I Iowa Highway Needs and Estimated Revenues for Highway Purposes 1961 through 1980

Van R. Snyder

Iowa State Highway Commission Ames, Iowa March 7, 1962

Iowa Highway Needs and Estimated Revenues for Highway Purposes 1961 through 1980

I. Introduction

The state and county road systems of Iowa compose a densely spaced network of rural highways uniformly distributed over the area of the state. Superimposed upon this network at fairly regular intervals are patches of various sizes and shapes of even more closely spaced networks which compose the street systems of the cities and towns of the state. Collectively, these rural and urban highway systems include a total of approximately 112,000 miles of roads and streets.

Annual travel by motor vehicle on these systems is approximately 12 billion vehicle miles. Annual expenditures for the construction, reconstruction, maintenance, engineering and administration of all systems amount to only a little less than a quarter of billion dollars. Virtually every economic activity in the state has become, with the elimination of mud roads and the proliferation of dependable motor vehicles, dependent upon uninterrupted daily usage of the highways by the people of the state in the attendance at work, in the conduct of business, in transportation of raw and processed farm products, in the transportation of raw or semi-finished materials to shops, fabricating plants or other industrial installation, and in the distribution of finished products from these various places to markets in Iowa as well as elsewhere in the Nation. Freedom of movement by motor vehicle over the highways of the state is essential to the health and growth of the economy of the state. Highway

-1-

transportation has become an indispensable element of the economy of the state.

The highways, therefore, must be available constantly for service whether it be for the passage of few vehicles per day, may be only the mail service, the milk collection truck, the fuel truck, the school bus, the livestock truck, a farm truck, or vehicles of any of several service personnel such as the telephone lineman, power lineman, or farm implement repair man or the veternarian, to the passage of several thousand vehicles each involved in some way in the various economic activities of the state.

The administering and financing of this great mileage (sixth largest among the states of the Nation) in such manner that each and all segments of it are furnished with the improvements appropriate to the quality and quantity of service required of them and are maintained in that condition constantly available for the service required of them are enormous and complex tasks. The provision of this service is, in Iowa, as elsewhere in the United States considered as basically a function of government. Its importance to the economic,health, and growth of the state, its complexity of management, and its magnitude of operation give it status as a major function of government.

Consequently, it is fitting that the Legislature be concerned with the problems involved in the provision and maintenance of the improvements needed upon the various highway systems of the state to supply the service required of them in connection with the economic activities of the citizenry of the state. In accord with its interest in the highways of the state and its responsibility to the

-2-

residents of the state in the discharge of this major function of the government of Iowa on their behalf, the Legislature in the 58th General Assembly created in 1959 a Highway Study Committee and directed this committee to make an analysis of the present and future physical needs of the existing highway systems and of the fiscal structure and capacity of the state, the counties and municipalities to meet these needs and to maintain the improvement required to satisfy them.

The Highway Study Committee, under the authorization given it by the Legislature, employed two non-profit research agencies to conduct the technical operation of the study, (1) the Automotive Safety Foundation, Washington, D.C. to make an analysis of the physical needs of the highways of the state, to prepare estimates of costs of the improvements required now and over some period in the future, and to make recommendations for the administration of the various highway systems and (2) the Public Administration Service, Chicago, Illinois, to make an analysis of the fiscal problems involved in meeting the physical needs of the various highway systems as determined by the Automotive Safety Foundation and to make recommendations with respect to the responsibility of each of the various groups of beneficiaries and users of the highways for financial support of the highways and with respect to the distribution of revenues from highway users among the various highway systems.

II. Determination of Physical Needs

Salient features of the work performed by the Automotive Safety Foundation in connection with the analysis of the physical needs of the highways of the state were:

---3---

- A. An inventory of the existing highway facilities on each of the highway systems;
- B. Determination of the extent and nature of the usage of each segment of each of the highway systems;
- C. Classification of the highways of the state into systems on the basis of thier predominant service functions;
- D. Selection of standards of facilities for each classification of highways;
- E. Comparison of the characteristics of the existing facilities of each section of the proposed systems with the standards appropriate to the service required of the section;
- F. Computation of the costs required to bring each section of each system to the standards of improvement appropriate to the service required of the section;
- G. Computation of the costs for the replacement of facilities at the end of their service lives on each section where such event is estimated to occur with a proposed program period;
- H. Tabulation of program costs for alternate programs each with a defferent length of period for elimination or catch-up of the backlog of improvements needed at the time the study was made; and
- Preparation of an extensive series of recommendations pertaining principally to items of legislation and to features of administration for the implementation of the proposed programs.

Data and comments pertaining to each of the facets of the work of the Automotive Safety Foundation for the Highway Sutdy Committee were presented in the report of that agency to the committee entitled, "Iowa Highway Needs, 1960-1980".

III. Determination of Financial Needs

Salient features of the work performed by the Public Administration Service in connection with the fiscal problems involved in meeting the physical needs of the various highway systems were:

- A. Preparation of a historical record of income from various sources for highway purposes;
- B. Preparation of forecasts of revenue from historical and new sources for each of the proposed alternate improvement programs;
- C. Comparison of the estimated annual revenues for each of the highway systems with the annual expenditures required for the execution of the alternate programs on the basis of
 - 1. Continuation in effect of laws pertaining to highway finance that were in effect in 1960, and
 - 2. Enactment of new laws proposed by the Public Administration Service;
- D. Computation of responsibility of highway users and non-users for financial support of each of the highway systems;
- E. Suggestion of sources of additional revenue for highways.

Data, comment and discussion of each of these and other features of the work performed by the Public Administration Service for the Highway Study Committee are set forth in the rather extensive report of that agency to the Committee entitled, "Financing Iowa's Highways".

IV. Highway Study Committee

The reports of the Automotive Safety Foundation and of the Public Administration Service were submitted to the Highway Study Committee late in the fall of 1960. The committee reviewed these reports and, in accord with the provisions of the Act creating the committee, submitted a report to the 59th General Assembly, nearly three months after the date specified in the Act. This allowed little time for the members of the Legislature to become thoroughly acquainted with the report and the basis for the numerous recommendations of the committee pertaining to legislation. Consequently, only one piece of major legislation pertaining to highways was enacted, that providing for a change in the formula for the allocation of the road

--5-

use tax fund among the highway systems. The 59th General Assembly, recognizing the necessity for further study of the highway problems of the state, did adopt a Resolution creating a new Highway Study Committee to continue the work of the previous committee, particularly to review and study the reports submitted to and by that committee and to recommend legislation for the consideration of the 60th General Assembly in 1963.

V. Program Costs of Highway Needs 1961-1980

The foregoing is intentionally a somewhat lengthy introduction to a discussion of the topic assigned for this report. It is believed to be essential background information for this discussion. It is presented here as a substitute for the three reports referred to in the foregoing, all of which are now out of print and unavailable for distribution in conjunction with the presentation of the data that follows.

VI. Classification of Highways

Iowa highway law provides for three rural highway systems and designates the agency responsible either singly or jointly with another agency for the administration of each system. These systems are the Primary Road System and the Secondary Road System, which is further classified into the Farm-to-Market Road System and the Local Secondary Road System. The Primary Road System is under the control of the state highway commission which also has general supervision of the Secondary Road System as a whole and joint supervision with County Boards of Supervisors of the Farm-to-Market Road System. The Secondary Road System is under the control of the County Boards of

⊸6⊸

Supervisors who act jointly with the state highway commission in the administration of the Farm-to-Market Road System portion of the Secondary Road System. Iowa law, for the first time in history, now provides for the classification of municipal streets. The 59th General Assembly adopted a recommendation of the Automotive Safety Foundation and subsequently by the Highway Study Committee for the classification of municipal streets into Arterial and Access Street Systems by January 1, 1963.

The Automotive Safety Foundation proposed a reclassification of the highways of the state into systems defined by the predominant service provided by the roads. Under this proposal, roads or streets serving similar purposes would be grouped together, systematically inter-connected and assigned to government agencies having the primary interest in the type of service each system provides. Such grouping of like purpose roads or streets together would greatly assist in providing equal service where conditions are similar and make possible better and more efficient management. It would give legislators and administrators opportunity to recognize and meet the most essential needs in the order of their importance and it would tend to reduce pressure for system changes thereby giving each system stability and freedom from change or serious threats of changes. Collectively, these things would aid materially in sound long range planning and provide a logical basis for proper financing of each system.

For the purposes of its analysis of highway needs, the Automotive Safety Foundation noted that existing legal provisions in Iowa for system classification were in need of modernization, and that revisions

--7--

of present systems and establishment of new systems were long overdue. For its analysis of highway needs, that agency reclassified the highways of the state on the basis of the predominant function and use of each road and street in the state. Each was grouped with others having a similar function to form interconnected systems. In this operation the primary road system was reduced to 8,400 miles including the urban extensions, 1,900 miles of the existing system being designated as Local Service Primary Roads and suggested for transfer to the secondary road system; the Farm-to-Market Road System was subclassified into a County Trunk and a County Feeder Road System; the Local Secondary Road System was left intact; and the municipal streets were classified into Arterial Street Systems and Access Street Systems. The proposed classification of the highways is a basic feature of the analysis of physical needs of the highways of the state. All data for the proposed programs are tabulated under the control of these classifications. All computations were based on the standards appropriate to each highway classification.

VII. Program Costs of Highway Needs, 1961-1980

The Automotive Safety Foundation report, "Iowa Highway Needs, 1960-1980," shows program costs over a 20-year period for each of three alternate programs. The difference between these programs is in the length of the period for the elimination or "catch-up", of the backlog of improvements needed at the time the study was made. The lengths of the catch-up periods are 10, 15, and 20 years, each identifying the particular program in which it is employed.

These programs, particularly the 20-year catch-up period programs,

--8---

are used in this discussion of Iowa highway needs and estimated revenues which may be made available under current laws for highway purposes in the event that these are continued in effect throughout the program period, 1961 through 1980. These programs are used because they are the only ones available. They were developed by competent authority. They were accepted by the Highway Study Committee. They are in reports presented to the Legislature. They are in the public domain and, to date, without any indication of objection by the public. General and widespread knowledge by the people, highway officials in state, county and municipal government and members of the Legislature of the needs for highway improvement set forth in these programs appears to have led to the common conclusion that these needs are substantial and, except for a few particulars, either the ASF programs or a quite similar program will be required to effect these improvements. The program costs are quite probably as accurate in statement and content as any forecast which may be made of revenues that may be expected over the program periods. If it be assumed that the accuracy be similar and the departures from accuracy be in the same direction, the relationships between expenditures required for these programs and the revenues estimated to become available for them over the program period may be expected to be about the same as they would if both the estimates of program costs and forecasts of revenue were absolutely accurate. They are, at the least, suitable for the purposes of this and similar discussions for the reasons here setforth.

VIII. All Road and Street Systems

Placement of the needs of any particular system in proper

---9----

perspective requires a knowledge of the needs of all systems as a whole. This may be obtained through an examination of the tabulation on page 7 of the ASF report. For convenience in reference this tabulation has been reproduced as Table No. 1A in this presentation.

From Table No. 1A it may be noted that the average annual expenditure required for the 20-year catch-up period programs for all highway systems is \$278,006,000. The forecasts presented in this discussion indicate an average annual revenue for highway purposes of approximately \$253,579,000 during that period. There would be therefore a deficit of slightly less than \$25,000,000 per year for the execution of these programs in that period. Elimination of this deficit through provision of additional funds for highways, corresponds to an invrease of two tenths of a cent in the cost per vehicle mile of travel by motor vehicle in Iowa if all of the additional amount were to be derived from road use taxes and corresponds to about \$9.10 per capita per year if it were derived from any combination of additional road use taxes and property or other taxes. In either event, the total per capita cost would be about \$100 per year. Without the additional funds required for the elimination of the difference between the average annual cost and the estimated revenues over the 20 year program period will be about \$90 per capita per year.

The classification of highways used in Table No. 1A is that proposed by the Automotive Safety Foundation and used by that agency throughout its report to the Highway Study Committee.

IX. Primary Road System

The Automotive Safety Foundation omitted any tabulation showing -10-

the average annual costs for alternate programs for the existing primary road system for the reason that it computed only the 20 year catch-up period program for those primary roads which that agency classified as Local Service Primary Roads. Therefore, Table No. 3 of the Road Study Report showing average annual expenditures for the existing primary road system, which was compiled from basic data of the study, has been reproduced in this presentation in Table No. 2A. Details of the other programs for the existing primary road system are shown in Tables No. 2 and No. 5.

Let is suffice, for the moment, to note that average annual expenditure for the existing primary road system is approximately 42 per cent of that required for all highway systems. At this point, it is of interest to note that the existing primary road system and its extensions into and through cities and towns carries 63 per cent of the travel on all roads and streets in the state.

X. Secondary Road System

Average annual program costs as developed by the Automotive Safety Foundation for the Secondary Road System are found on page 58 of the report of that agency to the Highway Study Committee and are shown in Table No. 3A in this presentation. These expenditures are approximately 39 per cent of the total required for all highway systems. The Secondary Road System carries approximately 18 per cent of the total travel on the roads and streets in the state, but requires an extensive mileage to serve all areas of the state. Consequently, much of the essential mileage has little traffic but does require substantial expenditure for improvement to the extent necessary

to provide even the small volume of service demanded of it.

XI. Municipal Street Systems

Average annual program costs as developed by the Automotive Safety Foundation for the municipal street systems are found on page 50 of the report of that agency to the Highway Study Committee, but that tabulation includes a duplication of the expenditures for those streets which are extensions of the Primary Road System for which the expenditures are included in Table No. 1A. The report of the Highway Study Committee contains these data without this duplication in Table No. 1 on page 43. This tabulation is included in this presentation as Table No. 4A.

These data indicate that the program costs for municipal streets other than primary road extensions is approximately 19 per cent of the program costs for all roads and streets over the 20-year program period. It is of interest to note that these streets carry approximately 19 per cent of the total travel on all roads and streets in the state . The municipal extensions of the primary roads carry about 13 per cent. Therefore, municipal streets as a group carry approximately 32 per cent of the total travel on all roads and streets in the state.

XII. Funds for Execution of Programs

The Public Administration Service shows in Tables B-6, B-7, and B-8 in Appendix B of the report of that agency to the Highway Study Committee, the estimated annual revenues from the various sources of income for the Primary, Secondary, and Municipal Street Systems respectively. The forecasts of revenues as presented in these tabulations

-12-

are based on the assumption that laws pertaining to highway finance in effect in 1960 would be continued in effect throughout the highway improvement programs developed by the Automotive Safety Foundation. The data given in Tables B-6, B-7, and B-8 were consolidated and presented in Table B-5 to show the estimated annual revenues for all roads and streets over the program period, 1961 through 1980. For the purposes of this discussion, these tabulations have been revised to take advantage of information unavailable at the time the originals were prepared, particularly with respect to federal aid allocations and with respect to the recent trend of income for the road use tax fund, and to reflect the effect of the laws pertaining to highway finance that were enacted by the 59th General Assembly in 1961. These tabulations so revised are presented in this discussion as Tables No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4.

XIII. Relationships Between Revenues and Expenditures

The Public Administration Service shows in Tables 14, 15 and 16 on pages 60, 61, and 62 of the report of that agency to the Highway Study Committee, the annual expenditures required over the period 1961 through 1980 for the execution of each of the alternate programs developed by the Automotive Safety Foundation for the Primary, Secondary, and Municipal Street Systems respectively and compares the annual expenditures with the respective estimated annual revenues for each system that would be available in the event that the changes in laws pertaining to highway finance recommended by the fiscal study agency were adopted. These tabulations have been revised for the purposes of this discussion in the manner described for the revisions

-13-

of Tables B-5, B-6, B-7, and B-8. Tables 14, 15 and 16 so revised are presented here as Tables No. 5, No. 6 and No. 7 respectively.

The responsibility for the rate of execution of the various programs is, at this time, obscure. Recent examination of certain work sheets assembled in the final stages of the physical needs studies indicate that the Automotive Safety Foundation rather than the Public Administration Service as first thought, is responsible. Study of these work sheets indicates that such conclusion is logical and that the Public Administration Service would have obtained these data from the Automotive Safety Foundation as a matter of course.

In any event, the rate of execution shown for the 20-year catchup period program for the primary road system is wholly unrealistic in that it is inconsistent with the revenues for this system through the portion of the program period covered by the known conditions for the execution of the Interstate construction program. It seems unlikely that the Public Administration Service would make so gross an error in its special field and it seems far more likely that the Automotive Safety Foundation would do so inadvertently in preparing the instructions for the machine calculation of the program costs, such calculations being most readily accomplished at a uniform rate of increase per year than at a variable rate of execution per year as would be required if proper consideration were given to the execution of the Interstate Highway portion of the program for the Primary Road System.

The effect of the adoption of a uniform rate of execution for the 20-year catch-up period program for the primary road system is

-14-

the production of a surplus of revenue over expenditures during the portion of the period including the construction of the Interstate Highways, that is, 1961 through 1971, when actually there is a deficit for the program as a whole. Consequently, Table 14 was further revised to employe a more realistic but variable rate of execution, one that bears a consistent relationship to revenues. After such revision, the annual deficits are relatively uniform as shown in Table No. 5.

Lacking such special feature as the variable program required for the Interstate on the Primary Road System, the rates of execution of the 20-year catch-up period programs for the Secondary Road and Municipal Street Systems show a fairly constant relationship between the estimated revenues and expenditures required throughout the entire program period as is indicated in Tables No. 6 and No. 7 respectively.

XIV. Validity of Deficits of Revenues

From the data in Tables No. 5, No. 6 and No. 7 it is obvious that there may be less revenue for each of the systems under laws now in effect than will be required to execute the 20-year catch-up period program developed for it by the Automotive Safety Foundation. Two questions arise immediately, the first, "Are the programs conservative or excessive?" and the second, "Are the revenues to be expected through continuation of laws now in effect, adequate or inadequate for the provision of highway facilities on each and all of the systems appropriate for the services required of them?"

Some data are now available as a basis for an answer to the first of these questions. For example, comparison of the average annual allowance for administration for the primary road system as shown in

-15-

Table No. 2A and the current expenditures for that purpose for a lesser program are approximately equal. It would appear, therefore, that expenditures for the greater progrm will require a greater allowance for administration than was made by the Automotive Safety Foundation for that purpose. Similarly, the current expenditure for maintenance on the primary road system is approximately \$1,000,000 greater than the annual average allowance for maintenance over the 20-year program period. Review of the standards for construction for the program reveals that those used for the major portion of the primary road system indicate a lower level of quality of construction than has been found by experience to be necessary for that system. A similar situation is found for the standards for secondary road construction. It seems fair to assume that similar conservatism was used in the selection of the standards for municipal streets. In these circumstances, it may be expected that all program costs as shown by the Automotive Safety Foundation are less than will be required for the execution of the programs. The program costs for each system are, therefore, believed to be conservative, perhaps even ultra-conservative.

If so, the answer to the second question is that the revenues for each of the highway systems through continuation of the laws pertaining to highway finance now in effect over the program period, 1961 through 1980, will be less than those required for the execution of the 20-year catch-up period programs for the system in each instance. The average annual deficiency for the Primary Road System will be approximately \$14,000,000; that for the Secondary Road System, approximately \$6,000,000; and that for the Municipal Street System, approxi-

-16-

mately \$5,000,000. The average annual deficiency for the Primary Road System is approximately 12.04 percent; that for the Secondary Road System is approximately 5.65 percent; and that for the Municipal Street System is approximately 9.11 percent of the average annual expenditure required for the execution of the 20-year catch-up period program developed for the system by the Automotive Safety Foundation.

The data on estimated revenues and expenditures required for this program for each system are presented graphically on Charts No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4 which are appended to this paper.

Estimated Annual Revenue for All Roads and Streets MAT For the Period 1961 thru 1980

31/2 1971

late linglet - yd tealle

(PAS Table B-5 Revised)

		Put appart to	nor the state	(\$1,000's) 5	in tim	Strate & Min	
	Year	۲ Federal Aid	Road Use Tax Fund	Property Taxes A	Special ssessments	Miscellaneous	Motol
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Total (7)
	1961	\$ 35,915 \$	118,948	\$ 49,300	\$ 5,800	\$ 5,900 \$	215,863
	1962	39,510	121,988	50,100	5,900	4,100	221,598
	1963	49,646	125,028	50,800	6,000	5,000	236,474
	1964	52,367	128,068	51,400	6,100	5,100	243,035
	1965	53,954	131,108	52,100	6,200	5,600	248,962
6	1966	55,410	134,148	52 <mark>,</mark> 800	6,300	5,200	253,858
0	1967	56,997	137,188	53,400	6,400	4,800	258,785
	1968	58,453	140,228	54,200	6,500	5,200	264,581
R	1969	58,453	143,268	54,800	6,600	5,800	268,921
X	1970	58,453	146,308	55,600	6,700	4,200	271,261
Ĺ	1971	56,998	149,348	56,200	6,800	4,900	274,246
	1972	20,496	152,388	56,900	6,900	5,400	242,084
	1973	20,496	155,428	57,600	7,000	4,900	245,424
	1974	20,496	158,468	58,300	7,100	5,500	249,864
	1975	20,496	161,508	58,900	7,200	5,100	253,204
	1976	20,496	164,548	59,700	7,300	4,500	256,544
	1977	20,496	167,588	60,300	7,400	6,100	261,884
	1978	20,496	170,628	61,000	7,500	4,700	264,324
	1979	20,496	173,668	61,700	7,600	4,200	267,664
	1980	20,496	176,708	62,400	7,700	5,700	273,004

Total\$760,620 \$2,956,560 \$1,117,500 \$135,000 \$101,900 \$5,071,580 The RR X- y Priteties for not included in this tople. Commence Com. ca

Columns 1, 4, 5, and 6 are same as in PAS Table B-5 for the Note: years 1961 thru 1980. Columns 2, 3, and 7 were revised to reflect effect of changes in Federal Aid allocations and in forecasts of revenues in the Road Use Tax Fund,

TABLE NO. 1A

ALL IOWA ROAD AND STREET SYSTEMS AVERAGE ANNUAL COSTS OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS At 1959 Prices

10-Year 15-Year 20-Year Catch-Up Period Catch-Up Period Catch-Up Period Proposed System First Next First Next 15 Years 5 Years 10 Years 10 Years State Rural Primary \$109,262,000 \$ 95,263,000 \$35,031,000 \$ 80,116,000 \$50,728,000 Municipal Primary 39,745,000 21,676,000 32,089,000 26,993,000 30,950,000 \$149,007,000 \$72,404,000 \$127,352,000 \$62,024,000 \$111,066,000 Total Local Service Primaries 5,478,000 \$ 1,422,000 \$ 1,322,000 Rural \$ \$ 4,108,000 \$ 3,384,000 2,658,000 595,000 2,018,000 501,000 1,654,000 Municipal \$ 2,017,000 6,126,000 \$ 1,823,000 5,038,000 Total 8,136,000 S \$ \$ Municipal \$ 31,169,000 \$12,622,000 \$ 24,521,000 \$13,081,000 \$ 21,512,000 Arterial 32,543,000 32,543,000 Local Access* 32,543,000 32,543,000 32,543,000 \$ 54,055,000 \$ 63,712,000 \$45,165,000 \$ 57,064,000 \$45,624,000 Total County \$11,279,000 \$ 32,192,000 \$ 54,373,000 \$12,025,000 \$ 39,753,000 Trunk 23,144,000 34,705,000 26,233,000 38,803,000 44,425,000 Feeder 40,950,000 40,950,000 40,950,000 40,950,000 40,950,000 Local* \$107,847,000 \$139,748,000 \$119,506,000 \$75,373,000 Total \$79,208,000 \$360,603,000 \$198,794,000 \$310,048,000 \$184,844,000 \$278,006,000 All Systems-Total

* Based on a 20-year catch-up program only

	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	Table No. 2 Annual Revenue for the Period 1961 th (PAS Table B-6 Revi	( )	Interstance
/	Estimate For	Annual Revenue for the Period 1961 th	Primary Roads (n ^{lt} ru 1980	Arola
	t welling	(PAS Table B-6 Revi (\$1,000's)		5 Low
Year	Federal Aid	Road Use In Press	Miscellaneous	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1961	\$ 28,882	\$ 57,504	\$ 700	\$ 87,086
1962	32,477	58,929	100	91,506
1963	42,613	60,354	300	103,267
1964	45,144	61,779	700	107,623
1965	46,731	63,204	300	110,235
1966	47,996	64,628	1,000	113,624
1967	49,583	66,053	600	116,236
1968	50,849	67,478	200	118,527
1969	50,849	68,903	800	120,552
1970	50,849	70,327	500	121,676
1971	49,394	71,752	100	121,246
1972	12,892	73,178	700	86,770
1973	12,892	74,602	300	87,794
1974	12,892	76,027	1,000	89,919
1975	12,892	77,452	600	90,944
1976	12,892	78,877	200	91,969
1977	12,892	80,301	800	93,993
1978	12,892	81,726	500	95,118
1979	12,892	83,150	100	96,142
1980	12,892	84,575	700	98,167
Total	\$611,395	\$1,420,799	\$10,200	\$2,042,394

Note: Columns 1 and 4 are same as in PAS Table B-6 for the years 1961 thru 1980. Columns 2, 3, and 5 were revised to reflect effect of changes in allocations of Federal Aid and in allocations of Road Use Tax Funds.

# TABLE No. 2A PRIMARY ROAD SYSTEM AVERAGE ANNUAL COSTS OF 20-YEAR PROGRAM

Item	ASF Proposed Primary Road System	Local Service Primary Roads	Total Existing Primary Road System
Rural			
Construction	\$ 66,283,000	\$ 2,389,450	\$ 68,672,450
Maintenance	9,385,000	833,750	10,218,750
Administration	4,448,000	161,100	4,609,100
Total	\$ 80,116,000	\$ 3,384,300	\$ 83,500,300
Municipal			
Construction	\$ 26,627,000	\$ 1,216,750	\$ 27,843,750
Maintenance	2,716,000	358,050	3,074,050
Administration	1,607,000	79,050	1,686,050
Total	\$ 30,950,000	\$ 1,653,850	\$ 32,603,850
Total			
Construction	\$ 92,910,000	\$ 3,606,200	\$ 96,516,200
Maintenance	12,101,000	1,191,800	13,292,800
Administration	6,055,000	240,150	6,295,150
Total	\$111,066,000	\$ 5,038,150	\$116,104,150

Note 2. E.A. inst admin. but changed directly to lants . or Wand .. Estimates conservative due parts to. Estimates conservative due parts to jour standards set up for estimated Actual costs how higher than estimated for Heavier proposed program. This Sor Heavier proposed program. Is due to changing standards cansed by progress.

Estimated Annual Revenues for Secondary Roads

For the Period 1961 thru 1980

(PAS Table B-7 Revised)

## (\$1,000's)

	Federal		Road Use Tax Fund	d (3+4)	Property				
Year	Aid	Farm-to-Market	Secondary Road	Total	Taxes	Miscellaneous	Τc	otal	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(	(8)	
1961	\$ 7,033	\$ 11,490	\$ 34,471	\$ 45,961	\$ 33,300	\$ 1,200	\$ 8	37,494	
1962	7,033	11,794	35,380	47,174	33,600	900			
1963	7,033	12,097	36,289	48,386	33,800	1,400		-	
1964	7,223	12,399	37,200	49,599	34,100	700		C CONSTRUCTION	
1965	7,223	12,703	38,109	50,812	34,300	1,400			
1966	7,414	13,006	39,018	52,024	34,600	1,000	ç	95,038	$\mathbf{i}$
1967	7,414	13,309	39,928	53,237	34,800	700	9	06,151	
1968	7,604	13,612	40,838	54,450	35,100	1,300	9	8,454	
1969	7,604	13,916	41,750	55,666	35,300	1,100	9	9,670	
1970	7,604	14,218	42,656	56,874	35,600	600	10	0,678	
1971	7,604	14,522	43,565	58,087	35,800	1,400	10	02,891	
1972	7,604	14,825	44,475	59,300	36,100	1,000	10	04,004	
1973	7,604	15,128	45,384	60,512	36,300	700	10	05,116	
1974	7,604	15,431	46,294	61,725	36,600	1,400	10	07,329	
1975	7,604	15,735	47,203	62,938	36,800	1,100	10	08,442	
1976	7,604	16,038	48,112	64,150	37,100	700	10	9,554	
1977	7,604	16,341	49,022	65,363	37,300	1,400	11	1,667	
1978	7,604	16,643	49,931	66,575	37,600	1,000	11	12,779	
1979	7,604	16,947	50,841	67,788	38,800	800	11	4,992	
1980	7,604	17,250	51,750	69,000	38,100	1,400	11	16,104	
Total	\$149,225	\$287,405	\$862,216	\$1,149,621	\$715,000	\$21,200	\$2,03	35,046	
	<pre>(1) 1961 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980</pre>	YearAid(1)(2)1961\$ 7,03319627,03319637,03319647,22319657,22319667,41419677,41419687,60419707,60419717,60419727,60419737,60419757,60419757,60419777,60419787,60419797,60419787,60419797,60419797,604	YearAidFarm-to-Market(1)(2)(3)1961\$ 7,033\$ 11,49019627,03311,79419637,03312,09719647,22312,39919657,22312,70319667,41413,00619677,41413,30919687,60413,61219697,60414,21819717,60414,52219727,60414,52219737,60415,12819747,60415,43119757,60416,03819777,60416,03819797,60416,94719807,60416,94719807,60417,250	YearAidFarm-to-MarketSecondary Road(1)(2)(3)(4)1961\$ 7,033\$ 11,490\$ 34,47119627,03311,79435,38019637,03312,09736,28919647,22312,39937,20019657,22312,70338,10919667,41413,00639,01819677,41413,30939,92819687,60413,61240,83819697,60414,21842,65619707,60414,52243,56519727,60415,12845,38419747,60415,43146,29419757,60416,03848,11219767,60416,34149,02219787,60416,64349,93119797,60416,94750,84119807,60417,25051,750	YearAidFarm-to-MarketSecondary RoadTotal(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)1961\$7,033\$11,490\$34,471\$45,96119627,03311,79435,380 $47,174$ 19637,03312,09736,289 $48,386$ 19647,22312,399 $37,200$ $49,599$ 19657,22312,703 $38,109$ $50,812$ 19667,41413,006 $39,018$ $52,024$ 19677,41413,309 $39,928$ $53,237$ 19687,60413,612 $40,838$ $54,450$ 19697,60413,916 $41,750$ $55,666$ 19707,60414,218 $42,656$ $56,874$ 19717,60414,522 $43,565$ $58,087$ 19727,60415,128 $45,384$ $60,512$ 19747,60415,431 $46,294$ $61,725$ 19757,60416,038 $48,112$ $64,150$ 19767,60416,643 $49,022$ $65,363$ 19787,60416,643 $49,931$ $66,575$ 19797,60416,643 $49,931$ $66,575$ 19797,60416,643 $49,931$ $66,575$ 19797,60416,643 $49,931$ $66,575$ 19797,60416,643 $49,931$ $66,575$ 19797,60416,643 $49,931$ $66,575$ 19807,60416,947 $50,841$ $67,788$	YearAidFarm-to-MarketSecondary RoadTotalTaxes(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)1961 $\$$ 7,033 $\$$ 11,490 $\$$ 34,471 $\$$ 45,961 $\$$ 33,30019627,03311,79435,38047,17433,60019637,03312,09736,28948,38633,80019647,22312,39937,20049,59934,10019657,22312,70338,10950,81234,30019667,41413,00639,01852,02434,60019677,41413,61240,83854,45035,10019687,60413,91641,75055,66635,30019707,60414,21842,65656,87435,60019717,60414,52243,56558,08735,80019727,60414,51244,47559,30036,10019737,60415,12845,38460,51236,30019747,60415,73547,20362,93836,80019757,60416,03848,11264,15037,10019777,60416,43149,02265,36337,30019787,60416,43149,02265,36337,30019797,60416,94750,84167,78838,80019797,60416,94750,84167,78838,80019797,60416,94750,84167,78838,800 <tr<< td=""><td>YearAidFarm-to-MarketSecondary RoadTotalTaxesMiscellaneous(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)(7)1961\$7,033\$11,490\$$34,471$\$$45,961$\$$33,300$\$$1,200$19627,03311,794$35,380$$47,174$$33,600$90019637,03312,097$36,289$$48,386$$33,800$$1,400$19647,22312,399$37,200$$49,599$$34,100$70019657,22312,703$38,109$$50,812$$34,300$$1,400$19667,41413,006$39,018$$52,024$$34,600$$1,000$19677,41413,309$39,928$$53,237$$34,800$70019687,60413,612$40,838$$54,450$$35,100$$1,300$19697,60414,218$42,656$$56,874$$35,600$$600$19717,60414,522$43,565$$58,087$$35,800$$1,400$19727,60414,825$44,475$$59,300$$36,100$$1,000$19737,60415,128$45,384$$60,512$$36,300$$700$19747,60415,431$46,294$$61,725$$36,600$$1,400$19757,60416,038$48,112$$64,150$$37,100$$700$19747,60416,341$49,022$$65,363$$37,300$$1,400$19757,60416,643$49,93$</td><td>YearAidFarm-to-MarketSecondary RoadTotalTaxesMiscellaneousTotal(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)(7)(7)1961\$7,033\$11,490\$34,471\$45,961\$33,300\$1,200\$619627,03311,79435,38047,17433,6009008619637,03312,09736,28948,38633,8001,4009019647,22312,39937,20049,59934,1007009019657,22312,70338,10950,81234,3001,4009019667,41413,00639,01852,02434,6001,0009019677,41413,30939,92853,23734,8007009019687,60413,61240,83854,45035,1001,3009019707,60414,21842,65656,87435,6006001019717,60414,52243,56558,08735,8001,4001019727,60414,82544,47559,30036,1001,0001019737,60415,12845,38460,51236,8001,1001019747,60415,73547,20362,93836,8001,1001019757,60416,34149,02265,36337,3001,4001019787,60416,64349,93166,57537,6001</td><td>YearAidFarm-to-MarketSecondary RoadTotalTaxesMiscellaneousTotal(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)(7)(8)1961\$ 7,033\$ 11,490\$ 34,471\$ 45,961\$ 33,300\$ 1,200\$ 87,49419627,03311,79435,38047,17433,60090088,70719637,03312,09736,28948,38633,8001,40090,61919647,22312,70338,10950,81234,3001,40093,73519667,41413,00639,01852,02434,6001,00095,03819677,41413,30939,92853,23734,80070096,15119687,60413,61240,83854,45035,1001,30098,45419697,60413,91641,75055,66635,3001,10099,67019707,60414,21842,65656,87435,600600100,67819717,60414,52243,56558,08735,8001,400102,89119727,60415,43146,29461,72536,6001,000104,00419737,60415,43146,29461,72536,6001,100106,44219767,60416,03848,11264,15037,100700109,55419777,60416,64349,93166,57537,6001,000112,77919797,604</td></tr<<>	YearAidFarm-to-MarketSecondary RoadTotalTaxesMiscellaneous(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)(7)1961\$7,033\$11,490\$ $34,471$ \$ $45,961$ \$ $33,300$ \$ $1,200$ 19627,03311,794 $35,380$ $47,174$ $33,600$ 90019637,03312,097 $36,289$ $48,386$ $33,800$ $1,400$ 19647,22312,399 $37,200$ $49,599$ $34,100$ 70019657,22312,703 $38,109$ $50,812$ $34,300$ $1,400$ 19667,41413,006 $39,018$ $52,024$ $34,600$ $1,000$ 19677,41413,309 $39,928$ $53,237$ $34,800$ 70019687,60413,612 $40,838$ $54,450$ $35,100$ $1,300$ 19697,60414,218 $42,656$ $56,874$ $35,600$ $600$ 19717,60414,522 $43,565$ $58,087$ $35,800$ $1,400$ 19727,60414,825 $44,475$ $59,300$ $36,100$ $1,000$ 19737,60415,128 $45,384$ $60,512$ $36,300$ $700$ 19747,60415,431 $46,294$ $61,725$ $36,600$ $1,400$ 19757,60416,038 $48,112$ $64,150$ $37,100$ $700$ 19747,60416,341 $49,022$ $65,363$ $37,300$ $1,400$ 19757,60416,643 $49,93$	YearAidFarm-to-MarketSecondary RoadTotalTaxesMiscellaneousTotal(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)(7)(7)1961\$7,033\$11,490\$34,471\$45,961\$33,300\$1,200\$619627,03311,79435,38047,17433,6009008619637,03312,09736,28948,38633,8001,4009019647,22312,39937,20049,59934,1007009019657,22312,70338,10950,81234,3001,4009019667,41413,00639,01852,02434,6001,0009019677,41413,30939,92853,23734,8007009019687,60413,61240,83854,45035,1001,3009019707,60414,21842,65656,87435,6006001019717,60414,52243,56558,08735,8001,4001019727,60414,82544,47559,30036,1001,0001019737,60415,12845,38460,51236,8001,1001019747,60415,73547,20362,93836,8001,1001019757,60416,34149,02265,36337,3001,4001019787,60416,64349,93166,57537,6001	YearAidFarm-to-MarketSecondary RoadTotalTaxesMiscellaneousTotal(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)(7)(8)1961\$ 7,033\$ 11,490\$ 34,471\$ 45,961\$ 33,300\$ 1,200\$ 87,49419627,03311,79435,38047,17433,60090088,70719637,03312,09736,28948,38633,8001,40090,61919647,22312,70338,10950,81234,3001,40093,73519667,41413,00639,01852,02434,6001,00095,03819677,41413,30939,92853,23734,80070096,15119687,60413,61240,83854,45035,1001,30098,45419697,60413,91641,75055,66635,3001,10099,67019707,60414,21842,65656,87435,600600100,67819717,60414,52243,56558,08735,8001,400102,89119727,60415,43146,29461,72536,6001,000104,00419737,60415,43146,29461,72536,6001,100106,44219767,60416,03848,11264,15037,100700109,55419777,60416,64349,93166,57537,6001,000112,77919797,604

Note: All columns except 3 and 8 are same as in Table B-7 for the years 1961 thru 1980. Columns 3 and 8 were revised to reflect effect of changes in allocation of Road Use Tax Funds.

# TABLE NO. 3A ALL COUNTY ROADS AND STRUCTURES AVERAGE ANNUAL COSTS OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

-57

		10-Year Catch-Up Period		15-Year Catch-Up Period		
	First 10 Years	Next 10 Years	First 15 Years	Next 5 Years		
County Trunks	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u></u>	<u> </u>			
Construction	\$ 45,535,000	\$ 4,955,000	\$ 31,594,000	\$ 4,229,000	\$ 24,406,000	
Maintenance	6,137,000	6,463,000	6,171,000	6, <b>500,</b> 000	6,178,000	
Administration	2,701,000	607,000	1,988,000	550,000	1,608,000	
Total	\$ 54,373,000	\$12,025,000	\$ 39,753,000	\$11,279,000	\$ 32,192,000	
County Feeders						
Construction	\$ 32,543,000	\$14,595,000	\$ 27,100,000	\$11,461,000	\$ 23,157,000	
Maintenance	10,169,000	10,630,000	10,201,000	10,773,000	10,213,000	
Administration	1,713,000	1,008,000	1,502,000	910,000	1,335,000	
Total	\$ 44,425,000	\$26,233,000	\$ 38,803,000	\$23,144,000	\$ 34,705,000	
Local Roads						
Construction	\$ 21,412,000	\$21,412,000	\$ 21,412,000	\$21,412,000	\$ 21,412,000	
Maintenance	18,344,000	18,344,000	18,344,000	18,344,000	18,344,000	
Administration	1,194,000	1,194,000	1,194,000	1,194,000	1,194,000	
Total	\$ 40,950,000	\$40,950,000	\$ 40,950,000	\$40,950,000	\$ 40,950,000	
All County Roads						
Construction	\$ 99,490,000	\$40,962,000	\$ 80,106,000	\$37,102,000	\$ 68,975,000	
Maintenance	34,650,000	35,437,000	34,716,000	35,617,000	34,735,000	
Administration	5,608,000	2,809,000	4,684,000	2,654,000	4,137,000	
Total	\$139,748,000	\$79,208,000	\$119,506,000	\$75,373,000	\$107,847,000	

Estimated Annual Revenues for Municipal Streets

for Period 1961 thru 1980

(PAS Table B-8 Revised)

(\$1,000's)

Year	Road Use Tax Fund	Property Taxes	Special Assessments	Miscellaneous	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1961	\$ 14,987	\$ 16,000	\$ 5,800	\$ 4,000	\$ 40,737
1962	15,331	16,500	5,900	3,100	40,831
1963	15,726	17,000	6,000	3,300	42,026
1964	16,120	17,300	6,100	3,700	43,220
1965	16,514	17,800	6,200	3,900	44,414
1966	16,909	18,200	6,300	3,200	44,609
1967	17,302	18,600	6,400	3,500	45,802
1968	17,696	19,100	6,500	3,700	46,996
1969	18,090	19,500	6,600	3,900	48,090
1970	18,484	20,000	6,700	3,100	48,284
1971	18,878	20,400	6,800	3,400	49,478
1972	19,273	20,800	6,900	3,700	50,673
1973	19,667	21,300	7,000	3,900	51,867
1974	20,061	21,700	7,100	3,100	51,961
1975	20,455	22,100	7,200	3,400	53,155
1976	20,849	22,600	7,300	3,600	54,349
1977	21,243	23,000	7,400	3,900	55,543
1978	21,637	23,400	7,500	3,200	55,737
1979	22,031	23,900	7,600	3,300	56,831
1980	22,425	24,300	7,700	3,600	58,025
Total	\$373,628	\$403,500	\$135,000	\$70,500	\$982,628

Note: Columns 1, 3, 4, and 5 are same as in PAS B-8 for the years 1961 thru 1980. Columns 2 and 6 were revised to reflect effect of changes in allocation of Road Use Tax Funds.

# TABLE NO. 4A AVERAGE ANNUAL COSTS OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF MUNICIPAL STREETS OTHER THAN PRIMARY ROAD EXTENSIONS

System	10-Year Catch-Up Period		15-Ye Catch-Up	20-Year Catch-Up Period	
	First	Next	First	Next	First
	10 Years	10 Years	15 Years	5 Years	20 Years
Arterial					
Construction	\$25,188,000	\$ 6,960,000	\$18,883,000	\$ 7,346,000	\$16,008,000
Maintenance	4,380,000	5,033,000	4,386,000	5,076,000	4,407,000
Administration	1,601,000	629,000	1,252,000	659,000	1,097,000
Total	\$31,169,000	\$12,622,000	\$24,521,000	\$13,081,000	\$21,512,000
Local Access Stre	ets				
Construction	\$23,239,000	\$23,239,000	\$23,239,000	\$23,239,000	\$23,239,000
Maintenance	8,356,000	8,356,000	8,356,000	8,356,000	8,356,000
Administration	948,000	948,000	948,000	948,000	948,000
Total	\$32,543,000	\$32,543,000	\$32,543,000	\$32,543,000	\$32,543,000
Both Systems					
Construction	\$48,427,000	\$30,199,000	\$42,122,000	\$30,585,000	\$39,247,000
Maintenance	12,736,000	13,389,000	12,742,000	13,432,000	12,763,000
Administration	2,549,000	1,577,000	2,200,000	1,607,000	2,045,000
Total	\$63,712,000	\$45,165,000	\$57,064,000	\$45,624,000	\$54,055,000

4

Relation Between Estimated Revenues and Expenditures for Alternate

Programs for Primary Roads over the Period 1961 thru 1980

(PAS Table 14 Revised)

(\$1,000's)

		20-Yr. Ca	tch-up						
	Estimated	Perio	đ	15-Yr。Cat	ch-up Per	riod	10-Yr. Cat	ch-up Per	iod
Year	Revenues	Expenditure	s Deficit	Expenditures	Surplus	Deficit H			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1961	\$ 87,086	\$ 95,000	\$ 7,914	\$ 110,000	-	\$ 22,914	\$ 139,700		\$ 52,614
1962	91,506	100,000	8,494	113,200		21,694	143,500		51,994
1963	103,267	118,754	15,487	116,500	<b>an</b>	13,233	147,300	***	44,033
1964	107,623	122,754	15,131	119,700	_	12,077	151,200	-	43,577
1965	110,235	125,504	15,269	123,000	_	12,765	155,000	Q.B	44,765
1966	113,624	128,009	14,385	126,300	-	12,676	158,900	<b>6</b>	45,276
1967	116,236	130,254	14,018	129,600	-	13,364	162,900	63	46,664
1968	118,527	132,504	13,977	133,000	_	14,473	166,900		48,373
1969	120,552	135,004	14,452	136,400	_	15,848	171,000	-	50,448
1970	121,676	135,965	14,289	139,900		18,224	175,000	-	53,324
1971	121,246	133,393	12,147	143,500	-	22,254	77,800	43,446	) =
1972	86,770	101,978	15,208	147,100	-	60,330	80,500	6,270	) -
1973	87,794	103,468	15,674	150,800	-	63,006	83,300	4,494	
1974	89,919	104,768	14,849	154,600	-	64,681	86,200	3,719	) 📼
1975	90,944	105,968	15,024	158,600	- 277	67,656	89,200	1,744	
1976	91,969	107,268	15,299	59,300	32,669		60,500	31,469	
1977	93,993	108,268	14,275	61,500	32,493	4000	62,800	31,193	Contra
1978	95,118	109,768	14,650	63,700	31,418	<u> </u>	65,300	29,818	
1979	96,142	111,168	15,026	66,100	30,042	_	67,800	28,342	-
1980	98,167	112,305	14,138	68,600	29,567	_	70,500	27,667	
		40 000 800		40 001 400					
Total	Ş2,042,394	\$2,322,100	ş279,706	\$2,321,400		\$279,006	\$2,315,300	100.0	\$272,906

Note: Column 2 revised to reflect change in estimated revenues and change in allocations of Road Use Tax Funds. Column 3 revised to provide a consistent relationship between estimated revenues and expenditures. Columns 5 and 8 are same as in PAS Table 14.

Relation Between Estimated Revenues and Expenditures for Alternate

Programs for Secondary Roads over the Period 1961 thru 1980

		2		(PAS Table 15	•	)			
		20-Yr. Cat	-	(\$1,000°	S)				
	Estimated				atch-up 1	Period	10-Yr. Cat	tch-up Pe	eriod
Year				Expenditures	Surplus	Deficit I	Expenditures	Surplus	Deficit
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1961	\$ 87,494	\$ 93,675	\$ 6,181	\$ 97,700	-	\$ 10,206	\$ 120,100	6.34	\$ 32,606
1962	88,707	95,167	6,460	100,300		11,593	123, $400$	-	34,693
1963	90,619	96,657	6,038	102,900	-	12,281	126,700	-	36,081
1964	91,622	98,149	6,527	105,600	-	13,978	130,100	-	38,478
1965	93,735	99,639	5,904	108,400		14,665	133,500	-	39,765
1966	95,038	101,131	6,093	111,200	-	16,162	137,000	5	41,962
1967	96,151	102,621	6,470	114,000		17,849	140,700		44,549
1968	98,454	104,113	5,659	117,000	-	18,546	144,300		45,846
1969	99,670	105,603	5,933	120,000	-	20,330	148,100		48,430
1970	100,678	107,095	6,417	123,100	_	22,422	152,100	445	51,422
1971	102,891	108,585	5,694	126,200		23,309	79,300	23,591	-
1972	104,004	110,077	6,073	129,400		25,396	81,400	22,604	<b>640</b>
1973	105,116	111,567	6,451	132,700	. –	27,584	83,600	21,516	-
1974	107,329	113,059	5,730	136,000		28,671	85,700	21,629	-
1975	108,442	114,549	6,107	139,400		30,958	.87,900	20,542	-
1976	109,554	116,041	6,487	77,900	31,654		79,400	30,154	-
1977	111,667	117,531	5,864	79,800	31,867		81,300	30,367	—
1978	112,779	119,023	6,244	81,700	31,079	<b>6-</b>	83,200	29,579	incr
1979	114,992	120,513	5,521	83,600	31,392		85,100	29,892	-
1980	116,104	122,005	5,901	85,500	30,604	-	86,900	29,204	-

Total \$2,035,046 \$2,156,800 \$121,754 \$2,172,400 - \$137,354 \$2,189,800

· 2

-

\$154,754

Note: Column 2 revised to reflect change in estimated revenues and change in allocations of Road Use Tax Funds. Column 3 revised to provide a consistent relationship between estimated revenues and expenditures. Columns 5 and 8 are same as in PAS Table 15.

 $\sim$ 

Relations Between Estimated Revenues and Expenditures for Alternate Programs for Municipal Streets over the Period 1961 thru 1980 ÷

				(PAS Table 1	6 Revised	1)			
		20-Yr.Cat	.ch-up	(\$1,000	's)	-			
	Estimated	l Period	L	15-Yr. C	atch-up H	Period	10-Yr. Ca	tch-up P	eriod
Year	Revenues	Expenditures	Deficit	Expenditures	Surplus	Deficit	Expenditures	Surplus	Deficit
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1961	\$ 40,737	\$ 45,657	\$ 4,920	\$ 44,600	cest	\$ 3,863	\$ 51,900	-	\$ 11,163
1962	40,831	46,541	5,710	45,900	_	5,069	•	-	12,469
1963	42,026	47,425	5,399	47,100		5,074	-	***	12,774
1964	43,220	48,309	5,089	48,500	-	5,280	•	ernis	13,180
1965	44,414	49,193	4,779	49,800	-	5,386	•	-	13,486
1966	44,609	50,077	5,468	51,200	_	6,591	59,600		14,991
1967	45,802	50,961	5,159	52,600	_	6,798	•	_	15,398
1967	46,996	51,845	4,849	54,100	-	7,104		_	16,004
1969	48,090	52,729	4,639	55,700	-	7,610	-		16,610
1970	48,284	53,613	5,329	57,200	_	8,916	*		18,316
1970	40,204	JJ,013	5,545	57,200		0,010	86,000	_	10,010
1971	49,478	54,497	5,019	58,900	-	9,422	43,200	6,278	-
1972	50,673	55,381	4,708	60,500		9,827	44,600	6,073	-
1973	51,867	56,265	4,398	62,300		10,433	46,000	5,867	
1974	51,961	57,149	5,188	64,000	. —	12,039	47,500	4,461	
1975	53,155	58,033	4,878	65,900	-	12,745	49,000	4,155	altana)
1976	54,349	58,917	4,568	49,900	4,449		50,500	3,849	-
1977	55,543	59,801	4,258	51,500	4,043	•	52,100	3,443	-
1978	55,737	60,685	4,948	53,100	2,637		53,800	1,937	040
1979	56,831	61,569	4,738	54,800	2,031		55,500	1,331	_
1980	58,025	62,453	4,428	56,500	1,525	-	57,200	825	ത്തെ
Total	\$982,628	\$1,081,100	\$98,472	\$1,084,100		\$101,472	\$1,088,800	- 1719	\$106,172

Note: Column 2 revised to reflect change in estimated revenues and change in allocations of Road Use Tax Funds. Column 3 revised to provide a consistent relationship between estimated revenues and expenditures. Columns 5 and 8 are same as in PAS Table 16.







# CHART NO. 4

REQUIRED ANNUAL EXPENDITURES AND ESTIMATED ANNUAL REVENUES FOR MUNICIPAL STREETS 1961 THRU 1980 20 YR. CATCH-UP PROGRAM

ROAD USE TAX	
PROPERTY TAX	<u>AIIIIIIII</u>
SPEC. ASSES.	ENNE HERE
MISC.	
DEFICIT	



