

MAY 8, 1968.

Re proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman, House Public Works Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FALLON: The Department of Transportation's proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 has been made available to the states through AASHO for preliminary review and comment. We note that the proposed bill goes into considerable detail and are taking this opportunity to pass our comments along to you for your consideration as Chairman of the House Public Works Committee.

Relative to revision of appropriations for the Interstate System—we don't think that completion of the Interstate System by 1973 should be abandoned at this time. There is a need to evaluate the time of completion in conjunction with major decisions still to be made on a Continuing Federal-Aid Highway Program.

Relative to Sections 5(2), 12 and 13—we question the need for defining and funding a separate program such as Topics. This should not be a matter of legislation. Some municipalities have been progressive in the application of traffic engineering principles, and may have more urgent needs.

Relative to Section 5(3) and (4)—we are opposed to financing forest and public lands highway out of the Highway Trust Fund.

Relative to Section 7—the proposed allocations are too high. Would prefer that more funds be allocated to Highway Safety Programs under Section 6.

Relative to Section 8—Ohio has recognized landscaping, erosion control, rest areas, or work that is normally a part of highway construction, as a necessary and proper use of highway user taxes and supports this concept. We question the need for other beautification programs. If special programs are considered necessary, they should be financed from other than Trust Funds.

Relative to Sections 14 and 15—we are opposed to a special program for Fringe Parking.

The above are specific comments of objection. In general, we would recommend that new concepts and proposals be limited until such time as a Continuing Federal-Aid Highway Program has been thoroughly studied and some guidelines established.

We would appreciate your consideration of the above comments.

Very truly yours,

P. E. MASHETER,
Director.

APRIL 29, 1968.

Re: Federal-aid highway legislation and a continuing Federal-aid highway program.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER: In response to your letter of April 10, 1968, relative to developing desirable and needed Federal-aid highway legislation, I have reviewed with the Department of Highways the listing of subjects which you indicate may be considered for inclusion in highway legislation this year. Director Masheter has informed me that all the subject matter contained in your questionnaire is being considered by the several State Highway Departments and that the American Association of State Highway Officials will assemble this information and present it to Congress with recommendation at a later date.

However, in order that you may have current information of our thinking in Ohio, we are presenting the following comments for your consideration:

A. Right-of-Way Acquisition

1. The concerns listed are real and are in keeping with our desire to adequately compensate affected property owners; however, once you start to enumerate individual items there is no end of it. It is our thought that numerous individual items would become difficult to control and administer. The fair market concept of negotiation and settlement, now used in Ohio, evaluates the various contingent items without undue administrative details.

2. Relocation of persons and businesses displaced by highway construction: