

We in Nebraska do have great needs on our highway systems. Many of these segments will ultimately require four-lane divided type improvements similar to those used on the Interstate. We do feel, however, that we can get more for our highway dollar if Federal funds are allocated among the several existing Federal-aid systems rather than spending most of those funds on extensive Interstate additions. Under such a plan each segment would be built to the appropriate standards for the traffic which it will serve. Thus, we could concentrate the Interstate type improvements on those segments which are vital to the highway service of our State, where volumes are such that freeway type improvements would markedly reduce the accident toll, rather than having it spent on routes criss-crossing the State and nation, portions of which would carry lighter traffic volumes.

Since 1956 and until about 1975 the "lion's share" of our Federal funds have been allocated to the completion of the Interstate system. Since an integrated cross-country network to our major cities and defense installations was essential this was proper. This has meant, however, that the normal highway systems of our country were neglected as we concentrated our funds upon this "super highway" system. In our opinion, when the 41,000 miles are complete, we should then concentrate our efforts on a modernization of our regular Federal-aid highway systems.

For the reasons above noted, we feel that the revenues going to the Highway Trust Fund should definitely be continued, but that they should be allocated for work on the existing systems with perhaps some added emphasis in urban areas, and with standards selected appropriate for the anticipated traffic volumes. In our state at least, this would give us considerably more highway service for the dollars involved. Naturally if extra Interstate mileage were to be added by Congress, we would have several routes to suggest for inclusion in that extended system. However, we doubt that system extension is in the nation's best interest.

We do appreciate your invitation to testify at the hearing, but feel that the AASHO representatives will adequately present our views on the matter. Should you have need for additional information, feel free to call upon us.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. HOSSACK,
State Engineer.

NEVADA

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI:

Re your wire of May 15, 1968, State of Nevada has supported AASHO stand on any extension of Interstate System until present system completed. In the event that extension will be made the State of Nevada, with States of Utah and California, have and will support extension of Interstate 70 from Cove Fort, Utah along U.S. 50 in Nevada and California to Sacramento. This has gained considerable support from U.S. 50 association and communities located along the route. The length of this proposed route in Nevada is some 410 miles. We also feel that a connection from Interstate 80 in Reno along U.S. 395 to Carson City, the capitol of our State is significant. This would be some 30 miles in length. We would also support along with Oregon and Idaho the addition of U.S. 95 from Winnemucca and Interstate 80 northerly to the Nevada-Oregon State line. The routing would then extend along U.S. 95 through Oregon and a junction with the existing Interstate System in Idaho. The length of this route will be some 74 miles in Nevada.

JOHN E. BAWDEN,
State Highway Engineer.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND HIGHWAYS,
Concord, May 17, 1968.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLUCZYNSKI: I am grateful for your telegram of May 15 relative to New Hampshire's needs for additional Interstate mileage and will respond to the questions it poses in the following paragraphs: