

highway needs study made on those revised systems on the basis of a manual developed jointly by the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments.

A better cost estimate on total highway needs than now is available is needed. Although the ones presently available do give us valuable information as to the enormity of the problem, as compared to the funds available, there has always been some variation in the estimating procedures used by the States in estimating needs on the Federal-aid systems, other than the interstate.

There is quite a variation from State to State as to the percentage of the public roads included in the Federal-aid secondary system which has been reflected in the respective estimates.

You have solicited comments from the several State highway departments regarding additions to the Interstate System. At the time our "After 75" Committee appears before your committee, we will go into this matter and give you the position on this important subject, and the reasons behind that position as developed by our member departments.

We have spent a great deal of time on the matter of a functional reclassification and adding to the Interstate System, and we believe that we will have something constructive to offer.

We believe the State highway departments would be content if your committee were to decide to report out at this time a simple, uncluttered authorization bill that would approve the 1968 interstate cost estimate for apportioning purposes, and provide for the necessary biennial authorizations to keep essential existing programs going and to consider some of the other proposals that are before you at a later time.

Thank you for the opportunity of appearing before your committee to express the views of our member State highway departments.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Thank you, Mr. Morton.

It is always a pleasure to have AASHO before this committee. You have been very helpful to this committee at all times.

Do the committee members have any questions?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Morton, I have appreciated very much your statement, particularly your references to the continuation of the partnership contract and obvious problems we are getting into with new programs and new moneys coming out of the trust fund and so forth.

My first question relates to some of those subjects. On page 1 of your statement you referred to a million dollars annually for the ABC system, with the balance going to the Interstate System.

Actually, the balance under this proposed bill and other proposals being made, including the TOPICS program, transferring the forest highways and public lands highways to come out of the trust fund, means, in effect, does it not, that this actually ends up coming out of the interstate money?

In other words, ABC sticks to a million a year, and what is left goes to everything else. When you start adding to those everything elses, in addition to the Interstate System, then you automatically reduce what goes to the interstate, do you not?

Mr. MORTON. You extend the time it takes to complete the Interstate System.

Mr. CRAMER. So, in effect, the Interstate System, by the operation of the program, out of the trust fund, gets last priority?