nothing has changed the requirement of Section 134 of Title 23 for a State- local cooperative process. You are going to continue to be very much in the act - as you should be."

"For example, consider Section 137 of the Act which allows Interstate System deletions for mass transit projects. Who initiates the proposal? Under the law it must be a joint request by the State governor and the local government. Who determines that the substitute mass transit project is in accord with the planning process and has a priority? The State highway department. And there are many more such examples. In short, the only possible way I could foresee a loss of State control is where there is an absence of State leadership - and I do not expect that to happen."

"Under the '73 Act, you have the option of ridding yourselves of some Federal red tape. I refer, of course, to the Alternative Certification Acceptance procedure, under which a State can elect to build all but its Interstate Federal-aid highways under its own laws and regulations, if they are at least equivalent to the Title 23 laws."

#### **FRANK C. HERRINGER**

"The flexibility of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 allows us, by working together, to take advantage of the environmental and energy saving advantages of mass transit, while continuing the appropriate use of highways."

"The key provision of this bill, and the one that has received the most publicity, is, of course, the use of Trust Fund monies for transit purposes. Over the next three years, about \$2 1/2 billion that would have been earmarked for highways alone may now be used for either highways or mass transit. This new flexibility is immediate...President Nixon and Secretary Brinegar have made it clear to me that we should encourage local areas to spend the Urban Systems money on transit now, if that is what they wish to do. We will take the amounts out of general revenues until the provisions regarding the Trust Fund take effect..."

**NOTE:** The Act provided for a staging of Trust Fund monies for the Urban System over several years.

"The flexibility in the highway bill has received much publicity. But, I believe that the most far reaching effect of the bill may ultimately be the closer relationship that will be encouraged between transit interests and highway interests at all levels."

"To me, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 is only the first step in giving State and local authorities the tools with which they can make and implement transportation decisions."

Ralph Bartelsmeyer Died Jan. 25, 1974.

