

the figures on Section 6 are taken alone, you would get the impression that the program tapers off in 1971. What those figures actually mean is this: Congress has already authorized us to obligate a total of \$267 million—\$67 million of that authorized for Fiscal 1967; and \$100 million each for Fiscal 1968 and Fiscal 1969. These authorizations extend for two years each, so there now exists the authorization to obligate funds through the end of Fiscal 1971. We will have obligated through June 1968 only \$27 million of that money, partly because of a limit of \$25 million that was placed on this year's budget. Thus, there remains \$240 million authorized, \$100 million of which is available for obligation through 1970 plus \$100 million of which is authorized through 1971.

We are asking the Congress to add \$50 million in Fiscal Year 1970 and another \$75 million in 1971. This is emphasized because the amounts requested in 1970 and 1971, if taken by themselves, would seem to indicate a tapering off of the program. Actually because of the carry-over of the authorization, if the request is enacted we will have authority to obligate a total of \$225 million in 1970.

Secondly, the requested increase in R & D funding is directly related to the large variety of R & D requirements, in a field where basic exploratory effort has only been accomplished to date. Our initial, comprehensive research program undertaken and planned for FY 67, 68 and 69 was intended to—

Define the nature and magnitude of the problems to be addressed,

Upgrade the understanding of these highway safety problems.

Therefore, at the conclusion of this exploratory phase we must move to the applied and experimental phase of (1) developing systems, techniques, and devices to improve highway safety, and (2) to testing and demonstrating the systems, techniques, and devices in the laboratory and highway environment. As with any R & D program, when you move from pencil and paper to actual design and operation of a system or systems, you are experiencing increased funding requirements.

(b) Can you give us a list of the Research Projects that have been undertaken under the Highway Safety Act of 1966 and those you would propose to undertake with these additional funds?

Answer: The attached Documents provide a listing of the projects undertaken during FY 67, 68 and planned for FY 69. These are contained in Attachments 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. Attachment 5 contains the FY 70 and 71 program areas in which effort will be undertaken to expand upon the base established in the exploratory phase. The specific projects for FY 70 and 71 have not been refined at this point in time.

Section 8—Authorizations for highway beautification

1. Section 8 of H.R. 17134 would authorize the appropriation of \$85 million for each of the fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971 for carrying out the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

Is the Administration seriously proposing that the Federal Government expend \$255 million for highway beautification purposes in addition to the \$984 million included in the 1968 Interstate cost estimate, in view of the Vietnam war and the absolute necessity of curtailing nonessential government spending?

Answer: It is expected that during the period in which the Interstate System is to be completed, construction of the items represented in the \$984 million reported in Line Item 13 of the 1968 Estimate will have been accomplished. These are the estimate costs for regular items for erosion control, landscaping, rest areas and facilities, and scenic overlooks; and during the remaining construction period we would expect this work to be completed.

The concurrent program for highway beautification, for which authorizations are requested in Section 8 of H.R. 17134 is a separate consideration from the Interstate program and the items covered in these authorizations are those required to carry out the provisions of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

2. I have before me a copy of a letter dated March 29, 1968, from Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd to a Mr. F. J. MacDonald, Chairman of the Governor's Commission on Arizona Beauty. The letter addressed itself to the question of imposition of the 10% penalty for failure to comply with the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 in the event the Arizona Legislature failed to enact the laws necessary for compliance at its 1968 session. Mr. Boyd states, and I quote,

"For these reasons, we feel that the Arizona Legislature will have, during its current session, ample opportunity to consider appropriate action. In the absence of some unforeseen development, I can see no reason to delay further