

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. I believe the statement was 466,000 spaces at about \$1,000 a space, was the estimate made by the Department of Transportation.

Mr. CRAMER. To the extent to which it relates to the Interstate System, it would thus increase the cost of that system and be further stretching that out; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON. It would be estimated at about half a billion dollars.

Mr. CRAMER. I can foresee in the Washington area, with this circumferential, where there are something like 36 major interchange areas, where they could ask for such parking at all of these places. You are talking about probably some very substantial funds out of the Trust Fund.

My own reaction is that I do not think enough study and careful preparation were given to that proposal.

Nobody suggested where the money ought to come from.

Mr. JOHNSON. Historically the highways departments have never felt this sort of thing should come from the Trust Fund.

Mr. CRAMER. There is no definition relating to what fringe parking is in the proposal, is there?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think some of the States brought that up. I do not know whether we mentioned it or not.

Mr. CRAMER. You have referred to overemphasis in administering section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation, having to do with park lands. This has been raised by a number of people and of course 4(f) reads, in the first sentence, "The Secretary shall cooperate and consult with the Secretaries of Interior, Housing, Urban Development, Agriculture, and of the States developing transportation programs," and so forth.

Then it goes on to a discussion of minimizing harm to such park and recreation areas, and so forth.

This is interpreted as not permitting the use of these lands for highway purposes, the comparative costs notwithstanding; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. Could you explain to us what your overemphasis is, what you mean by that?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, we might cite the particular instance here in Washington where the Virginia Department has an agreement about the location of the Three Sisters Bridge. We might cite the situation in San Antonio, Tex., where the city actually voted a bond issue to get the right-of-way which involved getting a little section of a park area, and they were asked to come back and consider a location taking several hundred houses instead.

There is a situation south of San Francisco, which I am certain the California people could talk on.

There are others around. That is the type of thing we are talking about.

We have got one down in Memphis, Tenn., dealing with a park.

Mr. CRAMER. Do you know how much more it is going to cost the State of Colorado, for instance, for I-70 if it cannot go across the primitive area?