

tract authorization to get more for mass transportation and thereby relieve this pressure that could develop.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Well, as long as it does not rob the trust fund, you draft the bill and I will introduce it.

Mr. HILLENBRAND. And you will get joint support for it. We can assure you of that.

(The complete statement follows:)

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES BY
BERNARD F. HILLENBRAND, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

We, in the National Association of Counties, are increasingly concerned that the national preoccupation with completion of the Interstate Highway System is causing a mounting crisis and overwhelming backlog of needed improvements on our other federal-aid highways. Our Association vigorously supported the 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act which inaugurated the Interstate system and we still are very much committed to completing the 41,000 miles of Interstate highways at the earliest practical date.

We are alarmed, however, with the rising cost of the Interstate system and the prospects that it may not be completed until as late as 1980. It is not that we are less enthusiastic about Interstate construction but that we are finding we must get on with the job of improving our other road systems. With the present primary, secondary, and urban extension systems (ABC roads) frozen at an annual appropriation level of one billion dollars, we actually are putting in place fewer miles of ABC roads because of inflation and other factors.

We have been working very closely with the National League of Cities in developing a joint transition program which we feel confident will enable us to begin a new non-Interstate program as we come to the completion date for the Interstate system.

NEW HIGHWAY DESIGNATIONS

We are suggesting in effect, that once the now designated 41,000 miles of interstate highways are completed, that, with the exception of 5 or 10 per cent of the annual highway appropriation for upgrading, the new emphasis be placed on three new highway systems. The first would be the state *Primary system*. In many cases this would be improved to expressway standards. The state primary system would provide rapid movement of large volumes of traffic between, around, and through metropolitan areas. Whether built to expressway standards or not, we envision that this system of roads would be subject to the regulation of parking, turning movements, pedestrian use, entrances, exits and curb use.

The second system would be an *urban major street and highway system* which would provide for traffic movement between and across portions of the urban area. In effect, this system would connect major traffic generating points within an urban area. A secondary purpose might be to provide direct access to abutting lands. This system also would be subject to regulations governing parking, turning movement, pedestrian use, entrances, exits and curb use. The individual major streets would combine to make a system of traffic movement throughout the entire metropolitan area. In some cases major streets would be divided arterial roadways with some control of access and they could even be built to freeway or expressway standards. Collector streets which connect major arterials directly with residential and industrial areas and local streets which serve primarily as access to abutting property would not be included in the federal-aid program.

The third system would be a *rural secondary or inter-county system*. The rural secondary system would be composed of major secondary roads not on the Interstate or state primary systems, and would be located outside metropolitan areas. These roads would serve the same function in rural areas as that served by major streets and highways systems in urban areas. This system would be limited in mileage and roads classified as of lesser importance would not be eligible for federal aid.