

The Highway Program in Indiana —State and Local

M. L. HAYES
Executive Director
Indiana State Highway Commission

INTRODUCTION

The title of this paper, *State and Local Highway Program in Indiana*, avails ample “elbow room” for discussing and touching base with many of the major facets of Indiana’s road, bridge, maintenance and traffic programs. I could not hope to cover all of the items but here are a few highway items that come to mind, any one of which could be discussed at length. The budget for fiscal years 1968 and 1969; the construction program between April 1, 1967, and June 30, 1968; the resurfacing and bridge painting programs for calendar year 1967; the bridge widening program for fiscal year 1968; the traffic program for the remainder of fiscal year 1967 (to June 30, 1967); the accomplishments of our design division during calendar year 1966; the progress being made by our right-of-way division; traffic safety as it pertains to the Indiana State Highway Commission; deferred federal funds; some specifics of the scenic roads and parkways development program; the research and training center; the new testing laboratory now under construction; or for that matter personnel alone makes a lengthy subject.

THE HIGHWAY BUDGET

Consider first the highway commission budget as passed by the 95th General Assembly and approved by Governor Branigin on March 10, 1967, which is within four percent or \$8.25 million of the highway commission’s total requests for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. House Enrolled Act No. 1014 provides \$98,776,141 in state funds, \$106,600,000 in federal funds, and \$5,500,000 in county-federal-aid making a total of \$210,876,141 in revenues available for fiscal year 1968. Originally the highway commission requested \$213,600,000 for fiscal year 1968. Act No. 1014 also provides \$98,662,051 in state funds, \$107,900,000 in federal funds, and \$5,100,000 in county federal-aid, making a total of \$211,662,051 in revenues available for fiscal year 1969. Our accounting

and control division anticipated the highway commission would need \$217,200,000 for fiscal year 1969, and this was the amount of our request. Adding the \$217.6 million and the \$213.7 million sought by the highway commission for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, results in a total of \$430.8 million for both years. The sum of the amounts which the highway commission will receive as decreed by the legislature, \$210.9 million for fiscal year 1968 and \$211.6 for fiscal year 1969, equals \$422.5 million for the next two fiscal years.

However, the General Assembly and the governor also approved House Enrolled Act No. 1015, which contains a "deficiency appropriation" for the highway commission amounting to \$14,389,470. This is a reimbursement to the highway commission for money raised from motor vehicle sources and transferred to the general fund for general government purposes. Act No. 1015 provides further that said money be used solely for engineering, land acquisition and construction, with or without federal participation, on state highways. This relief comes at an urgent time—urgent because of the federal freeze and cutback of funds.

PROGRAMMED CONSTRUCTION

With an inkling of the highway commission's budget, consider now the construction projects programmed between now and the end of fiscal year 1968. If right-of-way acquisition progresses in a satisfactory manner, the highway commission will receive bids between April 1, 1967 and June 30, 1968, for the following interstate construction. On Interstate 64—three projects should be placed under construction, from State Road 165 in Posey County west to the Wabash River. On Interstate 65—projects in Bartholomew, Shelby and Johnson Counties will be included if the right-of-way can be purchased. The commission hopes to receive bids for Interstate 65 on projects in Tippecanoe, White and Jasper Counties beginning with SR 26 east of Lafayette. All of Interstate 69 is presently under construction or open to traffic except one project between Interstate 465 northeast of Indianapolis and approximately two miles northeast of Fishers. That last, remaining project will be placed under construction before June 30, 1968. Bids will be received for the construction of Interstate 70 from SR 100 east of Indianapolis, east to the Marion-Hancock County Line. At the present time I-70 is under construction from I-465 west of Indianapolis to the Illinois State line with the exception of two projects located between SR 46 in Vigo County and SR 59 in Clay County. Our plans are to receive bids on these two projects before June 30, 1968. Bids

will be received during fiscal year 1968 for the construction of projects on I-94 extending east of the toll road into Porter County. Interstate 465 (east leg) is under construction from US 40 north to 56th Street. We should be able to receive bids on the balance of I-465 (north leg) from 56th Street north and west to I-65. If we can reach this goal, all of Interstate 465 would be open to traffic or under construction before June 30, 1968. Between April 1, 1967, and June 30, 1968, our planning involves the receipt of bids on ABC road and bridge construction projects in Allen, Bartholomew, Benton, Clark, Clinton, Dearborn, DeKalb, Dubois, Hamilton, Harrison, Hendricks, Howard, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Lawrence, Marion, Marshall, Miami, Montgomery Morgan, Noble, Ohio, Orange, Owen, Porter, Posey, Shelby, Starke, Vanderburgh, Warrick and White Counties.

We estimate the dollar amount of bids to be received between April 1967 and June 30, 1968, as follows:

May 9, 1967 bid-opening	\$16,000,000	(includes maintenance and traffic)
June 27, 1967 bid-opening	10,500,000	(according to federal funds available)
	<hr/>	
	26,500,000	
July 1, 1967 to December 31, 1968 bid-openings	60,000,000	
January 1, 1968 to June 30, 1968 bid-openings	60,000,000	

Based on present planning total construction, maintenance, and traffic work from April 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968 would involve approximately \$146,000,000.

RESURFACING, BRIDGE PAINTING AND WIDENING PROGRAMS

A look at the highway commission's resurfacing, bridge painting, and bridge widening programs for calendar year 1967 reveals the following: the program involves all of the six highway districts and calls for 216 miles of roads and streets in the state system to be resurfaced at an average cost of \$18,518.00 per mile or nearly \$4 million total.

During the same commission monthly meeting on February 21, they approved a 1967 bridge painting program estimated to cost \$430,435. The program calls for 76 structures, some in each of the six highway

districts, to be sandblasted and repainted before January 1, 1968. The cost of the annual bridge painting program averages approximately \$350,000 per year. The proposed bridge painting for 1967 is slightly higher than the average year. We have at least 25 bridges that definitely need to be widened in fiscal 1968.

Although bridge widening is considered a function of maintenance and is classified as a maintenance safety program, the funds necessary for the actual work usually come from the construction budget which is low and somewhat confused because of the federal freeze and cut-back of funds which hit Indiana's roadbuilding program unexpectedly last November. However, if at all possible bridge widening is not only necessary but most important to the overall program.

DIVISION OF TRAFFIC

The division of traffic plans to present its 1968 fiscal year program to the highway commission members for approval at the May, 1967 meeting. Since that program is not ready for commission action I can only state that the traffic program will probably be in the \$8 billion range.

The present program which is nearing completion has a budget of \$8,501,339. Programmed in it were improvements at 286 different locations. To date work has been contracted for at more than 200 of the safety and spot improvement locations. Specifically remaining for contract work are nine locations programmed for channelization, 62 locations programmed for signal work, and 13 locations programmed for illumination. The channelization will cost about \$200,000, the signal work about \$0.5 million, and the illumination about \$75,000.

DESIGN DIVISION

Another topic for discussion, and all too often overlooked, is the accomplishments of the commission's design division, consisting of both the bridge, road and landscape sections. During calendar year 1966 a status report of this division revealed the following.

Total design reviewed and completed road plans, exclusive of bridges, provided for 195.5 miles of highways in 1966 at an estimated cost of \$103,989,000. This \$104 million worth of design work represented 102 miles of interstate highways amounting to \$58,333,900. Included in the 102 miles are 22.8 miles of Interstate 465 which is being converted from a four lane to a six lane expressway. In addition, 48.6 miles of four-lane divided rural state highways, totaled \$30,998,100;

36 miles of two-lane rural state highways totaled \$7,672,900; 9.3 miles of urban streets totaled \$5,099,600; four rest area (double) installations at an estimated cost of \$755,500; and landscape projects amounted to \$1,129,000.

BRIDGE SECTION

The bridge section completed plans and reviewed final plans prepared by consultants for 179 structures at an estimated cost of \$35 million. Included with the 179 structures were 10 miles of approaches. In addition this section prepared and reviewed plans for structure widening for the maintenance division involving an estimated cost of \$250,000 and there were plans for 35 structures on county federal-aid at an estimated cost of \$2.5 million. Also 145 bridge plans previously completed in the bridge department, or by consultants, were updated for changes in specifications, standards, or procedures. A good record for a division, which like others, is understaffed.

LAND ACQUISITION

Land acquisition is another division that seems to have its share of personnel problems, however, its progress during the fiscal year 1966 was very good. Apparently there are very few who feel that we paid them a sufficient amount for the right-of-way, but in any event \$26.9 million in federal and state funds were expended for this item of construction.

For the first 8 months of this fiscal year (1967), 1,521 parcels have been secured and 193 have been condemned for a total of 1,714. Cost of procurement was \$16.5 million and we trust that the remaining 4 months of 1967 will make it possible to equal fiscal 1966. Calendar 1966 brought many challenges to all concerned, but despite these and other difficult problems, *safety* was one of the more important subjects on the congressional agenda.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Senator Warren G. Magnuson (Dem. Wash.) predicted that last year's Congress would be known as "the automobile safety congress." But only time will tell whether that congress' enactments meet the call of Under Secretary of Commerce Alan S. Boyd for "revolutionary, not evolutionary progress" to solve the highway safety problem.

President Johnson challenged congress and the states when he submitted to the congress a series of measures dealing with traffic, high-

way and transportation safety. He said, "The gravest problem before this nation—next to war in Vietnam—is the death and destruction, the shocking and senseless carnage that strikes daily on our highways . . ." And National Highway Safety Administrator William Haddon, Jr., expressed the following, "Highway accidents—are by far—the leading form of violence in American life . . ."

We will discuss today only some of the federal standards for state highway safety programs for two reasons: principally because David J. Allen, Assistant to the Governor, will talk in depth about a similar topic during the General Session, Wednesday afternoon.

The Highway Safety Act of 1966 sets standards for individual state highway departments. It provides, "Each state shall have a highway safety program approved by the secretary of transportation, designed to reduce traffic accidents and resulting deaths, injuries and property damage. Such state programs shall be in accordance with uniform standards promulgated by the secretary and expressed in terms of performance criteria. In general, the act involves motor vehicle inspection, driver education and training; driver licensing and performance; traffic safety data systems; accident investigation; emergency medical care and transportation of the injured; enforcement practices; pedestrian safety; street and highway design and maintenance for safety; traffic control devices related to safety; school bus safety; emergency motor vehicle operations; motorcycle safety; vehicle codes and traffic court practices. Highway departments must share the responsibility for their portion of the safety standards as well as a 10 percent penalty to the federal highway fund allotments if a state does not meet its responsibility."

The act provides that after January 1, 1969, if a state fails to obtain the secretary's approval of its plan, or fails to implement an approved program, it would be ineligible for grants authorized by this Act, and lose 10 percent of its otherwise available federal-aid highway grants for the year.

Expenditure of approximately one-third of a billion dollars is authorized, over a period of three years. Of this sum \$267 million is for federal grants to states and localities on a 50 percent matching basis, for such state highway safety programs, including driver education. Forty percent of these federal grants are earmarked for local safety programs.

Each state's safety program is to be subsidized by 50 percent federal and 50 percent state matching funds. Indiana is to receive about \$1.2 million in federal monies for fiscal year 1967 and about \$1.8 mil-

lion for fiscal year 1968. The 1967 funds must be obligated by the end of fiscal year 1969, and similarly the 1968 monies must be obligated by the end of fiscal year 1970.

The most recent development in highway safety is a circular dated March 7, from F. C. Turner, acting Federal Highway Administrator, containing proposed standards for state highway safety programs. Mr. Allen will discuss most of the individual proposals with you on Wednesday, with the possible exception of three which are: *Identification and Surveillance of Accident Location; Highway Design, Construction and Maintenance; and Traffic Control Devices.*

From the highway department's standpoint, identification and surveillance of accident locations is to identify specific locations or sections of streets and highway which have high or potentially high accident experience, as a basis for establishing priorities for improvement, selective enforcement, or other operational practices that will eliminate or reduce the hazards at the locations so identified. To be included in the program are: a system of road numbers, milepost designations or a geographical means of precisely fixing the location of accidents on all roads and streets. This system must be capable of identifying accident locations with a high degree of accuracy. This involves the ability to: (a) identify accident experience and losses on any specified section of the road and street system (b) to produce an inventory of high accident locations, or locations in which accident experience is changing sharply, and (c) to evaluate the effectiveness of each safety improvement on a specific roadway section.

The purpose of highway design, construction and maintenance is to assure that existing streets and highways are maintained in a condition that promotes safety, that capital improvements either to modernize existing roads or to provide new facilities meet approved safety standards, and that appropriate precautions are taken to protect the motorists. The program shall include: plans for meeting minimum design standards, neighborhood street systems, lighting proposals for specified intersections and thoroughfares, a skid prevention program, requirement to make construction sites safer, a crash protection program which includes recently publicized "break-away" signs, and a planned program of providing highway features that facilitate post-crash emergency and other measures that will increase the chances of injured parties later full recovery.

The Highway Safety Act covers a broad field but basically those items mentioned concern the highway departments.

BEAUTIFICATION ACT OF 1966

The Beautification Act of 1966, concerns the highway departments in a program of scenic roads and parkways as set forth in Title III of the 1965 Federal Beautification Act, as well as Titles I and II of the act which pertain to control of outdoor advertising and junkyards.

The Beautification Act provides that states must take action by January 1, 1968, to prohibit billboards within a zone extending 660 feet from the edge of the right-of-way of interstate and federal-aid primary highways. Signs will be permitted in commercial and industrial areas if they conform to national standards to be established by the secretary of commerce, and no restrictions are imposed on signs advertising business activities located on the property where these activities take place. Existing signs which are not in conformance with the new law may remain in place until July 1, 1970.

The bill authorized \$20 million annually for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 from the General Fund to be matched by the states on a 75-percent-federal-25-percent-state basis and to be used to compensate sign owners and land owners for the removal of signs and billboards. Also states must take action by January 1, 1968, to control junkyards within 1,000 feet of the right-of-way of interstate or other federal-aid primary highways. Junkyards are to be screened from view or, wherever that is impracticable, removed from the controlled area. Here again the penalty for non-compliance by a state is the loss of 10 percent of the state's total federal-aid apportionment.

Our first inventory estimates that there are 941 signs along interstate routes and 30,949 signs along primary routes that must be removed, at an estimated cost of \$12.5 million. \$152,000 is estimated for the removal, relocation, disposal, or screening of 14 junkyards along the interstate system, and \$3 million for similar proceedings involving 341 junkyards on primary roads.

Over and above this, the planning and landscape personnel remind me that during the next eight to ten years, an estimated \$11.5 million could be used to an advantage on landscaping and roadside development of federal-aid primary and secondary highways, not including rest and recreational areas and scenic overlooks. Another \$7.5 million for interstate scenic development, and \$4 million for primary and secondary scenic development. In all more than \$25 million should be channeled into the highway commission's total landscape and scenic enhancement program to meet our obligations.

CONCLUSION

All of this points to one fact and that is that Indiana is just one of 50 state highway departments in this nation, not including the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico, and I sometimes get the feeling that we will never accomplish all that is expected of us. Then I stop and think about DOT—the initials for the new Department of Transportation, reported as the 5th largest of the federal departments, with upwards of 92 thousand employees and a total annual budget estimated at \$6 billion, that seems to calm my nerves and gives me a mustard seed of hope.