

(5) Such customers (the users of signs) *are not compensated* for their devastating projected losses;

(6) Highway advertising signs directly serve the motoring public;

(7) Such prohibitive costs for sign removal as those projected were never intended; they can be brought within reason only by treating the larger Highway Advertising Industry as reasonably, in regard to *where* it may be, as city signs;

(8) *Rural areas simply are not synonymous with natural beauty*; many such areas are appropriate for the signs that are needed there (page 3 hereof).

RURAL AREAS NOT ALWAYS BEAUTIFUL

True, one purpose of the Federal Act is to preserve natural beauty.

But there was no intent to bar signs from rural areas per se. "Rural areas" and "natural beauty" are far from synonymous. We know this from honest, objective observation.

In rural areas, one can encounter miles upon miles of nothing but barren plowed fields, growing crops, dusty plains, poultry ranches, waste lands, hog wallows, burnt-over lands, dilapidated buildings, gravel pits, farm machinery, swamp lands, power lines, and so on. In many cases his view is improved by well maintained signs which obscure ugliness and relieve monotony, while also serving his convenience.

Beauty is *relative*. The only standard is that which the "reasonable man" would apply. He *likes and needs* well placed and maintained signs—otherwise they could not exist.

Opposing values must be weighed (huge compensation costs, the plight of 500,000 highway oriented businesses, unemployment, devastation to the economy, the promotion of outdoor advertising, the convenience of the motorist).

Thus the "beauty purpose" *has* to be to protect *Uncommon Natural Beauty*, as selectively distinguished from such ordinary beauty as may be represented by the countryside at large.

THE UNIQUE NEED FOR RURAL SIGNS

The Under Secretary's Report of January 10, 1967, to Congress (Senate Document No. 6) stated at page 28:

"there are currently *more than one-half million* establishments engaged in what can be called a *highway-oriented business* industry. * * * Several studies found that highway-oriented businesses estimated that about *one-third of their business can be attributed to outdoor advertising.*"

These include the more than 5,000 motels for which I speak, restaurants, gas stations, resorts, natural attractions, and so on. *Their survival depends literally on rural signs.*

For those who use rural signs there is simply no alternative advertising medium. Only signs can reach a fast-moving car in the country *at the precise location where communication with its occupants is essential.*

On-premise signs (exempt from the Act) are essential. But they are not nearly as effective in the country as in the city, where passers-by walk or drive slowly, and can even re-trace their steps.

Also, in the country effective information is not available by the telephone "yellow book", by inquiry at myriads of other commercial establishments, by newspapers and "visitors magazines" and radio and television, by word of mouth, and so on.

In the country, where people drive fast, and where commercial establishments are scattered, off-premise signs are generally the only effective advertising medium.

RE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SURVEY

A reprint of highlights from the Washington University survey of the economic impact of the Federal Act was attached to our statement of last year. Some of its findings:

It concluded (at page 3) "that the *highway sign industry in Missouri will be destroyed* if sign standards presently proposed by the Bureau of Public Roads are put into operation."

Its findings included the fact (page 2) that the "734 businesses covered in this study expect to lose \$8.5 million and as a result to cut back payments to individuals and firms in Missouri by at least \$6.7 million. Extrapolating from