

Under secondary road procedures the State highway departments must comply with section 103(c) of Title 23, U.S. Code, regarding cooperation with appropriate local authorities. The manner and extent of such cooperation are to be determined by the State. Where all public roads and highways in a county or other political subdivision of a State are under the control and supervision of the State highway department, the State highway department is considered the local road authority and cooperation with other local authorities of such political subdivisions is not required.

In Montana, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, the State highway departments may exercise their powers in an incorporated town subject to the consent of the municipal government.

In Arkansas, Delaware, Kentucky, Mississippi, and North Dakota, the State highway departments are authorized to lay out limited access highways "provided that within cities and towns such authority shall be subject to such municipal consent as may be provided by law."

In Minnesota and Washington, arbitration procedures are available to municipal governments when agreement cannot be reached on freeway locations.

In California and Oregon, municipal consent is based upon statutes which require the highway departments to reach agreement with municipality to close off local streets for freeway construction.

Mr. CRAMER. How about the Tennessee situation?

Mr. BRIDWELL. Mr. Cramer, I will respond to that, if I may, by relying upon memory and not upon any documents before me.

In terms of location of a highway, to the best of my knowledge there has not been any instance in which a location has been disapproved; that is, a recommendation from a State highway department has been disapproved in favor of one recommended by a city. There are perhaps two or three cases that I can recall offhand which remain unsettled in which there are very decided differences of opinion between the State highway department and the city on location. But at this point, of those decided, to the best of my recollection there has not been any instance in which a recommended location by the State has been overridden in favor of a location or of a location proposed by a city. There have been several instances—

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Pardon me just a moment.

We have a call to the floor. We obtained unanimous consent to sit this afternoon. So some of us will leave and vote on this and we will continue the hearings.

(At this point, Mr. Edmondson assumed the chair.)

Mr. CRAMER. With regard to final say of the local area, I guess Washington, D.C. would be one exception to that rule.

Secretary BOYD. Yes, yes.

Mr. BRIDWELL. I said of the ones decided, Mr. Cramer.

Mr. CRAMER. I see. We have understood there was to be a report submitted of the future highway needs on April 1.

Secretary BOYD. That is overdue. It is in the process of what is euphemistically called "executive coordination." We hope to get it out very shortly.

Mr. CRAMER. Do you think it might be out before we have a mark-up of the bill?

Secretary BOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. I am sure you are aware of the interest of a number of members who sent out a request to a number of States concerning additional mileage on the Interstate System and many States replied they had additional mileage they were interested in. I trust the report will include that aspect of future highway needs?