

study shows that we require another 2,200 miles of this type of facility to better serve the people. It would be extremely difficult to make a determination as to which of these suggested routes has the priority, which should be placed on the next program. All are needed, all should be built and, according to our growth, all will be built eventually.

I think that whatever program of adding mileage to the Interstate System you in your wisdom decide, whether it be 1, 100, 1,000 or 10,000 miles, the difficulties of obtaining public acceptance of more highways will be lessened if programs are adopted which will include advance right-of-way planning and acquisition.

The need to determine the location of the supplemental miles at the earliest possible date is perhaps the most important goal the Congress should strive for in the highway field. The present poor image of highway administrators will be greatly improved when we are able to plan for highways where the land adjoining urban areas is still relatively undeveloped, where community boundaries, fire protection districts, school districts, public utility installations and the like will be the least disrupted by advance right-of-way acquisitions.

The investment of trust funds in lands not yet developed will greatly reduce the costs of future highway construction because it will largely avert the cost of moving people, business and industry, and avert the heartaches that this social upheaval generally causes today.

So, in arriving at a decision as to what the future of federally aided highway programs should be, I respectfully suggest that you consider the need to update the existing corridors at the same time you add new miles and, at the same time, provide a realistic advance right-of-way acquisition program with a good-working revolving fund to get effective results.

In passing, I might note that AASHO's recommendation of the completion of a \$100 million fund for advance right-of-way acquisition, may I suggest to you that the State of Illinois tried, in the last session of the general assembly, to create a \$30 million revolving fund just for the State of Illinois.

In my judgment, the request to set up a \$100 million revolving fund is far too modest to get the job done effectively.

In my judgment again, one of the ways to get this thing back in the proper perspective, to do the job effectively, to solve the problems that every State has for adequate funds, is to provide the right kind of funds at the right time and to avoid the interruption of the flow of funds, so that the highway administrators can be contracting at all times in the best interests of people.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Thank you, Mr. Lorenz, for that wonderful statement.

I know you do not have much time, but I am going to ask Mr. Cramer if he has any questions of you.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank you for your testimony, Mr. Lorenz, and I was particularly interested in your comment relating to advance right-of-way acquisition in the revolving fund.

Of course, the administration bill does not provide for revolving funds, does it, just the \$100 million?

Mr. LORENZ. That is all.

Mr. CRAMER. Secondly, \$100 million is not enough.