

The State highway departments are generally in accord with the recommended authorizations for roads and trails in the public land highways coming from the highway trust fund.

The most conservative estimate of highway needs is so much greater than available highway funds in sight that we must oppose anything that might further dilute the highway trust fund.

Section 6: Authorization of the highway safety programs.—About half of the States that responded felt that the proposal was generally acceptable as written; however, seven were of the opinion that too much was recommended for the second year. It is interesting to note that 18 States made no comment at all on section 6.

It is unusual for the State highway departments to offer no comment on legislative proposals, and in our responses relative to this bill under consideration we had several such reactions.

Section 7: Authorization for highway safety research and development programs.—We received the same reaction from the State highway departments on this section that we received on section 6. Some of this attitude may be the result of a lack of adequate dialog at the State level between those handling the State safety programs and the State highway departments.

Section 8: Authorization for highway beauty.—Twenty-six States felt that the language as written was generally acceptable; however, there was considerable feeling that the penalty clause in the present beautification language should be eliminated.

Some suggested a slowdown of the program until it is determined the general direction in which the highway beautification program is to take and until it is better defined and stabilized.

Nine States made no comment on this section.

The State highway departments are for an effective beautification program and they would like to stop the growing ugliness along our highways, but we feel that something more definitive could be done in defining the program to make certain that the funds expended do not produce disappointing results in the long run.

Section 9: Advance acquisition of rights-of-way.—The State highway departments generally are in accord with the purpose of this section, however, eight opposed it.

Some felt that the 7-year limitation should be lifted.

The AASHO After 75 Committee has been developing a proposal along this same subject. In essence, it provides a \$100 million revolving fund to be financed from the highway trust fund, with no interest being charged a State for using the revolving fund. It would be made available to a State upon application, and could be used only if construction were 5 years or more in the future, and it was desirable to obtain the right-of-way in advance, and without the State using current funds needed for construction.

The States supported the AASHO-developed version by a 91-percent vote. We will be explaining this in greater detail when our After 75 Committee appears before your committee.

Section 10: Definitions of forest roads and trails and forest development roads and trails.—Roads and trails under these categories do not involve all of the highway departments, but only about half. As a