

of an Interstate System would continue indefinitely, and in all likelihood at the expense of accelerating improvements on the ABC system. An enlarged ABC program would permit States to build appropriate portions of highways to the same standards as the Interstate System; and if authorized by Congress, sections of highways built to these standards, which would constitute an appropriate addition to the presently authorized Interstate System, could be so marked.

In the event it is the decision of your subcommittee, the Public Works Committee, and Congress to add mileage to the presently authorized Interstate System, U.S. 78, for a length of 122 miles in Mississippi, which would form part of a route between Birmingham, Alabama and Memphis, Tennessee, should be added.

It is believed that the relocation policy should make some provision for payments to persons and businesses displaced by acquisition of highway rights-of-way to permit their relocation in comparable quarters and comparable environments.

Due to the present needs on the ABC System, it is our opinion that highway funds should not at this time be used to finance the construction of parking areas or garages. It would seem preferable for a fund to be made available from which local jurisdictions could finance the construction of such facilities and repay the loan with revenue obtained from operation of the parking lot or garage.

The invitation to appear before your Subcommittee is sincerely appreciated, but this Department does not plan to have anyone testify on May 23, 1968.

Yours very truly,

T. C. ROBBINS, *Director*.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, 341 NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

RESPONSE SHEET ON:
THE DOT DRAFT LEGISLATION
"FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1968"

(TO AUTHORIZE APPOINTMENTS FOR 1970 AND 1971)
(TRANSMITTED TO AASHO MEMBER DEPARTMENTS ON APRIL 25, 1968)

Section 2 of the Bill: (Freezes authorization at \$4 Billion starting with 1970)

Comments: The apportionments to the Interstate System should be the maximum that the Trust Fund can bear (after increased taxes, if any) less the ABC apportionments.

Section 4 of the Bill: (The dates specified do not appear to be the final completion dates.)

Comments: There should be a completion date established and financing provided for fulfillment.

Section 5 of the Bill:

(1) Comments: Satisfactory.

(2) Comments: (For TOPICS Program) There is no end to conflicting jurisdictions. Oppose in principle and oppose the Trust Fund diversion.

(3) & (4) (Note to come from Trust Fund)

Comments: Oppose any raid on the Fund. Imperative the Interstate System be completed as rapidly as possible.

Section 6 of the Bill:

Comments: None.

Section 7 of the Bill:

Comments: None.

Section 8 of the Bill:

Comments: Proper method of handling financing.

Section 9 of the Bill: (All Subsections)

Comments: This would advance States' share. Oppose as all this will do will save the States interest on its share, but will decrease interest revenue to Trust Fund.

Section 10 of the Bill:

Comments: Satisfactory.

Section 11 of the Bill:

Comments: Satisfactory.

Section 12 of the Bill:

Comments: Oppose for same reason as given under Section 5(2).

Section 13 of the Bill:

Comments: Oppose.

Section 14. Oppose.

(S) T. C. ROBBINS, *Director*.