

Ohio concurs that a uniform policy on all Federal and federally assisted programs should be obtained, and that better coordination of housing programs with highway construction is desirable. However, we do not believe the policy should be oriented to the highway program for coordination responsibility. It could become a serious delaying factor.

We are in full accord with the principle of relocation payments. Again, for administrative purposes, it is desirable that lump sum or flat payments with ceilings be retained.

B. Metropolitan Areas

1. Multiple use of rights-of-way.

Ohio favors maximum use of airspace and has work of this type underway.

In the area of multiple use of highways provision should be made for the sharing of right-of-way costs by all using agencies according to the value of the rights required by each. Almost every presentation of the joint use concept proposes that the highway program pay "residue damages" to the additional land acquired, thus making joint use very attractive to other users who thereby obtain land rights at bargain prices, but at the expense of the Highway Trust Fund. The highway program should not be required in this way to subsidize these other uses.

We are opposed to utilization of highway rights-of-way for rapid rail transit.

Separate traffic lanes for exclusive use of buses should be considered on the basis of project by project justification.

2. Use of design concept teams made up of engineers, architects, etc.

We do not consider this a matter that should be directed by legislation. It is recognized that organized planning is desirable, and the 1962 Highway Act on Urban Transportation Planning accomplishes this goal. Highway engineers have primary responsibility for highway locations and must provide leadership and decisions. Through consultant use or by establishing staff positions to supplement Urban Transportation Comprehensive Planning, the same goals can be accomplished.

C. Federal-aid Financing of Highway Construction

Ohio favors the continuation of the Highway Trust Fund but not necessarily restricted to its present revenues. For instance, the 7% automobile excise tax should be directed into the Trust Fund as a revenue resource, and this additional income could provide funds for a federally financed advance right-of-way acquisition program.

We are against any diversion of monies from the Highway Trust Fund for non-federal highway purposes, including other modes of transportation.

The present three-year period for obligation of Federal funds is reasonable and we endorse it.

Highway safety features and corrective work to reduce hazards is a proper use of Trust Funds and a highway user payment responsibility as much as other highway improvements. We subscribe to the use of regular Trust Funds for this work at the regular participation rate as for other highway improvements.

We strongly favor enactment of law to prohibit the executive branch from withholding apportioned Federal-aid highway funds from obligations. Since allocations must match revenues on a pay-as-you-go program, we feel that Congress should accept the responsibility of providing the revenue-obligation balance.

D. Highway beautification

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 are opposed to use of Highway Trust Funds for beautification purposes that are not within this concept.

We would recommend extensive revision of the billboard and junkyard sections of the Beautification Act to cut down the cost of the program and to allow the States more leeway to control these items as they see fit. For example, the States should have the option to control by police power or to pay compensation, and the States should not be forced to control these items inside of municipalities. The 10% penalty for non-compliance should be repealed as this is strictly arm-twisting and repugnant to the whole concept of Federal-State partnership.