

longer. Thus, we urge that an urban major street and highway fund be created under H.R. 17134 which would support both traffic engineering improvements and construction on major streets and highways that are not part of the State primary system. This program would be the beginning step in implementing the urban element of the State, urban and rural system we propose.

We support development of a fringe parking program as an integral part of the urban comprehensive transportation planning process. This will relieve pressure on central city streets by inducing those who do not require their cars for work, shopping or entertainment to leave them on the outskirts of the urban area and take public transportation to get to the central business district. The efficient use of our highway system requires relief of peak hour pressures. Fringe parking in connection with public transportation facilities can provide this relief by combining the flexibility of the automobile with the ease of direct movement to and from the core area.

Secretary Boyd has indicated that the primary purpose of the fringe parking program which would be established by H.R. 17134 would be to relieve pressure on downtown streets while still providing a means of easy access to the downtown area. We urge that in any fringe parking program it be absolutely clear that the legislation is not intended to support near commercial developments which might become traffic generators in their own right.

Finally, I would like to address the problem of advance acquisition of right-of-way and relocation. The inadequacy of present programs have been, and continues to be, a major roadblock to highway construction in urban areas.

Financial limitations on the highway program make it difficult to acquire rights-of-way sufficiently in advance to control development and avoid costs from appreciation of land values and control development. The new proposal will avoid much frustration and opposition to highway programs by making it possible to acquire property soon after the right-of-way is planned rather than leaving private citizens holding property for years which they know will eventually be taken, but which they cannot get rid of.

Relocation has been a most troublesome aspect of highway planning and development. That procedures followed to date have been less than satisfactory is acknowledged by all. The fair treatment of owners and renters who are forced to move so that the community may benefit from the added convenience of a new highway must be considered an appropriate part of the cost of that highway. A relocation program must make the displaced person whole again, it must place him in a home or business at least equal to that which he had before, and on the same terms and conditions as he enjoyed before relocation. If this cannot be done, the individual should receive adequate compensation for his loss. Further, the law should require that adequate provision be made for relocation before highway programs can proceed.

This approach is not only the most humane thing to do, but it makes good economic and practical sense. Expensive delays in highway construction and costly changes in highway plans are often occasioned by citizens who oppose highway programs because they believe—often correctly—that they will bear economic losses and be placed in less