

While the fringe facility does help meet basic parking demands its primary functions relate more to keeping automobiles off major radial routes, and out of the CBD with a resultant decrease in traffic congestion. Since such facilities seldom generate revenues it is unlikely that the need can be met by the local community.

10. If Federal-aid highway funds are to participate in fringe parking facilities, it seems to me that this Federal expenditure should be reflected in increased usable traffic lanes on Federal-aid highways. Would you object to a further condition in this section which would make approval of fringe parking projects conditional upon an agreement by the State to prohibit parking on space on a specific Federal-aid highway equivalent to that provided by the fringe parking facility?

Answer: While we readily agree with the desirability of removing street parking to increase the capacity of major arterials during periods of high demand such a proposal is rather inflexible. Appropriate parking restrictions may already be imposed on the Federal-aid highway directly connected to the fringe facility. The condition would appear to restrict application of the program in many needed areas.

11. In this section we are discussing, it is stated that "In the event fees are charged for the use of any such facility, the rate thereof shall not be in excess of that required for maintenance and operation."

Under this limitation, would the State be permitted to set fees at a rate sufficient to amortize the State's investment in the acquisition and construction of the facility as well as the cost of maintenance and operation?

Answer: Under certain conditions a fringe facility might be able to produce revenue above that required for maintenance and operation and possibly sufficient to amortize the State's investment, but this will not be common. The primary criterion we are seeking is maximum usage of these facilities, and the rate charged is basic to such usage. It would be highly undesirable if a State would require the recoupment of its investment to the detriment of the usage of any or all fringe facilities provided.

12. I note that the term "parking facility" as defined in the bill includes, among other things, "equipment." Would this authorize Federal participation in the cost of:

(a) Cash registers, ticket issuing machines, and time stamp machines?

Answer: This bill permits the collection of revenue to cover annual maintenance and operation. As this equipment will be necessary in the collection of such revenue, they would be eligible items.

(b) Elevators and other mechanized equipment for moving motor vehicles and personnel?

Answer: Standard mechanical equipment necessary for the normal operation of the individual facility would be an eligible item.

(c) Equipment commonly found in some parking facilities for the servicing of automobiles, such as car wash facilities, battery rechargers, mechanics tools, automobile jacks and other tire repair equipment, etc.?

Answer: While these services might represent an added convenience to the user, they are not essential to the operation of the facility and would not be eligible for Federal participation.

(d) Waiting rooms, rest rooms, and other facilities for the convenience of patrons?

Answer: Convenience facilities would be eligible items; however, the extent of such facilities necessary to successful operation of the individual fringe facility would have to be determined. In some cases simple shelters would be adequate, while others might require modest structures with rest rooms. Criteria such as length of trip, size of facility, transit headways, etc. would determine these requirements.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. In June 1966, the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-aid Highway Program, held exhaustive hearings on the Relationship of Toll Facilities to the Federal-aid Highway Program. During his appearance before the Committee on June 23, 1966, then Under-Secretary of Commerce Alan S. Boyd, was asked whether he would consider submitting legislation which would grant additional authority to the Federal Government with respect to toll facilities. Mr. Boyd's response was as follows: