

UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,
Salt Lake City, May 9, 1968.

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURTON: Enclosed is a copy of our comments on the Department of Transportation's proposed 1968 Highway Act. The comments were prepared for AASHO but should be of interest to you.

AASHO has organized an "After 1975 Committee" to prepare recommendations for a continuing program to be implemented upon completion or shortly prior to completion of the presently authorized Interstate Highway Program. A great effort is being made by the Community and it has the support of the Utah Highway Department.

Recommendations to Congress by the Committee and action by the present Congress on the AASHO Program would be premature. There are, however, several items of importance to the highway program in Utah of which you should be aware.

It would be detrimental to the Utah Program were any extensions of the Interstate System mileage to be authorized. Such an action would defer the time when funds now going to the Interstate Program could be channeled into programs on the Primary and Secondary Systems. The need for improvement on Primary and Secondary Highways in Utah is becoming critical. Particularly is this true with regard to federal-aid Secondary Highways. The present allocation of Secondary projects in Utah is \$3,000,000 per year. Under federal regulations one-half of this amount is made available to Counties for improvements to the County Secondary System. The balance, with State matching funds, totals \$2,000,000 per year. A large proportion of these funds has been used to construct approaches to the Interstate System and consequently little has been or can be done on other State Secondary roads. Public demand for improvements is high but funds are not available. A similar, though less critical situation, exists on the Primary System, particularly in Urban areas. Relief cannot wait upon completion of the Interstate System. An increase in the authorization for Primary, Secondary and Urban roads from \$1,000,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000 is needed now.

The DOT bill does not provide such an increase. It does propose an allocation of \$250,000,000 for the TOPICS program. The funds could be better used in the regular federal-aid program with a reduced amount of \$50 to \$100 million being made available for the TOPICS program.

Your assistance in supporting any effort to increase ABC apportionments and to resist any attempts to expand the Interstate System would be appreciated.

We would be happy to furnish any other information which you may desire concerning proposed federal legislation pertaining to the highway program.

Very truly yours,

R. W. GRIFFIN,
(For Henry C. Hellan, Director of Highways.)

RESPONSE SHEET BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS
ON THE DOT DRAFT LEGISLATION, "FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1968"

*Section 4 of the bill*¹

Comments: With the extension of time needed to complete the system the next cost estimate need not be required before January 1971. The present estimate could be used for apportionments through fiscal year 1972 or later.

Section 5 of the bill

(1) Comments: The current back-log of needs on the Primary and Secondary Systems need immediate relief. ABC authorization should be increased by 50% to \$1,500,000,000.

(2) Comments: (For TOPICS Program) The TOPICS Program needs to be financed but \$250,000,000 is too much. In some States this would exceed the allocation for Primary construction. An amount between \$50 and \$100 million would be more appropriate.

(3) and (4) (Note to come from Trust Fund.) Comments: Public Land and Forest Highway Programs should be financed from the General Fund, not the Trust Fund. Increases in these funds should be considered.

¹ The dates specified do not appear to be the final completion dates.