

the State road board relating to a location of the highway or those highway problems?

Secretary BOYD. I would have to submit that for the record. I do not at this moment recall a single instance.

(The following was received:)

CASES WHERE STATES WERE OVERRULED ON LOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS (IN FAVOR OF CITY RECOMMENDATIONS)

In practice, the Bureau of Public Roads does not dictate the location of highways, although it can withhold approval of a particular State proposal and, by refusing to approve route alternates, indirectly influence State location decisions. In a few instances, the Bureau has been quite influential in the determination of locations favored by cities rather than by States. The extent of any such action is quite small considering the number of new highway improvements within urbanized areas each year. Excluding the freeway problems in Washington, D.C., with which the committee is already familiar, there are several cities throughout the country where State proposals are not being fully advanced principally because of Public Roads or Federal Highway Administration's rulings which could be construed to favor a particular city. Recent examples are:

MASON CITY, IOWA

The Bureau of Public Roads required restudy of a 90-mile section of Interstate Route 35 from Williams, Iowa, to Albert Lea, Minnesota. The location ultimately approved was similar to that recommended by Mason City, Iowa.

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

The Federal Highway Administration requested additional study of the necessity for the Boston Inner Belt (I-695) after the State submitted its recommendation for a route through Cambridge opposed by city. This study is now underway.

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

The Pennsylvania Department of Highways has been recently requested by the Bureau of Public Roads to abandon planning and right-of-way acquisition for an interchange between the proposed Crosstown Expressway and I-95 which in effect could defer construction of the Crosstown Expressway indefinitely. This expressway has been strongly opposed by Philadelphia officials because of displacement problems.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

This controversy involves a 4.2-mile segment of I-280 in San Mateo County through watershed lands along Upper Crystal Springs Reservoir which are owned by the City of San Francisco. The disagreement is between the California Highway Commission and the City of San Francisco. Issues include water pollution, costs, scenic and recreational values, highway-user benefits and safety. The Federal Highway Administration recently withdrew a 1958 Bureau of Public Roads location approval and asked the California Division of Highways to recommend an alternate location for its consideration.

* * * * *

Section 134 of Title 23 provides for a "continuing comprehensive transportation planning process" in urban areas over 50,000 population, and Section 128 provides for hearings to be conducted by State highway departments on projects involving incorporated or unincorporated communities of any size. The effective use of these highway planning and hearing processes promotes a measure of review and cooperative planning with local governments.

Pursuant to the urban transportation planning requirement, the Bureau requires each highway department to execute a memorandum of understanding with local governments in the urban area. This is not intended to create a local veto over location decisions. If there is an unwillingness on the part of a local political unit to participate in the transportation planning process in such area, the Bureau makes determination as to whether the percentage of the urban area affected is such to negate an effective planning process for the whole area.