

Broadening our outlook onto a regional base, we perceive that similar situation prevails all along our proposed I-35W "missing link" corridor in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, South Dakota, and Minnesota. Certainly the inter-regional importance of this facility is equivalent to that of other currently approved Interstate links in the west north central region!

Proposals set forth by AASHO and the Department of Transportation would terminate the Interstate program in order that funds might be used to concentrate on the ABC system. Yet, four years ago, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads was considering Interstate extensions and only one year ago, AASHO was recommending 5 or 6,000 miles additional. Now, their proposals would have us go abruptly to the other extreme—that of abandoning the Interstate development before it is really completed and concentrating fully on the ABC. The I-35W Association submits that the Interstate development should be extended as long as need exists which, today, appears to be a very modest extension—about 6,000 miles. Concurrently, the ABC program can be given more emphasis.

The I-35W Corridor's need for an Interstate highway is equivalent to or exceeds that of other regions which already have been allotted Interstate mileage under the current highway program. Furthermore, we believe that I-35W should be built as a "missing link" extension to the current program and should be financed on the basis of 90% federal, 10% state participation.

Our conclusion is that other regional corridors in this nation, if viewed in a 1968 and a 20-year projected time frame perspective, should also be provided with Interstate system highways built as "missing link" extensions.

These needs should be accommodated either by a modest extension of about 6,000 miles to the current Interstate program or by specific designation, within the ABC system, of 6,000 miles to be used solely for completion of the "missing links". We recommend that H.R. 16994 be amended accordingly.

Gentlemen, I thank you!