

Regarding the Department's desire to testify, the State of Massachusetts is desirous of participating to whatever extent you or other members of the Subcommittee feel would be beneficial in this cause, and I trust I may hear from you regarding your wishes in this matter.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD J. RIBBS, *Commissioner*.

MAINE

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI:

The reply to your telegram of May 15, 1968, is as follows:

1. The Maine State Highway Commission believes that present Interstate System of 41,000 miles, countrywide, should be constructed before additional mileage is authorized for this system.

2. We believe emphasis should be placed on construction of primary roads which under the ABC program have been neglected to some extent in favor of construction on the Interstate System, this emphasis to take place on completion of the present Interstate System.

3. In the event that additional mileage is to be authorized by Congress at this time the following routes and mileage should be considered in the State of Maine.

(a) Houlton to Fort Kent, via Van Buren—122 miles.

(b) Brunswick to Calais—244 miles. (Note section from Brunswick to Bath, 8 miles, now constructed to interstate standards through use of primary and urban funds.)

(c) Calais to Bangor—97 miles; and Pittsfield to Fryeburg—103 miles (Maine-New Hampshire border) this is part of proposed Maine-to-New York Highway.

(d) Portland to Fryeburg—40 miles.

4. I do not plan to appear before your committee but will rely on presentation by AASHO which I understand is to be made on May 28.

Thank you for advising us of the hearings and for the invitation to attend.

DAVID H. STEVENS,

Chairman, Maine State Highway Commission.

MICHIGAN

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE HIGHWAYS,
Lansing, Mich., May 20, 1968.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
*House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Roads,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLUCZYNSKI: In response to your telegram dated May 15, 1968, we are pleased to have this opportunity to express Michigan's opposition to any expansion of the Interstate System.

There is no question that constructing the existing Interstate System has been one of the great public works programs of all time, and the results have been spectacular. To accomplish this tremendous task, it has been necessary to utilize most of our financial resources. It has not been accomplished without a detrimental effect on the remainder of the highway system. Federal-aid Primary, Urban and Secondary programs have not kept pace with the increasing needs of our motorists. We are concerned that an expanded Interstate System would again put emphasis on a minimum amount of mileage to the detriment of the remainder of the highway system.

We are loud in our praise of the Interstate System, however, it is our belief that by 1975, we should be turning most of our attention to the Primary, Urban and Secondary Systems of our total highway network. Also, the need for additional financial assistance on the arterial highways in our major metropolitan areas is of great concern. We propose that the Highway Trust Fund be extended and these funds be used to finance a balanced highway program including all of the Federal-aid Highway Systems. The need for additional freeways is evident, but these freeways, as well as the upgrading of the existing Interstate System, can and should be financed through expanded primary and urban