

On request to the States for information regarding cost comparison between the two estimates for landscaping and rest areas, the total reported was the \$555 million item shown in House Document 199.

8. The "1967 Highway Beautification Program" submitted to the Congress in January 1967 (Senate Document No. 6), suggests alternative programs for landscaping and scenic enhancement. Program A would involve only "top quality" work, and the report states that, "Obtaining maximum benefit for minimum expenditure was the overriding concern in selecting this program work". Program B would include all work considered "desirable and feasible", and the report states that Program B "could be considered as an ultimate program". The total estimated cost for Program A for the Interstate System is about \$506 million. The estimated cost of Program B for the Interstate System is about \$876 million. Excluding the estimated cost of acquiring scenic strips adjacent to the right-of-way of Interstate highways (to be financed largely, if not entirely, by funds appropriated to carry out the Highway Beautification Act of 1965), the estimated cost of landscaping and scenic enhancement on Interstate Highways would be about \$462 million under Program A, and about \$800 million under Program B.

According to the 1968 cost estimate, the estimated Federal share of the cost of highway beautification items (including those items which were and those which were not included in the 1965 cost estimated) is about \$984 million.

Can you tell me why the estimated cost of beautifications items for the Interstate System under the 1968 Cost Estimate is so much higher than the estimated cost of both Program A and Program B as set forth in the "1967 Highway Beautification Program"?

Answer: There is no valid comparison which can be made between these two reports since the instructions which covered the two estimates were totally different, the estimates were for different purposes, and the variables which controlled the ultimate costs reported in each case were many and different. As stated under Question 7 the *Line Item 13* costs for the 1968 Estimate covered erosion control, landscaping, rest areas and facilities, and scenic overlooks. We can report a breakdown of the \$984 million as follows:

Erosion control	\$331,000,000
Landscaping	353,000,000
Rest areas and facilities	284,000,000
Scenic overlooks	16,000,000
Total	984,000,000

These values reflect the increased emphasis on landscaping and erosion control within the highway right-of-way, and the increased need for safety rest areas along the Interstate System. The great use being made of rest areas on completed sections of the Interstate System points up the public need for these facilities. As shown in the tabulation, the cost of scenic overlooks reported by the States is not a large part of the total Item 13 costs.

SECTION 4—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF SYSTEM

1. Under existing law, the 1968 cost estimate is to be used for apportioning funds authorized for fiscal year 1970, and the final cost estimate is to be submitted in January 1969 for use in apportioning funds in fiscal years 1971 and 1972.

Section 4 of the bill would provide for the 1968 cost estimate to be used for apportioning funds for both fiscal years 1970 and 1971, and would require the next and last cost estimate to be submitted in January 1970 for use of that cost estimate for apportioning funds for fiscal years 1972, 1973, and 1974.

(a) If the price increase trend continues and the 1970 cost estimate is to be used for apportioning funds for three fiscal years, wouldn't it be badly out of date by the end of the program?

Answer: Assuming a price increase, as reported in the appendix of House Document 199, is included in development of the new authorization schedule for completing the Interstate System; and assuming there are no major system changes which require adjustment of apportionment factors—the 1970 Estimate should not be badly out of date if used for apportionment of funds for three fiscal years.

(b) In the view of the extension of time for completing the Interstate System, shouldn't an additional cost estimate be submitted to the Congress?

Answer: The number of additional estimates needed to provide equitable apportionment factors for completing the Interstate System depends, of course, on the length of program time extension required. The Act provides for an extension to fiscal year 1974 with the 1970 Estimate used for apportioning funds for 1972,