

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like also to have supplied for the record, if you reached a point of determination with regard to some States whose laws obviously are not the basis for an agreement, the identification of those States.

Mr. BRIDWELL. Mr. Edmondson, may I ask the committee's indulgence in the latter category, to put it on the basis that our preliminary evaluation of a State's statute is that it is in conflict with the Federal law? And I ask that indulgence because, as I say, at this point in time we have not taken the position that any State law is in conflict and that we therefore cannot even attempt to negotiate an agreement.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, would that be satisfactory, to have it submitted on that basis, that there has been a preliminary finding by the Department that the law is not in compliance?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record.

(Information follows:)

As of May 30, 1968, 33 States have enacted some form of legislation for the control of outdoor advertising. Of this number, the following listed 19 States have enacted legislation to carry out all of the provisions of Title I of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 and, in the opinion of the Secretary, appear to provide the designated State agency adequate authority as a basis upon which the States could enter into agreements.

Alaska	New York (not yet signed by Governor)
Arkansas	North Carolina
California	Rhode Island
Connecticut	Utah
Hawaii	Vermont
Idaho	Virginia
Kentucky	West Virginia
Louisiana	District of Columbia
Maryland	Puerto Rico
New Mexico	

Texas, Colorado and New Hampshire have passed laws which are temporary in nature; the Texas legislature passed a resolution which authorizes negotiation relative to outdoor advertising controls under the Federal Act, while in Colorado and New Hampshire moratorium statutes restrict the erection of new signs for a designated period of time.

North Dakota enacted a unique law which sets up a highway Corridor Board to regulate outdoor advertising in addition to other duties. This law appears to be reasonably susceptible to several alternate methods of implementation. Therefore, the adequacy of this law to fully comply with the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 will be contingent upon the State's interpretation and implementation of its provisions.

Specific standards and provisions are written into the laws of the remaining 10 States listed below:

Georgia	Missouri
Indiana	Montana
Kansas	Oklahoma
Michigan	South Dakota
Mississippi	Wyoming

Based upon a preliminary review of these laws, certain features contained therein raise serious questions as to the State's authority to fully comply with the Highway Beautification Act. Final determination as to whether these laws are in need of amendment or further legislative action will rest upon State interpretation of the various statutory provisions and the authority of the designated State agencies to negotiate satisfactory agreements with the Secretary to comply with the Federal Act.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Any further questions?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.