

dence River to the State line enroute to a junction with Massachusetts Interstate Route 195 in North Swansea. This extension would represent an addition of 13 miles in Rhode Island. It is envisioned that Massachusetts would continue the route northerly from the junction in North Swansea to Interstate Route 95 in Attleboro thereby completing the encirclement of the Providence Metropolitan Area by Interstate Route 295. In effect it would achieve a sort of belt route to integrate important radials emanating from this urban complex which has a population of 750,000.

(2) Our second suggestion is a route extending from existing Interstate Route 95 in downtown Providence westward generally on the alignment of U.S. 6 enroute to Hartford, Connecticut. This would require an addition of 21 miles and would directly connect the second and third largest metropolitan centers in New England with their combined population of over 1,500,000.

(3) The third candidate for Interstate System additions would be a route following the alignment of Rhode Island State Route 146 from a downtown Providence junction with existing Interstate Route 95 proceeding north-westerly enroute to Worcester, Massachusetts. Worcester also ranks high as a metropolitan area, having a population of over 600,000 and is fifth largest in New England. This would add 16 miles in Rhode Island.

(4) A final suggested addition would be a spur from Interstate Route 495 (a circumferential route in Massachusetts) south-westerly into and through Woonsocket, Rhode Island, to make a connection with present State Route 146 in North Smithfield. This would involve only a 5 mile addition in Rhode Island, but it would be useful in making I-495 more accessible from Woonsocket and environs (population 50,000).

Thus for your purposes, Rhode Island considers that four additions aggregating 55 miles would be well worthwhile.

Thank you for your telegram and we appreciate the opportunity to convey to you our wishes with respect to Interstate System extensions.

Very truly yours,

ANGELO A. MARCELLO,
Director.

SOUTH CAROLINA

SOUTH CAROLINA,
STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Columbia, S.C., May 17, 1968.

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Member of Congress,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLUCZYNSKI: This is in reference to your telegram concerning proposed 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Legislation and our needs for additional Interstate mileage.

I am a member of AASHO "After 75 Committee," and it is my understanding that this committee's proposals will be submitted to your committee. I am strongly in favor of the proposals to be submitted by AASHO "After 75 Committee". Also, it is my understanding that, in this proposal, AASHO is recommending that five (5) percent of the Federal-Aid funds be allocated for upgrading the existing 41,000 Interstate mileage and that no additional Interstate mileage be added. Additional controlled access highways would be constructed from Federal-Aid Primary or Urban funds apportioned to the states on an equitable formula. Provisions are being proposed that any such highways constructed which would comply as logical extensions of the Interstate System could be added after construction and officially approved for addition to the Interstate System. I am of the opinion that is the fairest means of allocating the Federal funds to the states and would provide for logical additions to the Interstate mileage. The states would be in much better position for planning their future highway program if the formula apportionment basis is used for all Federal-Aid distribution of funds except for the five (5) percent established for upgrading the existing Interstate mileage.

We do have need for additional highways constructed to Interstate standards in our State, but it is believed that the proposal being submitted by AASHO is the most desirable plan for the total highway program. This plan as indicated