

We try to do everything possible to mesh all forest uses together so there will be a minimum of closing roads and restricting other traffic. We wholeheartedly believe in obtaining an adequate road system in the most economic manner possible while continuing to manage the National Forests for all uses.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Now we will have the Secretary and Mr. Bridwell and Mr. Turner again.

For the benefit of the committee, I will ask a question.

Mr. Secretary, there are some specific problem areas bothering a great many of the States. The specific problem for the most part turns on a general question of what the appropriate role of the Department at the Secretarial level, at the Federal Highway Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads—and the State—should be.

Specifically, there is a great deal of concern about the extent to which section 4(f) of the Transportation Act should be decisive in determining highway location and design.

There is also a great deal of concern about the very complicated requirements for public hearings.

Mr. Secretary, we would appreciate your commenting in detail on these two areas.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION; ACCOMPANIED BY HON. LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION; FRANCIS C. TURNER, DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS; DR. WILLIAM HADDON, JR., DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU; AND DR. ROBERT BRENNER, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU—Resumed

Secretary BOYD. Well, first and foremost, I would like to say that I think the relationship between the various officials, State and Federal, is an evolving one and will continue to be an evolving one depending upon the circumstances of the highway design and construction in the United States.

Insofar as the determination of projects based on section 4(f), we are in the process of issuing a regulation on the procedures to be used in considering the 4(f) question. That regulation will be within the framework of the law and will be an attempt to follow the law established by the Congress.

As to the complications of hearing procedures, one of the major complaints which I and many others have received about highway projects is that the hearing procedure has been used purely and simply as a memorial for the record to approve a route alinement which has already been decided upon, and that the interested public have in effect had no opportunity to have any voice in influencing the location, the site, or the design of the project.

We are working on a two-hearing procedure. We have sent our drafts, I believe, to the various States and requested their comments in connection with this two-hearing procedure which would permit