

Mr. BRIDWELL. Well, let me break that down, if I may, Senator, into two or three parts.

One, I think perfectly obviously, there are many instances in which a precise breakdown of cost does not turn out to be 90 to 10 for a lot of peculiar reasons appropriate to a particular project.

Senator MUSKIE. It tends to become a pattern year after year.

Mr. BRIDWELL. I would not think that that percentage would vary in any significant way. I suspect that one of the factors which influences these statements to you would be the necessity that in connection with an interstate system project but not a part of it would be the necessity of upgrading, reconstructing feeder roads to the system. Now, certainly, that is not eligible for 90 percent Federal participation. If it is on the Federal-aid system, it is eligible for 50-50 participation. And of course in many cases, the connecting roads are not on any Federal system, so it is a 100 percent State or State and local responsibility. Yet to make the system work well, these feeder or connecting roads must, in many instances, be upgraded, in some cases reconstructed. So if they are taking those kinds of costs into consideration, then certainly it would be less than 90 to 10.

But it is very unusual for us within the rights-of-way, if I may put it that way, of a Federal-aid interstate project to disallow any features which would then raise the relevant cost to the State.

And of course, you are aware of the public lands sliding scale in which some States receive more than 90 percent.

Senator MUSKIE. I am really not complaining about the fact that this additional cost to the State changed the 90 to 10 ratio. I might have to make more specific instances. But that was not the thrust of my question.

You mentioned the fact that what we are talking about here in the highway program is a \$40 million—

Mr. BRIDWELL. I believe my testimony, Mr. Chairman, was that 55 percent of the displacees are associated with the interstate program and 45 percent from others. And of course, under the proposal—

Senator MUSKIE. The figure I am looking at is this: The Federal Government spends annually \$4 billion in the Federal-aid highway program. Now, 1 percent of that is \$40 million.

You talk about a \$173 million cost; that is 4 percent. As I recall, I think 4 percent is a greater variation than my highway provision suggested, because it is half of 90-10, or 50-50. Incidentally, I might say that that \$173 million estimate that you give is much greater than the one given to us by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I think it was twice their estimate for the cost of all programs under the act. I wonder if you would check your figures with the Commission's so we may have as firm a figure as possible?

Mr. BRIDWELL. Yes, we will be glad to do so, Senator.

(The material referred to follows:)

Question

Senator MUSKIE. "I might say that that \$173 million estimate that you give is much greater than the one given to us by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I think it was twice their estimate for the cost of all programs under the Act. I wonder if you would check your figures with the Commission's so we can have as firm a figure as possible."