

VII. Position

It is, therefore, the position of the Iowa State Highway Commission that the present limitation of vehicle dimensions and weights as contained in the Code of the State of Iowa and federal law, is prudent and proper and should not be altered, at this time. While the Interstate System in Iowa may be able to sustain the increased weight without excessive wear, this is only 710 miles out of 112,000 miles of Iowa highways. The remainder of the system cannot sustain this without excessive damage.

It is the position of the Commission that any increase in these loads or dimensions will substantially shorten the life which can be anticipated from the present highway facility, will greatly increase the maintenance costs of the present highway facility, will act to the detriment of highway safety, and, unless accomplished in conjunction with an increased revenue structure, will increase the disparity between present financing for highway maintenance and construction, and highway needs.

[Iowa State Highway Commission Position Paper No. 2, Mar. 8, 1968]

CONTINUING FEDERAL AID PROGRAM AFTER COMPLETION OF THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

I. Current Review of Federal-Aid Concept

At the present time the United States Congress is engaged in hearings as part of the Legislative process leading to the apportionment of funds later this year to the ABC System for fiscal year 1970. The same process involves review and approval of the 1968 Interstate Cost Estimate leading to the determination of apportionment factors for the several states for fiscal year 1970.

At the same time Congress is expected to address itself to a determination of the future concepts of the Federal Highway Program. The last major change in federal highway legislation was embodied in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. The new philosophy at that time was expressed in the creation and funding of the Federal Interstate System and the establishment of the Federal Highway Trust Fund as the funding vehicle for both the ABC and Interstate Systems.

With the Interstate System now nearing completion, it is necessary, if a continuous coordinated program is to be maintained, that the next objectives be defined. The American Association of State Highway Officials as well as the individual member states have addressed themselves to defining these objectives. AASHO has prepared a statement which has been reviewed by the states and is being presented to the Congress.

While the views of the State Highway Departments are being heard, other interested individuals and groups are also presenting their views about the future of federal transportation and highway legislation. It is from this information base that Congress will formulate the legislation which will govern much of our future activity.

While Congress is in the process of restating the philosophy of the Federal-Aid Program, it will also develop a new formula for distribution of federal highway resources in order that they may be oriented to the new philosophy.

II. Present Factors in Allocating the Trust Fund Among Highway Systems and Apportioning Funds Among the States

A. Apportionment Among States

1. *ABC Systems.*—The apportionment factor for the Federal-Aid Primary System is based $\frac{1}{2}$ on area, $\frac{1}{3}$ on total population and $\frac{1}{6}$ on rural delivery and star route mileage as certified by the Postmaster General.

The apportionment factor for the Federal-Aid Secondary System is based on $\frac{1}{3}$ area, $\frac{1}{3}$ rural population and $\frac{1}{3}$ rural delivery and star route mileage the same as in the Federal-Aid Primary System.

The apportionment factor for the Federal-Aid Urban System is based on the ratio of each state's population in cities over 5,000 to the national population in cities over 5,000.

2. *Interstate System.*—In the beginning the Interstate System funds were apportioned by formula as follows:

One-half based on total population ratio and one-half based on the Federal Aid Primary formula as listed in Section A-1 above with the stipulation that no state was to receive less than three-fourths of one percent. This applied to the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, 1958 and 1959. From that point to the