

miles of expressway designed substantially the same as the interstate standards, but to a somewhat lower standard in that some public access at grade will be allowed.

We estimate the cost of this supplementary system to be \$1,790 million, based on present day costs, and obviously over the next 20 years, those costs are going to increase rather substantially.

Therefore, it seems to us that we are going to have to begin planning now for the kind of Federal-aid program and the kind of resources, the kind of revenues that will be available to us to construct this supplementary system, which will be to all intents and purposes very similar to the Interstate System, and to also maintain the other 10,000 miles of primary highways and 10,000 miles of secondary highways in our State.

We have given a great deal of thought to our recommendations to you on the kind of Federal-State partnership that should be continued and we have come to the conclusion at the Iowa State Commission that while we need additional highways designed the same as interstate highways, that we do not believe the 90-10 formula, based on the actual costs, should be continued beyond the 41,000 miles of highway now included in the Interstate System.

If it is the decision that you will continue with this means, we would ask for the entire 1,800 miles of freeway and expressway system that we have outlined, which is in part of the supporting documents there that you have, would be included in this additional Interstate System.

We rather believe that we should go back to the old historic formula philosophy and have that introduced to the entire Federal-aid partnership system.

Obviously, I do not believe any State could match on a 50-50 basis the additional funds that will become available to them for improvement of the ABC system upon completion of the Interstate System, and I think, too, there has to be additional recognition—and I am sure you people are doing this—of the increased requirements of our urban area where 90 percent of our people are living in 2 percent of our land area.

So with these considerations in mind and on this point we would make the following recommendations:

One, that upon completion of the Interstate System, all Federal aid be apportioned to States on a formula basis.

Two, the formula would take into consideration the same factors now used—that is, area, population, and road mileage—but with somewhat greater emphasis on road mileage and somewhat less emphasis on area and population.

Now we are talking about the allocation, the apportionment between States.

We do recognize the additional needs of urban areas and therefore recommend a change in the allocation between systems. We would recommend that expenditures from trust funds be allocated very similarly to what the AASHO report was—I think we have varied only slightly. We would recommend 5 percent be allocated to upgrading the Interstate network, 10 percent to this new metropolitan area arterial system we think is important, 20 percent to those highways presently classified as urban extensions on the primary system, 45 percent