

result, we found that half of the States felt the definitions as written are generally acceptable. The other half offered no comment.

*Section 11: Amendment dealing with forest development roads and trails pertaining to the size of project where bids would be solicited for construction.*—The comments received on this section from the State highway departments were almost identical to those pertaining to section 10.

*Section 12: Urban area traffic operations improvement programs, TOPICS program.*—In response to this section, we received the same type of replies from the State highway departments that we got pertaining to the authorizations for the same purpose.

Less than half the States felt this proposal as written was acceptable, and an equal number felt that it should not be tied specifically to a TOPICS program, but the legislation should make the money available for improving the ABC systems.

Four felt the proposal was not spelled out in sufficient detail to clearly understand the intent. Five States offered no comment. In general, much can be accomplished through the TOPICS type of program.

*Section 13.*—Whether or not this section is enacted would depend on whether or not your committee saw fit to provide for an urban area traffic operations improvement program.

*Section 14: Fringe parking.*—Only five of the State highway departments felt that this proposal is acceptable as written.

Eleven States are completely opposed to it on the grounds that it is further fragmenting or diluting the highway trust fund, which was intended originally for constructing an Interstate System and to maintain a certain minimum level of development on the ABC systems during the time the Interstate System was being built.

Thirteen States would accept such a program, if the financing were not to come from the trust fund, or in case the parking facilities could be self-financing and self-sustaining.

Eighteen States offered no comment whatsoever on section 14.

To have any chance of success, fringe parking must provide convenient, adequate, safe parking, and be served with convenient, adequate, comfortable, and attractive commuter service at reasonable costs.

This is the type of program that might be included in a separate trust fund program, as proposed by the National League of Cities.

It has generally been the policy of the State highway departments that parking facilities should be included in overall transportation planning in urban areas, and that they are a necessary part of transportation, but since conventional highway needs are so much in excess of available highway funding, some other means must be found to supply the facilities, especially since they are generally patronized by repeat users and they are for the almost exclusive benefit of the local community or urban area.

AASHO will make recommendations on this subject at the time that our After 75 Committee reports to your committee.

During the time of the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments, in March of this year, that regional highway association adopted a resolution entitled