

1. U.S. 78 (F.A. 4) Memphis to Mississippi State line (connect Memphis-Birmingham).
2. Continuation of I-155 from Dyersburg to I-40 at Jackson.
3. U.S. 23 (F.A. 36) North Carolina line via Johnson City and Kingsport to Virginia State line (connect Asheville, N.C. to Columbus, Ohio).
4. From I-155 at Dyersburg to I-24 near Clarksville.
5. U.S. 72 (F.A. 27) Alabama State line to I-24 near Jasper (connect Chattanooga and Huntsville to Memphis-Birmingham route).

C. W. SPEIGHT,
Commissioner, State Highway Department,
Nashville, Tenn.

TEXAS

TEXAS HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Austin, Tex., May 16, 1968.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLUCZYNSKI: Thank you for your telegram of May 15th advising of the Roads Committee Hearings scheduled to begin May 23rd covering the Administration's Federal-aid Highway legislation and inviting comments from the Texas Highway Commission as to its position on increased mileage to the existing Interstate System.

Since receiving your telegram, I have polled my Commission on this matter, and it is our collective judgment that the *minimum* additional need to the Interstate System in Texas is approximately 1,500 miles at this time, even though the commission has heard in public hearing justifiable requests from delegations over the State for substantially more mileage than this amount.

For the Committee's information, Texas still had two cities and excess of 100,000 population which are not on the present Interstate System. These two cities are Lubbock and Wichita Falls.

In an effort to complement the Interstate System with improved routes to Lubbock and Wichita Falls, as well as some other areas of the state, Texas has already expended millions of dollars of its Primary and State Fund in the building of primary routes to slightly lower standards than Interstate requirements. If it appears that additional Interstate mileage is not in the picture, Texas could live with a proposition which will probably be submitted by the American Association of State Highway Officials to the effect.

"That if a State or States elects to improve a section of the Primary System to Interstate standards and that it would make a logical addition to that System, that it be marked with an Interstate marker."

If additional Interstate mileage is approved or financed in some manner as "expressways" on the primary system, substantially as indicated in the "quote" above, it is our considered opinion that some of the severe "control of access" provisions as now required on Interstate construction should be relaxed in order to save expending millions of dollars in revising and upgrading primary routes already constructed to slightly less imposing standards than Interstate standards.

We have been advised that AASHO will testify before your Committee on May 28th. Should the Texas Highway Department wish to appear before your Committee, we will submit such request to you or the Committee Secretary by telegram at a later date.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. DINGWALL,
State Highway Engineer.

UTAH

MAY 20, 1968.

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Re: hearings on Federal-aid highway legislation, further extensions of interstate system mileage would be detrimental to highway program needs in Utah.