

MISSOURI

The State highway department, by letters of September 20, 1967, and October 24, 1967, requested that their existing law be reviewed for compliance with the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. By memorandum of December 15, 1967, the Administration's Chief Counsel's office pointed out the objectionable features of the existing Missouri law, insofar as an outdoor advertising control agreement was concerned.

MONTANA

On April 9, 1968, a representative of the Federal Highway Administration met with officials of the State Highway Commission in Helena. At that time the Administration representative pointed out that the present Montana law raises serious questions as to the State's authority to fully comply with the Highway Beautification Act. On April 22, 1968, Administrator Bridwell wrote to Chairman Blewett detailing certain provisions of the Montana law which possibly would prevent agreement. Mr. Bridwell offered to have his representatives continue to meet with State officials in further negotiations which could lead to a mutually acceptable agreement, to be contingent upon ratification by the State Legislature. Chairman Blewett, by letter dated April 30, 1968, indicated that the matter would be considered at the next highway commission meeting.

NEBRASKA

On August 7, 1967, Mr. Bridwell wrote to State Engineer Hossack asking that the State develop proposed standards for study and mutual discussion. On September 7, 1967, a representative of the Administration met with Mr. Hossack and other officials of the State in Lincoln. On January 19, 1968, Mr. Hossack discussed a draft of a proposed agreement with representatives of the Federal Highway Administration while in Washington in connection with other matters.

NEVADA

On August 7, 1967, Administrator Bridwell wrote to State Highway Engineer Bawden asking that the State develop proposed standards for study and mutual discussion. Again on January 25, 1968, Mr. Bridwell wrote to Mr. Bawden, offering to commence active negotiations. Mr. Bawden replied on February 9, 1968, stating that the State was at that time drawing up proposed standards which would be forwarded for the Administrator's review.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Negotiations were commenced with New Hampshire on November 22, 1967, when a representative of the Federal Highway Administration met with State officials in Concord. By letter dated March 28, 1968, Commissioner Morton advised that their attorney felt that it would be unwise to enter into an agreement at that time. Commissioner Morton pointed out that the moratorium legislation enacted in 1967 had stipulated that an agreement could not be signed until the State stood to lose Federal funds. In reply of April 29, 1968, Mr. Bridwell pointed out that the moratorium legislation could endanger the State's bonus eligibility, since it might allow signs in areas restricted under the bonus agreement. Mr. Bridwell's letter offered to have representatives meet with the State to further discuss the matter. Mr. Morton by letter dated May 1, 1968, stated that the New Hampshire Legislature had been reluctant to pass more complete legislation during its 1967 session because of the lack of specific standards. In reply, Mr. Bridwell wrote that an interim agreement could be valuable to the Legislature during its 1969 session, since it could be regarded as a recommendation to the Legislature as to what the specific standards should be in the light of conditions within the State. Mr. Bridwell further pointed out that the terms of an interim agreement are not binding on the State or the Legislature and are only binding on the Federal Government.

NEW JERSEY

Negotiations were commenced on August 2, 1967, when a representative of the Federal Highway Administration met with State officials in Trenton. On August 14, 1967, Administrator Bridwell wrote to Commissioner Goldberg asking that