

off-premise outdoor advertising. Provided the State Legislature finds that this is in the best interest of the State, there is nothing inconsistent with such action insofar as the objectives of the Federal Act are concerned.

(b) In view of this commendation of the Legislature of Vermont for "considering this farsighted proposal" would it be your policy to encourage other States to enact similar legislation?

*Answer:* It is our policy to encourage all States to enact the necessary legislation to comply with the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

The initiative for action similar to Vermont's must come from the State, and specifically the State Legislature, as it did in Vermont. If the State Legislature of any State felt that such action would promote travel and tourism by the preservation of its natural beauty, we feel that such action would be commendable.

6. If the Congress refuses to authorize additional funds for carrying out the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, what will be your position with respect to imposing the 10% penalty in 1969 against States which cannot comply with the requirements of the 1965 Act?

*Answer:* As the Secretary stated to Mr. McEwen at the May 23 hearing, the threat of the 10 percent loss exists whether or not the Congress appropriates Federal funds for carrying out the Highway Beautification Act. See also the answers to questions 2(a) and (b).

7. Suppose that a State complies with the junkyard control provision of the Act, but fails or refuses to comply with outdoor advertising control provisions. Will a penalty be imposed upon such a State and, if so, in what amount?

*Answer:* Should a State clearly and finally refuse to comply with Title I of the Federal Act, there is no question but that the penalty of 10 percent will be imposed.

8. Suppose that a State fails or refuses to comply with both the outdoor advertising and junkyard control provisions of the Act, and penalties are imposed. Will the penalty be 10% or 20% of the State's Federal-aid highway apportionment?

*Answer:* Since most States have already provided for compliance with Title II of the Act, and there has been very little opposition thereto, we cannot foresee that any State will be penalized for failure to comply with this section of the Act. For this reason, we think the question is academic and would prefer to defer an answer until such time as a specific situation of the nature described may arise.

9. It is my recollection that 25 States entered into agreements under the bonus provision of section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958. Is this correct?

*Answer:* That is correct.

10. I understand that only 17 States have entered into agreements under the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

(a) Is this correct?

*Answer:* Eighteen States have signed agreements under the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

(b) Could you give us the names of those States?

*Answer:* Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Hawaii, District of Columbia, Connecticut, New York, Kentucky, Minnesota, Maine, Utah, Puerto Rico, California, Maryland, Alaska, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Iowa.

11. I have been informed that of the 17 States which have entered into agreements, 4 of these have signed agreements not authorized by State legislation. These 4 States are : Delaware, Maine, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania.

Is this correct?

*Answer:* Five States have signed agreements pending ratification or approval by the State Legislature. These are Delaware, Maine, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Iowa.

12. In 4 of the remaining 13 States which have entered into agreements, the agreements will result in the removal of a grand total of 155 signs.

A table based upon information supplied by the Bureau of Public Roads, which I inserted at page 910 of the hearings of this Subcommittee in hearings on "Review of Highway Beautification—1967" shows the following with respect to off-premise advertising signs existing on October 22, 1965, which would have to be removed under the Administration's standards: