

16006
c.2

The Michigan Highway Program
1950-1976 and Projections

By

Larry Beckon

Dr. McAnaw

Political Science 630

Seminar in State Administration

Western Michigan University

August 12, 1976

	Page
DEFINITION OF TERMS	i
Chapter	
1. GENERAL BACKGROUND BEFORE 1950	1
2. FEDERAL IMPACT ON THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM	4
BACKGROUND	4
1950-1960	4
1960-1970	5
1970-1976	6
3. STATE LEGISLATIVE IMPACT ON THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM	7
BACKGROUND	7
1950-1960	7
1960-1970	10
1970-1976	11
4. ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL	12
BACKGROUND	12
1950-1960	12
1960-1970	13
1970-1976	15
5. SUMMARY OF THE PERIODS	17
1950-1960, THE EXPANSION BEGINS	17
1960-1970, THE PROGRAM FALTERS	17
1970-1976, ON A TREADMILL	19
6. THE FUTURE	20
GENERAL COMMENTS	20
FEDERAL IMPACT ON THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM	20
STATE LEGISLATIVE IMPACT ON THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM	21
ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL	22
FINAL COMMENTS	23
FOOTNOTES	24
BIBLIOGRAPHY	27

Definition of Terms

1. The term "Department" refers to the Michigan State Highway Department or the Michigan Department of State Highways and Transportation as it became known in 1973.
2. The term "Commissioner" refers to the elected State Highway Commissioner.
3. The term "Director" refers to the person appointed as State Highway and Transportation Director by the State Highway Commission.
4. The term "Commission" refers to the four member bipartisan State Highway Commission.
5. The term "highways" refers to State trunkline highways which are under the control of the State Highway Department. These highways may be located any place in the state, including cities.
6. The term "roads" refers to county roads of any type that are under county control.
7. The term "streets" refers to city streets of any type that are under city control.

Chapter 1

GENERAL BACKGROUND BEFORE 1950

The year 1950 and later in the highway program in Michigan can best be understood in terms of the years that came before.

The Michigan Department of State Highways was established in 1905 (after a constitutional change approved by the electorate to allow such a department) for the improvement of "public wagon roads." The Department paid "rewards" to counties and townships who built roads if such roads met state specifications. Township administration of roads did not cease until 1936. The State Trunkline System was established in 1913, with actual Department coordination coming in 1917 as a result of federal legislation that authorized grants-in-aid to improve rural roads, with administration to be through state highway departments. Bonds for construction of highways were approved by an amendment to the State Constitution in 1919 authorizing 50 million dollars in bonds. During the 1930's, the highway program took a reverse as weight taxes were reduced because of economic conditions at the time.¹

The popularity of a highway program is seen from the start of the State program in 1905. When a law passed in 1903 to create a State Highway Department was declared unconstitutional by the Attorney General, a constitutional amendment establishing a State Highway Commission went on the ballot in 1905. The amendment passed carrying every county in the State. Even though the roads were called "public wagon roads," the public support was impressive.²

The year 1950 found the Highway Program in Michigan caught between several delemmas based not only upon the 1930's but also the 1940's. Construction or major improvement of highways was nil, except for efforts directly related to the war effort, during World War II. Secondly, the very minor construction efforts in the post-war era were met with shortages of cement, steel, and new equipment and with rising costs for the materials that were available. Thirdly, roads wore out heavily during World War II due to the heavy use of trucks in the major industrial effort in Michigan to provide supplies for the war effort. In addition, revenues decreased during the war years due to decreased motor fuel usage (rationing).³

Some work had begun in the late 1940's on urban freeways in the Detroit area with such construction financed in part by Detroit and Wayne County and in part by 50 percent federal financing.⁴

During the tenure of Commissioner Charles M. Ziegler (1943-1957) the Department moved from a program of doing much of its own maintenance for the State Trunkline System to contracting the work to cities and counties. As the 1950's began, the Department directly maintained the trunklines in only 15 counties, compared to direct maintenance in 51 of the 83 counties when Ziegler took office in 1943.⁵ This policy of contract maintenance proved so popular (as the work and overhead of the county is spread between the county and the Department) that the present Director, John P. Woodford, has adopted a "flagpole" policy. The next District Maintenance Engineer that has a county reject the State Contract, thus requiring the Department to provide direct maintenance, will be placed on a flagpole to sit forever.

The gasoline tax in Michigan was 3 cents per gallon in 1950, compared to the national average of 6 cents. However, a study had been completed in February, 1948 under the direction of the Michigan Good Roads Federation. This study showed a need of \$1,053 million to place the highways, roads, and streets in good and safe condition for the traffic they were expected to bear. The Michigan Good Roads Federation, based on the study results, recommended a raise from 3 cents to 4 1/2 cents per gallon. The bills were passed and became effective in 1951.⁶

The 1950's were entered with the Highway Program having survived, rather than flourished, during the previous 20 years.

Chapter 2

FEDERAL IMPACT ON THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Background

It was in 1819 that Secretary of War John C. Calhoun stated that the nation must have roads for the defense of the United States. Prior to that time travel was mostly by boat along the rivers and the ocean coasts.⁷

The concept of federal emphasis and national defense has continued to play a large role in any major financial expansion of the highway system. From Calhoun in 1819, to federal aid in 1916 (in the form of grants-in-aid to states for the use of improving rural roads), to snow removal in 1918 as a response to World War I demands, to the National Defense Interstate System in 1955 and to a 55 mile per hour speed limit in the 1970's, the answer is the same: reaction to federal programs and often to matters of "national defense."⁸

1950-1960

The year 1950 found the Department unable to utilize the federal aid available to it because of a lack of matching state dollars (due to the 3 cent per gallon tax levied in Michigan compared to the national average of 6 cents). Therefore projects providing local participation were being pursued (cities provided some matching funds). As State tax increases occurred, the problem of providing matching funds resolved itself.

The major impact of federal legislation during the 1950's was the introduction in 1956 of 90 percent federal financing for the Federal Interstate Defense Highway System, a 50 billion dollar, 42,500 mile highway program. This led to the building of divided four-lane highways across the state. The real "boom" in highway construction during the 1950's (and into the 1960's) came directly from the federal legislation.⁹

1960-1970

The federal funnel remained open during the 1960's. The interstate program was supplemented by smaller programs such as acts for beautification, billboard control, and safety programs. All included federal funds for meeting federal standards. The Department enthusiastically responded to these programs, except for the billboard program which met opposition (because of lobbyists engaged in billboard advertising) in the State Legislature. A Traffic Operations Program to Increase Capacity and Safety (TOPICS) was initiated with funds going to cities, but with state administration involved.¹⁰

The Department was one of the leading states in the nation in taking advantage of federal aid. When dollars became unexpectedly available for minor federal programs or additional money became available for "regular" programs (such as Interstate), the Department was promptly in line with projects eligible to use the additional funds.

The major change in the federal program in the 1960's was increases in federal regulations. Proposed highways that would (directly or indirectly) impact a recreational facility became a major problem for the Department and delayed several major projects. Federal regulations for relocation assistance, and funds for people and businesses displaced by construction also added to the delay and cost of construction programs.

During the 1960's federal aid received by the Department rose from 95 million dollars a year (1960) to 218 million dollars a year (1970).

1970-1976

The period 1970-1976 found a federal impact adversely affecting the highway program in several ways. The increase in federal regulations of the 1960's continued. In addition, the Federal Highway Trust Fund became an item that was sought after by urban and public transportation ("Mass Transit") advocates. Scheduling of federal projects became a problem as President Nixon impounded federal highway funds on several occasions. In some years the federal aid received by the Department was less than in 1970 (declining from 218 million dollars in 1969-70 to as low as 141.3 million dollars in 1973-1974.)¹¹

June 26, 1974 found the Department issuing the approved State of Michigan Action Plan. The "Action Plan" was prepared to comply with the Federal Highway Administration's Policy and Procedure Memorandum 90-4. The Action Plan defines the planning process the state must follow on all federal projects and specific standards and guidelines for considering the impact that social, economic, and environmental factors may have on proposed federal aid projects. The Action Plan was prepared based on meetings with many interested groups (environmental and social as well as the "normal" highway and construction interests) and was developed after many public hearings.¹²

It is an attempt to consider all aspects, including "no-build" in the planning process. The Action Plan recognizes that the planning and pre-construction period will take more time than in the past, but attempts to better coordinate all parties interested in transportation facilities and their impact on society. While federal legislation requires only that the Action Plan be followed on federal aid highway projects, the Department has chosen to apply it to all modes of transportation.¹³

Chapter 3

STATE LEGISLATIVE IMPACT ON THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Background

The highway program in Michigan is based on Constitutional and legal sanctions. A 1905 constitutional amendment allowed the Department to be established. Later legislation broadened the responsibilities of the Department and provided its financing. The building of major highways has often been specified by the Legislature in the legislation authorizing tax increases (US-2, US-131, US-31 and US-23 in the most recent gasoline tax increase).

1950-1960

Act 51 of 1951 wrote a new chapter in highway program history in Michigan. This act made the Commissioner responsible for the approval of county road programs and street programs of incorporated cities and villages. The Commissioner became responsible for uniform reporting to the Governor and the Legislature on the status of all roads in Michigan, the programs carried out each year, and the resources needed for the total "highway program."

Act 51 also abolished the previous legal requirement that in each fiscal year 25 percent of the funds be spent in the Upper Peninsula, 25 percent above Townline 12 (Saginaw) in the Lower Peninsula, and 50 percent below the Townline 12. The "old" formula had contributed to "bits and pieces" of highways rather than a system of highways. The story was often told of Commissioner Charles M. Ziegler posting expenditures on a map on his wall on which he kept track of how much money was being spent for each county each year. The new law allowed the construction program to be

based on needs established in highway needs studies rather than on a geographic basis.¹⁴

At this time, the gasoline tax was raised from 3 cents to 4½ cents per gallon via Act 51. Minor increases in weight taxes also occurred.

These increases occurred despite opposition by Governor G. Mennen Williams, whose veto of Act 51 was overridden by the State Legislature.

The increase to 4½ cents a gallon still left Michigan far below the national average of 6 cents a gallon. The highway needs as defined in the study issued in 1948 by the Good Roads Federation still were far from being met.

Act 51 also established the percentage of maintenance costs on the trunklines inside cities that was to be paid by the Department and the cities. The Department's obligation for such maintenance ranged from 50 percent (in large cities) to 100 percent in the smallest cities. Act 51 imposed the entire maintenance responsibility of all state trunklines on the Department. This increased the Department's municipal maintenance budget from \$898,048 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951 to \$1,639,892 in fiscal 1952. This cost rose to \$5,176,995 in fiscal 1975.¹⁵

In 1952 the Department sold an 80 million dollar bond issue based on legislation passed specifically authorizing Detroit, Wayne County, and the Department to assume final responsibility for issuing and paying for bonds for highway construction purposes. The bonds were to be (and were) repaid from revenues comprised of federal aid and future motor vehicle fund receipts (gas tax and license fees).¹⁶

In 1953 a State Turnpike Authority was established, composed of four members appointed by the Governor and the Commissioner. The Authority studied the feasibility of establishing toll roads connecting Bay City, Detroit, and Toledo, as well as one connecting Detroit and Chicago. The Authority hired consultants to study the proposed routes and their financing. A preliminary study found the east-west (Detroit-Chicago) route feasible, but further study was ordered. The announcement of a north-south freeway proposed by the Commissioner, the passage by Congress of an Interstate highway program (to be financed by 90 percent federal payments), and the announcement of the new Commissioner of a five-year Construction Program of \$1,250 million (based on borrowing, state finances, and new federal money) resulted in a slow death of the Authority in 1957.¹⁷

Upon urging from the Department, the Legislature authorized another highway needs study in 1955 under the direction of the Automotive Safety Foundation. The study found that despite the increases in the gas tax and license fees, the rising costs and expanding demands (because of increasing travel) were not being met by the increased revenue. As a result of the study, the Legislature increased the gas tax to 6 cents per gallon, with 75 percent of the 1½ cent increase to go to the Department, with the remainder to the cities and counties. The Legislature also specified the routes for which the additional taxes were to be used. This legislation also authorized the issuance of bonds for a variety of highway construction purposes.¹⁸

With greatly expanded finances available because of the favorable actions of both the state and federal governments, Commissioner John C. Mackie took office on July 1, 1957. Using the federal Interstate financing, the State gasoline tax, and the bonding capabilities made available by the recent legislation, Mackie announced a 5-year construction program on October 3, 1957. The program was a 1.2 billion dollar construction program.¹⁹

1960-1970

The increased demand for highways from motorists, coupled with lobbying efforts of several special interest groups (including the Department) led to the approval of an increase in the state gasoline tax from 6 cents to 7 cents per gallon (effective January 1, 1967). Increases in weight taxes were also approved. The ratio used to distribute these funds to the state, counties, and cities was altered slightly (2% more to the cities and 1% less to the other two parties). There had been no tax increase in more than 10 years despite a highway needs study completed in 1960 (for 1960-1980) which showed a need for an additional 2.9 billion for the 20 year period.²⁰

Increasing concern for the persons displaced by the construction of highways led to the passage (in 1965) of legislation requiring the preparation of plans regarding the displacement and relocation of persons and businesses, and also requiring cooperation with local units of government in such relocations.

1970-1976

The early 1970's saw several significant actions by the Legislature, as proposed by Governor Milliken and the Commission. Gas and weight taxes were raised again, with the State gasoline tax going from 7 cents to 9 cents a gallon. For the first time in the history of Michigan part of the gas tax ($\frac{1}{2}$ cent a gallon) went to finance mass transit programs. The needs study for the period 1970-1990 reported that 46.4 percent of the highways, roads, and streets in Michigan were inadequate and that 29 billion dollars was needed for highway purposes in the 20 year period. The $1\frac{1}{2}$ cent a gallon increase was not sufficient to place much of a dent in the needs.²¹

Safety became a large issue as the State allowed itself to be sued. The result was several loses in court as well as increased expenditures to assure that the State was not responsible (and liable) for traffic accidents.

The Department stopped issuing 5-year programs, which because of the additional involvement of the public had become 8-year programs in reality. Because of the increasing costs the Department even stopped publicizing the planned costs of individual projects.

Much of the proposed expansion during this period was in the area of mass transit. These proposals were submitted to the State electorate and were defeated. While the highway needs and costs increased, no corrective action was being taken.

Chapter 4

ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL

Background

The Department has always been a highly centralized organization. While some states, such as Texas and Florida, have a decentralized department of highways or transportation, Michigan has continued its centralized tendencies. The Department has had district offices (8 or 10 of them) for decades, but the districts basically carry out the policy and program direction given from Lansing. Except for the first Commissioner, all heads of the Department have been engineers.

1950-1960

The Department continued its centralized organization during the 1950's. The number of divisions expanded from 9 to 18 and the number of districts from 8 to 10. During the early 1950's turnover of personnel caused some problems for the Department. In fiscal year 1953-1954 there was a turnover of 35 percent, apparently due to the relatively low pay then paid State employees as compared to private business during the period. This problem eventually resolved itself and State employees are now paid on a basis comparable to private business.²²

During this entire period the Department felt a need for an increase in engineers (with shortages of 150 or more). The Department entered into several training programs to develop engineers and also to train technicians.

The personnel within the Department rose from 2,448 in 1950 to more than 4,000 in 1960 to meet the expanded program brought about by the increase in financial resources (state and federal) and in program administration responsibilities (via Act 51, 1951). Expansions were mostly in those areas directly connected with the construction program (highway designers, right of way buyers, construction inspectors, etc.).

The expanded program resulting from additional funds also led to the Department hiring consulting engineering firms to design many of the roads and bridges built under the expanded program. The use of consultants for "rush" jobs continued even into 1976.

1960-1970

The State Constitution adopted in 1963 and effective on January 1, 1964 provided for a bipartisan State Highway Commission composed of four persons appointed for four-year terms by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to administer the Department.

The Executive Organization Act of 1965 transferred the Mackinac Bridge Authority, the Blue Water Bridge Authority, and the International Bridge Authority to the Department. The Blue Water Bridge Authority was abolished when the bonds financing the bridge were repaid and the bridge then fell under the normal organization of the Department (the Maintenance Division). The other two authorities continued to operate independently as they were transferred to the Department with the authorities retaining most of their basic authority.

The Plan of Organization required by the Executive Organization Act stated that the Commission is a policy making body. It was the intent at

that time to delegate to the Director (unclassified and appointed by the Commission) all of the powers of the former Commissioner, except for the power to establish policy.²³

Practice during the 1960's did not follow the stated intent of the Commission. The Commission involved itself in such things as:

1. Approval, or denial, or requests for out-of-state travel.
2. Approval, or denial, of proposed conferences planned for Department training and communication purposes.
3. Selection of, and promotion of, classified state personnel above a certain level.
4. Proposing and implementing organizational changes.
5. The establishment of a Commission Auditor (reporting directly to the Commission) to monitor the activities and efficiency of the Department.

These actions had an adverse action on the morale of Department personnel who felt that the Commission suspected, rather than supported, them.

No major changes in the rest of the organization occurred during the 1960's. Personnel rose to over 5,000 during the middle 1960's and then decreased by 1970. There were no skills required that were difficult to find. The need for engineers felt during the 1950's was reduced by the reduced construction program (in number of projects) and by the use of technicians in place of engineers. A study conducted in 1965 found that design engineers were spending a large portion of their time on non-engineering tasks and that a reduction on engineering staff from 164 to 87 would result in more effective personnel utilization.²⁴

In 1968 the Director recommended to the Commission (through a report written by this author) that the district operations in the upper areas of the State be consolidated. The Director recommended that five offices (in the Upper Peninsula and the northern part of the Lower Peninsula) be consolidated into two districts. Even though the economics favored such a move, the political impact on the Commission was such that the action taken on the report was to study it, which in reality meant to bury it so that no official action had to be taken.

In 1968 the Department moved to a new Highway Building directly to the west of the State Capitol, thus centralizing staff, some of whom were previously located throughout the Lansing area.

1970-1976

The year 1950 found the following divisions as the internal organization of the Department:²⁵

Road Maintenance

Road Construction

Road

Planning and Traffic

Bridge

Testing and Research

Finance

Personnel

Right of Way

State Ferry

Public Information

The same basic organizations exist in 1976 with some minor changes. A Construction Division, a Design Division, and a Maintenance Division consolidate the road and bridge programs. Planning has become a larger factor in the Department and is at the bureau (one step higher) level, while Traffic is now called the Traffic and Safety Division. The State Ferry Division was replaced by the Mackinac Bridge Authority.

One of the key results of the Action Plan prepared in response to federal requirements that the public be involved in planning for transportation projects was the establishment of multi-discipline and multi-organization teams to plan for transportation facilities.²⁶

On April 1, 1973, Governor William G. Milliken issued an Executive Order making the Department responsible "...for coordination and administration ... of all transportation agencies within State government." The Department finally became a department of transportation, at least in responsibility if not totally in name. The title Michigan Department of State Highways and Transportation is used because of a constitutional requirement for a State Highway Department.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY OF THE PERIODS

1950-1960 - The Expansion Begins

This period saw a 50 percent increase in both motor vehicle registration (from 2.4 to 3.6 million) and in miles driven (from 22 to 33 million). These increases far surpassed the increase in population in Michigan (from 6.4 to 7.8 million people). Much of the population increases were in the suburbs thus increasing the move to the automobile.²⁷

Highway construction expenditures increased at an astounding pace, from 34.4 million dollars in 1950 to 219.9 million dollars in 1960. It can be easily seen that as the 1960's began, the highway "boom" was rushing forward at a rapid rate.²⁸

1960-1970 - The Program Falters

The patterns established in the 1950's continued into the 1960's. Population increases (13% for the decade) were far surpassed by increases in vehicle registration (42%) and increases in vehicle miles traveled (53%). The combination of increasing disposable incomes, working women, increased recreational travel, and the continuing growth of the suburbs expanded demands for highways. While the population in Wayne County rose 5 percent in the 1960's, population grew 33 percent in neighboring Oakland County with many persons traveling to Wayne County for employment. Similar patterns continued to emerge throughout the state.²⁹

The end of this decade concluded with another needs study of the state highways, county roads, and municipal streets. This study showed a need for 29 billion dollars for the 1970-1990 period, with present tax rates expected to provide only half of the needed funds. This projection was based on a 59 percent increase in vehicles in the 1970-1990 period and an 83 percent increase in traffic. The Commission proposed a 1 cent per gallon tax increase which was yet to be acted on at the end of the decade.³⁰

While in the early 1960's Michigan led the nation in the percentage of the Interstate system completed, the program was slowing down by 1970. The rural, less expensive, freeways were completed with the urban freeways yet to be completed. The large land acquisition costs, delays due to property owners being reluctant to sell, and the cost of additional features needed in urban areas (retaining walls, more structures, etc.) resulted in delays and cost increases in the urban areas. The dollars spent on the construction program in 1970 were just one million dollars more than spent in 1960 (219.9 million to 220.9 million).³¹

Because of the increasing complexity (public hearings, environmental considerations, etc.) of getting a project to the point where it was ready for construction (as noted above), an eight-year (rather than five-year) program was adopted.

Bonding for construction ended in 1962. Expenditures on the part of the Department rose to nearly 350 million dollars by 1970 compared to 65 million dollars in 1950. Even with the expanding expenditures, the total number of miles of highways, roads, and streets rose only 3.4 percent (from 110 to 115 thousand miles) during the 1960's.³²

In 1966, 42 percent of the State's highways, roads, and streets were classified as "inadequate" and in need of reconstruction. At the conclusion of the decade 46 percent of the highways, roads, and streets were classified as "inadequate" by the needs study.³³ What appeared to be a massive road building program (in terms of dollars) was not keeping even with "needs." The demands of society (in vehicles, miles traveled, ecological considerations, etc.) and inflation had left the Department unable to satisfactorily meet the needs with present taxing policies.

1970-1976 - On a Treadmill

This period experienced a slowing of the upward trend in travel demands. The Arabian oil problem and the resulting energy crises resulted in a decrease in miles driven and a move to smaller cars. The 55 miles per hour speed limit also reduced the use of gasoline, although once the "energy scare" was over, drivers increased their speeds. Those persons who travel at 55 miles per hour or below are in the minority. Gas tax receipts decreased by about 3 million dollars in 1974-75 and the total money available for distribution to the state, counties, and cities decreased by 1.3 percent from the previous year.³⁴

Attempts at car pooling, bus development programs, train programs, etc., generally were not effective as persons returned to the family car.

Costs for construction and maintenance of highways rose during the period faster than income. Therefore, 1976 found the Department with more highway needs than it was able to meet.

Chapter 6

THE FUTURE

General Comments:

Despite the frailties of our system of government, the will of the people often prevails. It is the author's evaluation that the public in Michigan wants a transportation system based on vehicles personally controlled by them. The demand has been, and will continue to be, for a door-to-door transportation system. The public wants to drive their own car to work, to church, to shop, and to play. They will use another mode of transportation only if the other mode can provide flexibility and comfort comparable to a personally-controlled vehicle. This vehicle may be different than the cars we drive now, but it will proceed over highways, roads, and streets as we know them today. The vehicle of the future may get more miles to a gallon of gas, may proceed at a slightly different speed, and may even be propelled (at least partially) by a different energy source than gasoline.

However, the majority of the transportation of the future, at least to the year 2000, will be carried on a highway system.

Federal Impact on the Highway Program

The future will see some of the Highway Trust Fund (set up for the Interstate system) going to other modes of transportation. However, most persons in the United States will do most of their travel (and as the trucking industry will continue to be the major carrier of goods) on the highway system. Therefore, considerable financial resources, and the normal accompanying restrictions and controls, will flow from the federal

government to the states. The ratios of federal aid on the different federal systems (Interstate, Primary, Secondary, Safety, etc.) are likely to change, but the basic concept of major federal financing for the highway system is not likely to change.

Because of the increasing maintenance costs that are sure to arise as the Interstate system ages, the year 2000 may find the federal government financing part of the maintenance costs of state highway and transportation departments.

State Legislative Impact on the Highway Program

The State Legislature holds the key to the answer to the question, "How much of a highway program in the future." The most recent highway needs study points out the following (projections until 1990):

1. The driving population (despite any decline in birth rates) will increase in number.
2. Motor vehicle registrations are likely to continue to increase in the future.
3. Vehicle modes of travel are projected to increase by 80 percent over the miles traveled in 1970.
4. The total highway needs for 1970-1990 amounts to 29 billion dollars.³⁵

A more recent update of this information shows the need for 40.4 billion dollars to place all highways, roads, and streets in Michigan in good, safe condition for the expected 1994 traffic. This most recent analysis was made after the energy problem became a known reality.³⁶

Michigan's economy is based on industry (automotive the major industry), recreation, and agriculture. All these key parts of Michigan's economy require an efficient and cost effective transportation system. The automotive industry uses the highways for shipment of supplies and materials, as well as for shipment of the finished product. The recreation business stimulates the economy only if people can get to the recreation and vacation areas. Agriculture cannot exist in Michigan without the highway system to get its goods to market. The Legislature is not likely to allow the economy to suffer, and suffer it will if an effective highway system is not continued in the future.

Organization and Personnel

As part of Governor Milliken's proposals for transportation financing, the Governor has proposed, and the Commission and Director have supported, the direct appointment of the Director and the establishment of a five member bipartisan Commission with greatly reduced powers. In addition the Department would become known as the Michigan Department of Transportation. Under this proposal, the Director would not be required to be a competent highway engineer. These changes, which would require constitutional changes, would tend to make the transportation program more responsive to the Governor's wishes.³⁷

Final Comments

The highway program is one that has a large constituency; a constituency that has demanded and received increased services over the last 26 years. There is nothing in the foreseeable future that leads one to believe that the next 24 years will differ greatly from the past. Any changes will be

incremental in nature. The sprawl of communities, the desire for door-to-door transportation, and the way of American life itself points to the highway program continuing to be a stimulus to the economy and a major factor in both state government and the quality of life in Michigan.

FOOTNOTES

Chapter 1

- ¹ Roger L. Morrison, "The History and Development of Michigan Highways," Michigan Alumnus, No. 11 (1973), pp. 57-69.
- ² Michigan State Highway Commission, History of Michigan Highways and the Michigan Department of State Highways (Lansing: 1969) pp. 2-3.
- ³ Michigan, Twenty Fourth Biennial Report of the State Highway Commissioner 1951-1952 (Lansing: Franklin DeKleine Company, 1952), pp. 11-12; and Twenty Third Biennial Report of the State Highway Commissioner, 1949-1950 (Lansing: Franklin DeKleine Company, 1950), Forwarding letter from State Highway Commissioner Charles M. Ziegler to the Governor.
- ⁴ Michigan State Highway Commission, p. 7.
- ⁵ Twenty Third Biennial Report, pp. 87-88.
- ⁶ Michigan Historical Commission, Finding Aid, Records of the Michigan State Highway Department, 1916-1953 (Lansing: 1962).

Chapter 2

- ⁷ Michigan State Highway Commission, pp. 1, 4 and 5.
- ⁸ Michigan State Highway Commission, p. 7.
- ⁹ Michigan, Twenty Sixth Biennial Report of the State Highway Commissioner, 1955-1956 (Lansing: Speaker-Hines & Thomas, Inc., 1956), Forward.
- ¹⁰ Michigan, Fifteenth Annual Progress Report for the State Highway Department, County Road Commissions, Incorporated Cities and Villages (Lansing: 1966).
- ¹¹ Michigan, Financial Report, Michigan Department of State Highways, (Lansing: 1971 and 1972) and Financial Report, Michigan Department of State Highways and Transportation (Lansing: 1973, 1974 and 1975).
- ¹² Michigan Department of State Highways and Transportation, Action Plan (Lansing: June 26, 1974), pp. i-xv.
- ¹³ Action Plan, pp. ix-xv.

Chapter 3

- ¹⁴ Twenty Fourth Biennial Report, pp. 7-15.
- ¹⁵ Twenty Fourth Biennial Report, pp. 24-25; Michigan, Twenty Fourth Annual Progress Report for the State Highway Department, County Road Commissions, Incorporated Cities and Villages (Lansing: 1975); and Conversation Between Mr. Raymond Boomer, Maintenance Division, Michigan Department of State Highways and Transportation and Mr. L. Beckon, August 11, 1976.

- 16 Twenty Fourth Biennial Report, p. 31.
- 17 Michigan Historical Commission, Finding Records of the Michigan Turnpike Authority, 1933-1957, (Lansing: 1962).
- 18 Michigan State Highway Commission, p. 8.
- 19 Michigan State Highway Commission, p. 9 and Michigan, Michigan State Trunkline Five Year Construction Program, July 1, 1957-July 1, 1962 (Lansing: October 3, 1957).
- 20 Michigan, Sixteenth Annual Progress Report for the State Highway Department, County Road Commissions, Incorporated Cities and Villages (Lansing: 1967), Forward.
- 21 Michigan, Twentieth Annual Progress Report for the State Highway Department, County Road Commissions, Incorporated Cities and Villages (Lansing: 1971).

Chapter 4

- 22 Michigan, Twenty Fifth Biennial Report of the State Highway Commissioner, 1953, 1954 (Lansing: Franklin DeKleine Company, 1954).
- 23 Michigan State Highway Department, Plan of Organization Under the Executive Organization Act of 1965 (Lansing: September 1, 1965), pp. 1-2.
- 24 Roy Jorgensen and Associates, Management Evaluation Project, Michigan State Highway Department (Lansing: September 7, 1966), pp. 12-15.
- 25 Twenty Fifth Biennial Report, p. 13.
- 26 Action Plan, pp. ix-xv.

Chapter 5

- 27 Michigan State University, Michigan Statistical Abstract, 1970 (1971) pp. 4 and 431.
- 28 Michigan State University, Michigan Statistical Abstract, 1974 (1975).
- 29 Michigan Statistical Abstract, 1970, pp. 4, 26, 27 and 431.
- 30 Twentieth Annual Progress Report, Forward.
- 31 Michigan Statistical Abstract, 1974, p. 512
- 32 Michigan Statistical Abstract, 1970, p. 428 and 537.
- 33 Twenty Fourth Annual Progress Report, p. 28.

³⁴Twenty Fourth Annual Progress Report, Forward.

³⁵Wilbur Smith and Associates, Michigan Highway Fiscal Analyses, 1970-1990
(Lansing: December, 1972), pp. 32, 36, 38 and 205.

³⁶Twenty Fourth Annual Progress Report, Forward.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boomer, Raymond, Maintenance Division, Michigan Department of State Highways and Transportation, Conversation with L. Beckon, August 11, 1976.

Jorgensen, Roy and Associates, Management Evaluation Project, Michigan State Highway Department, Lansing, September 7, 1966.

Michigan, Twenty Third Biennial Report of the State Highway Commissioner, 1949-1950, Lansing: Franklin DeKleine Company, 1950.

_____. Twenty Fourth Biennial Report of the State Highway Commissioner, 1951-1952, Lansing: Franklin DeKleine Company, 1952.

_____. Twenty Fifth Biennial Report of the State Highway Commissioner, 1953-1954, Lansing: Franklin DeKleine Company, 1954.

_____. Twenty Sixth Biennial Report of the State Highway Commissioner, 1955-1956, Lansing: Speaker - Hines & Thomas, Inc., 1956.

Michigan, Tenth Annual Progress Report for the State Highway Department, County Road Commissions, Incorporated Cities and Villages, Lansing, 1961.

_____. Fifteenth Annual Progress Report for the State Highway Department, County Road Commissions, Incorporated Cities and Villages, Lansing, 1966.

_____. Sixteenth Annual Progress Report for the State Highway Department, County Road Commissions, Incorporated Cities and Villages, Lansing, 1967.

_____. Twentieth Annual Progress Report for the State Highway Department, County Road Commissions, Incorporated Cities and Villages, Lansing, 1971.

_____. Twenty Fourth Annual Progress Report for the State Highway Department, County Road Commissions, Incorporated Cities and Villages, Lansing, 1975.

Michigan, Financial Report, Michigan Department of State Highways, Lansing, 1971 and 1972 (2 reports).

_____. Financial Report, Michigan Department of State Highways, Lansing, 1973, 1974 and 1975 (3 reports).

Michigan, Michigan State Trunkline Five Year Construction Program, July 1, 1957-July 1, 1962, Lansing, October 3, 1957.

Michigan Department of State Highways and Transportation, Action Plan, Lansing, June 26, 1974.

Michigan Historical Commission, Finding Aid, Records of the Michigan State Highway Department, 1916-1953, Lansing, 1962.

_____. Finding Aid, Records of the Michigan Turnpike Authority, 1953-1957, Lansing, 1962.

Michigan State Highway Commission, History of Michigan Highways and The Michigan Department of State Highways, Lansing, 1969.

Michigan State Highway Department, Plan of Organization Under the Executive Organization Act of 1965, Lansing, September 1, 1965.

Michigan State University, Michigan Statistical Abstract, 1970, (1971).

_____. Michigan Statistical Abstract, 1974, (1975).

Milliken, Governor William G., Special Message to the Legislature on Transportation, March 1, 1976.

Morrison, Roger L., "The History and Development of Michigan Highways," Michigan Alumnus, No. 11 (1937), pp. 57-69.

Smith, Wilbur and Associates, Michigan Highway Fiscal Analyses, 1970-1990,
Lansing: December, 1972.