

Substantial expenditures on the Interstate System could fast reach the point of diminishing returns and such monies could better be spent on the improvement of roads and streets having higher fatality rates.

What could we suggest there?

(Mr. McCarthy assumed the chair.)

Mr. E. M. JOHNSON. The fact that we had there, Mr. May, is that in the first place that should be "substantial additional expenditures." And our feeling is that certainly there are many things which you have pointed out, such as signs, and major obstructions as compared to bridge piers, for example, bridge supports, that could and should be moved with little additional expense. But it could be that in lengthening bridge spans or even eliminating intermediate bridge supports or widening your bridges to full roadway width, all of them, it could be that the expense involved there could not be justified in the reduction of fatalities that would accrue as a result of those improvements.

Then, too—and, of course, I am mixing funds here, I realize that—but some of the safety features, for instance, on primary—we will not mix funds—some of the money that would be spent in moving back roadside obstructions and particularly in lengthening bridge span and in full roadway width bridges, might be better spent in improving the geometrics of rural mileage, that is pavement widths and shoulders and so forth. That was the thought that we had in that statement.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Right on this point, Mr. May, can you tell me will the Federal Bureau of Public Roads authorize 90-10 money for these improvements that you are suggesting in the rearranging of obstructions; because as I read Mr. Johnson's statement on page 2, he makes it pretty clear that the expense factor here has been important and it was not really until he got into the 90-10 situation that some of this more elaborate safety designing could be taken from the drawing boards and put on the ground.

Now you are suggesting that these changes are going to be made—my question is, If these changes that we feel are necessary are going to be made, is this going to be at the rate of 90-10 and does the Bureau have a position on that?

Mr. W. MAY. Yes, sir. When it comes to going back to our completed sections of the Interstate and making this type of correction, generally roadside hazards, guardrail, and signs and replacing them with break-away supports and that type of matter, the Bureau has already participated in some States in 90-10.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Are there examples of that for the record that they have put up 90-10 money?

Mr. W. MAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to ask another question. Have there been some States that have recommended some changes that the Bureau said, "No, we do not feel they are necessary?"

Mr. E. M. JOHNSON. I will attempt to answer that, Mr. Cleveland. In recent months, I do not know of any such refusal on the part of the Bureau. But it has been and always has been, and this is not a critical statement at all, a frugal attitude in design to provide what was thought to be needed, but not to go much, if any, above minimums. And I am sure there have been many cases in the past, and I am speaking of, let's say, a year or more ago, various States wanted wider