

tem of roads. What we really want to do is apply the concepts we have developed in the Interstate System to an urban area and rural area so we are not appropriating money willy-nilly but appropriating it for completing usable increments of a system within an urban area and a rural area. In a rural area, for example, we may want to build a road network to a recreational facility or a rural college and this might very well involve crossing several counties and through several cities and so on. So we want to apply the same planning requirement now as when we came before this committee in 1962 to support the idea of continuing, comprehensive, cooperative planning in the urban areas. In our judgment, that has worked so extremely well we would now like to extend it into the rural areas, and we would like in this session of the Congress and before this committee to ask you to authorize the use of the one and one-half percent funds which we are suggesting be increased to 2 percent, and open these funds for use in rural areas on exactly the same basis under which they were made available in urban areas with so much success to have a continuing, comprehensive, cooperative planning process.

If we have our way, Mr. Chairman, when we are finished every road in the United States will be a part of a planned system, everyone involving a Federal expenditure where we can be sure that preceding that we have this other point that we classify the road network in the United States. A classification of a road in one State doesn't mean the same thing in another State and it doesn't even mean the same thing within a State. So I am sure this committee is well aware of the tremendous problem of even taking an inventory of roads in the United States and determining what the needs are where someone may sit down with a slide rule and measure eight blocks of city streets and projects into a universe of some type. The highway classification we would do in cooperation with the State.

And that leads to another point, Mr. Cramer, you made in your questions. What we are after in this continuing, comprehensive, cooperative planning process is to come up with a community program that everybody is agreed on, and then we can fix responsibility for the State highway official and the Bureau of Public Roads to actually build the road after all this planning is done. Someone at the end of the line has got to have a responsibility, and we think the planning process that we are suggesting in both urban and rural areas will do just exactly that. They will have wide community acceptance and will enable the state highway department, to say this is where the road is going because this is what the plan indicates.

Mr. Chairman, those were the main points of reference. We want to emphasize again that this is a city-county position, that we are together on it. We have worked on it a considerable amount of time with the American Association of State Highway Officials and we are suggesting that these changes ought to be made this year. As a point of fact they probably ought to have been made several years ago so we can get our ducks in a row. We note from our experience that the 1962 planning requirement is only now becoming fully operative in all of the metropolitan areas. So we need as much leadtime as we can get. We know if we go with the highway classification project there ought to be cooperation with the city, county, State, and Con-