

Mr. JOHNSON. The advance acquisition program could be helped along if we were able to get this right-of-way at an earlier period in the project development. At the present time we almost have to have final construction plans before it can be used.

Mr. CRAMER. Do you not think in the long run it would end up saving far more money than it actually costs by acquiring in advance?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, I think in California, for example, where they have a \$30 million revolving fund, they have saved \$600 or \$700 million all told as a good estimate over the years.

Mr. CRAMER. You have discussed a revolving fund. I am sure you are familiar with the fact that the administration bill does not provide for a revolving fund.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 16622, along with a number of other members of this committee, providing for a revolving fund, carrying out the acquisition of right-of-way recommendations with the study which this committee directed, the 100 million for a 3-year period, giving us a total of 300 million to put into a revolving fund.

What is your reaction to that proposal?

Mr. JOHNSON. In talking this matter over with the State highway departments, the State that has had the most experience in the revolving fund, California, recommended that we not get it above \$100 million, and that would be a revolving fund, that is, used, that it be brought back up to \$100 million; and, as it is repaid, it will be repaid into the Trust Fund.

They are of the opinion that if you get too large a total in the revolving fund there is a tendency on the part of land developers and others to come in and make certifications about their intentions which are not entirely right in order to get some money to operate on.

Mr. CRAMER. As I see it, the basic problem with regard to the \$100 million limitation is that if that is absorbed in the first couple of years, which I would anticipate it would be, then you might have a substantial waiting period before the moneys paid back in construction occurred.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. So there is a question on that. I assume you support the concept.

Mr. JOHNSON. We do, and we do not think that the money ought to be apportioned to the States. It ought to be used when a State needs it. It ought to be used on application.

Mr. CRAMER. Relating to fringe parking on page 5, you say that only five States favor the fringe parking proposal as written. Could you indicate what those States are?

Mr. JOHNSON. No. We can furnish that to the committee.

Mr. CRAMER. That is another area where we do not know what the cost is going to be, where it ends up as a Trust Fund expenditure. Is that right?

Mr. JOHNSON. Indirectly it is out of the Trust Fund, yes. It could be used out of an authorization for any of the Federal-aid systems.

Mr. CRAMER. So it comes out of that money?