



VOL. 16, NO. 2

APRIL 1935



PUBLIC ROADS A Journal of Highway Research

Issued by the

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Volume 16, No. 2

April 1935

The reports of research published in this magazine are necessarily qualified by the conditions of the tests from which the data are obtained. Whenever it is deemed possible to do so, generalizations are drawn from the results of the tests; and, unless this is done, the conclusions formulated must be considered as specifically pertinent only to described conditions

In This Issue						
Some Characteristics of Traffic on New Jersey Highways						Page 17
Needed Research on Flexible-Type Bituminous Roads .	•					32
Roadside Planting Survives Drought					÷	34

THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS - - - - - - - - Willard Building, Washington, D. C. REGIONAL HEADQUARTERS - - - - - - - - - Mark Sheldon Building, San Francisco, Calif.

▼ DISTRICT OFFICES

DISTRICT No. 1. Oregon, Washington, and Montana.	DISTRICT No. 7. Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, and Michigan.
Post Office Building, Portland, Oreg.	South Chicago Post Office Building, Chicago, Ill.
DISTRICT No. 2. California, Arizona, and Nevada. Mark Sheldon Building, 461 Market St., San Francisco, Calif.	DISTRICT No. 8. Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Post Office Building, Montgomery, Ala.
DISTRICT No. 3. Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming. 237 Custom House, Nineteenth and Stout Sts., Denver, Colo.	DISTRICT No. 9. Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Federal Building, Troy, N. Y.
DISTRICT No. 4. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.	DISTRICT No. 10. Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania,
907 Post Office Building, St. Paul, Minn.	Virginia, and West Virginia.
DISTRICT No. 5. Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. Saunders-Kennedy Building, Omaha, Nebr.	Willard Building, Washington, D. C. DISTRICT No. 11. Alaska. Room 419, Federal and Territorial Building, Juneau, Alaska.
DISTRICT No. 6. Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.	DISTRICT No. 12. Idaho and Utah.
Room 502. United States Courthouse, Fort Worth, Tex.	Federal Building, Ogden, Utah.

Because of the necessarily limited edition of this publication it is impossible to distribute it free to any person or institutions other than State and county officials actually engaged in planning or constructing public highways, instructors in highway engineering, and periodicals upon an exchange basis. At the present time additions to the free mailing list can be made only as vacancies occur. Those desiring to obtain PUBLIC ROADS can do so by sending \$1 per year (foreign subscription \$1.50), or 10 cents per single copy, to the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

> CERTIFICATE: By direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the matter contained herein is published as administrative information and is required for the proper transaction of the public business

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF TRAFFIC ON NEW JERSEY HIGHWAYS

EXTRACTS FROM A REPORT ON THE NEW JERSEY TRAFFIC SURVEY 1

Reported by L. E. PEABODY, Senior Highway Economist, Division of Highway Transport, Bureau of Public Roads



COLLECTING DATA ON CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUCK TRAFFIC

FIELD observations in the New Jersey traffic survey were carried on at 352 observation stations located over the entire State highway system and on the principal county routes. Observations were made from August 1932 to August 1933. Traffic data were recorded upon more than 1,000 sections of highway at the stations with locations as shown in figure 1.

Traffic volumes of all motor vehicles, and of trucks, busses, and foreign vehicles are presented graphically in figures 2, 3, 4, and 5. Passenger cars were 86 percent of all observed vehicles, trucks 12 percent, and busses 2 percent. Heaviest traffic volumes were at the Holland Tunnel, Camden-Philadelphia Bridge, the High-Level Viaduct between Newark and Jersey City and on U S 1 southeast of Elizabeth. Average daily traffic exceeded 25,000 vehicles at all these locations, while west of Montclair on the Montclair-Caldwell Highway and west of Jersey City on the Newark Turnpike there were between 24,000 and 25,000 vehicles per day.

HEAVY PEAK TRAFFIC FOUND ON A NUMBER OF ROUTES

Peak traffic exceeded 50,000 vehicles per day on the Philadelphia-Camden Bridge and was more than 40,000 per day at other locations. Routes leading to shore resorts had the highest ratios of maximum daily traffic to average daily traffic. Near Weymouth on N J 42, the ratio exceeded 700 percent and ratios in excess of 500 percent were found southeast of Cedar Bridge on N J S-40 toward Long Beach and on a county route connecting with Atlantic Highlands southwest of New Monmouth. These ratios are of special significance in considering pavement width and right-of-way width re-

121777-35----1

quirements. Eighty-four sections of highway throughout the State were found with ratios of peak to average traffic in excess of 300 percent.

The heaviest traffic volume was on U S 1 between Trenton and the Holland Tunnel which averaged more than 16,000 vehicles per day throughout its length. Other routes with average volumes greater than 5,000 per day include: N J 4, George Washington Bridge to Paterson; county road, West Caldwell to Belleville to Jersey City; county road, N J S-1, N J 6, and N J 9-W, Bayonne to Coxiesville to Alpine to the New York State line; US 9-W and county road, Hoboken to Leonia to New York State line; N J 5-N and 24, Mount Tabor to Morristown to Newark; N J 29, Hillside to Somerville; US 22, Elizabeth to Somerville to Phillipsburg; county road, East Rutherford to Paterson to Pompton to Lakeside; N J 27, Trenton to Newark; N J 35, South Amboy to Point Pleasant to Lakewood; N J 2, Harrison to the New York State line; U S 30 and county road, Camden to Atlantic City; N J S-41, Berlin to Palmyra; N J 6 and S-6, Fort Lee to Paterson to Delaware; county road between Fort Lee and junction with N J 6 west of Bogota; N J 25, New Brunswick to Bordentown to Camden; U S 130, Bordentown to Trenton; N J 42 and county road, Camden to Atlantic City; N J 23 and 8-N and county road, Newark to New York State line; a total of 20 sections or 675 miles of highway. There are over 1,000 trucks per day on 4 of these routes, with the largest average, 2,690 trucks per

17

¹ The full report prepared by the Bureau has been submitted to the New Jersey State Highway Department and will not be published or distributed by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Vol. 16, no. 2



FIGURE 1.-LOCATION OF TRAFFIC SURVEY STATIONS ON STATE AND IMPORTANT COUNTY HIGHWAYS.





CAPE MAY POINT FIGURE 2.- AVERAGE DAILY MOTOR VEHICLE TRAFFIC ON STATE AND IMPORTANT COUNTY HIGHWAYS.

ANGLESEA

MAY

SCALE OF MILES

SCALE 500 OR MORE VEHICLES PER 5000 0000 LESS THAN SO VEHICLES 40000 PER DAY SHOWN THUS

STATE ROUTE NUMBERS 47 47



FIGURE 3.-AVERAGE DAILY DENSITY OF FOREIGN VEHICLE TRAFFIC ON STATE AND IMPORTANT COUNTY HIGHWAYS.

-





Figure 4.—Average Daily Density of Motor Truck Traffic on State and Important County Highways. Number of Trucks of More than 1½ Tons Capacity are Indicated by Solid Black Within the Truck Flow Band, and are Shown only for those Routes where Detailed Information was Obtained in the Field. Truck Capacities on Sections of Highway Within Closely Built Urban Areas are not Shown where Intersections with Cross Routes are Frequent. day, on U S 1 between the High-Level Viaduct and Trenton.

Figure 2 shows the average daily traffic on State and important county highways.

Traffic volume was greatest in August—about 132 percent of that of the average month. Foreign traffic varied more widely than local traffic, the range being from 52 to 177 percent of that of the average month. Local traffic varied from a low of 77 percent in February to a high of 122 percent in each of the 3 months of June, July, and August.

Foreign traffic had a large daily variation from a low of 94 percent of the average on Tuesdays and Thursdays to a maximum of 206 percent on Sundays, as compared with a range of 92 to 122 percent for local traffic.

NEW JERSEY HIGHWAYS CARRY A LARGE VOLUME OF FOREIGN TRAFFIC

The average daily traffic density of foreign vehicles is shown in figure 3. Foreign vehicles averaged 18 percent of all observed vehicles. Nearly one-half (46 percent) of foreign vehicles were from New York, 41 percent from Pennsylvania, and not quite 13 percent were from other States. They follow well-known State and county highways and are most prominent on cross-Their volume has no fixed relation to State routes. total traffic. For example, U S 9-W from Jersey City to the northern New Jersey State line had a traffic of 11,821 vehicles per day, of which 26 percent was foreign, while the county road from West Caldwell to Jersey City-a direct connection from N J 6 to the latter city, though comparatively unknown to touristshad practically the same traffic volume, and a percentage of foreign traffic of but 13. Similarly, US 30 from Camden to Atlantic City, N J 6 and S 6 from Fort Lee to the Delaware line, each with an average traffic practically equal to that of N J 35 from South Amboy to Lakewood, carried 44 and 22 percent of foreign traffic as against 10 percent on N J 35.

THROUGH ROUTES CARRY LARGE VOLUME OF TRUCK TRAFFIC

The average daily density of motor truck traffic is shown in figure 4. Truck traffic in New Jersey was 12 percent of all motor traffic, although there was considerable variation in the percentages on different routes. For example, on the Pennsylvania Railroad ferries at Camden trucks were more than one-half of all traffic and on the Reading ferries, 44 percent. The heaviest truck traffic was found on U S 1, exceeding 1,200 trucks per day at all points except the by-pass around New Brunswick.

Figure 5 shows the average daily density of motor bus traffic.

INTENSIVE USE MADE OF STATE SYSTEM

The average daily traffic on the New Jersey State highway system was 4,659, of which 3,996 were passenger vehicles. This represents an annual use of the State system of 2,609 million vehicle-miles, or approximately 81 percent of the annual use of the Michigan trunk lines, although average use per mile in New Jersey is approximately four times that in Michigan.

Use per mile of the State system was greatest in Hudson, Union, Bergen, Camden, and Middlesex Counties—listed in order of magnitude. The average daily traffic was in excess of 8,000 vehicles in all five counties, with an average of 16,608 vehicles daily on State highways in Hudson County. Population per square mile is heaviest in these counties and follows the

same order as the use of the highways. Hudson County has 16,063 persons per square mile and all of these counties, except Middlesex, have more than 1,000 persons per square mile. Average daily traffic was least in Cape May, Salem, and Sussex Counties, but in none of these does average traffic on State highways drop below 1,600 per day, indicating that even in counties of relatively light population density, usage of State highways is relatively high.

Foreign passenger cars constitute a much higher percentage of the total traffic on the New Jersey State highway system than they do in many other eastern States. For the whole State of New Jersey the percentage of highway use by foreign passenger cars was 24.3, as compared with 10.2 percent in Ohio and 10.8 in Michigan. This percentage is exceeded in several of the western States, but foreign passenger-car-miles in all such States are less than one-third of the amount in New Jersey.

Similar data were obtained on a portion of the county highways of New Jersey, but since only the important county routes were included in the survey, a direct comparison between State and county routes would be inaccurate. Although the coverage of county roads was incomplete some of the proportions are worth noting. Foreign passenger vehicles constituted 12 percent of the passenger vehicles on county roads, less than half the percentage found on the State system. A comparison of the density of passenger vehicle traffic on State and county roads in certain of the counties indicates the importance of certain county routes. In Essex County the figures are 4,838 passenger vehicles daily on State highways, and 5,987 on county roads. In Hudson, Monmouth, Passaic, and Salem Counties the averages for the county roads are close to those for the State highways.

Use of the State system by passenger cars originating in local and adjacent counties was 71.8 percent of the total use in Essex, Hudson, Union, Passaic, Morris, and Bergen Counties, and averaged 51.8 percent in the remainder of the State. Despite the large volumes of foreign traffic that pour through these counties, which are in the New York metropolitan area, the local use of the State system was nearly 40 percent more than in the rest of the State.

In the resort counties of Atlantic, Cape May, and Warren the percentage of use of the State system by foreign cars was 40.7, as compared with 22.7 percent for the remainder of the State. The significance of such foreign use is greatly increased when it is noted that both Atlantic and Cape May Counties are removed from adjacent States and that all foreign cars must pass through other counties to reach these two. Nearly 43 percent of the total travel in these two counties was by foreign cars. Warren County is adjacent to Pennsylvania and so receives large numbers of local trips by passenger cars with foreign plates.

Monmouth, Ocean, and Sussex are largely resort counties and are much more heavily patronized by New Jersey residents than by those from other States. The proportion of passenger car use of the State system in these three counties by residents of nonadjacent counties was 35.4 percent, as compared with 14.2 percent for the remainder of the State.

ORIGIN AND DESTINATION OF TRAFFIC AT PRINCIPAL STATE OUTLETS STUDIED

State highways in Hudson County. Population per Nearly 125,000 motor vehicles entered or left New square mile is heaviest in these counties and follows the Jersey each day by way of 15 principal river crossings.



Figure 5.—Average Daily Density of Motor Bus Traffic on State and Important County Highways.





	5.11	Percen	it of total
	Daily average traffic	New Jersey traffic	Through traffic
15]crossings, total	124, 277	83.7	16.3
Hudson River crossings Holland Tunnel George Washington Bridge Alpine-Yonkers Ferry Delaware River crossings	30, 036 15, 840 808	18.6 7.8 .4	5.6 5.0 .3
 Columbia-Portland Bridge Delaware-Portland Bridge Delaware-Portland Bridge Phillipsburg-Easton Bridge Trenton-Langhorne Bridge Burlington-Bristol Bridge Palmyra-Philadelphia Bridge Camden-Philadelphia Bridge Camden-Philadelphia Ferry (Pennsylvannia R. R.) Camden-Philadelphia Ferry (Reading R. R.) Bridgeport-Chester Ferry Pennsville-Newcastle Ferry 	952 2,556 16,958 6,091 11,615 3,443 27,491 1,938 3,775 762 1,361	.7 1.2 12.5 3.6 7.8 2.7 21.8 1.6 3.0 .6 .8	(¹) . 9 1.1 1.3 1.5 (¹) . 3 (¹) . 3 (¹) . 3 (¹) . 3

¹Less than t_{σ}^{1} of 1 percent

FIGURE 6.—TRAFFIC ORIGINATING OR TERMINATING IN NEW JERSEY AND THROUGH TRAFFIC USING HUDSON AND DELA-WARE RIVER CROSSINGS.

About 47,000 crossed the Hudson River on the George Washington Bridge, the Holland Tunnel, or the Alpine-Yonkers Ferry, and nearly 78,000 crossed the Delaware River at 12 points. Twenty-nine percent of the cars which crossed the Hudson represented through traffic, originating at points outside of New Jersey and passing through the State without stop-over. In contrast only 9 percent of the vehicles crossing the Delaware passed through New Jersey without stopping, and 91 percent either stopped or started in New Jersey.

The location of each crossing, together with the amounts of through traffic and New Jersey traffic, are shown in figure 6. The total length of each bar represents the relative part of total traffic using the crossing, while the black portion represents New Jersey traffic and the white portion through traffic. Traffic through the Holland Tunnel was greater than that at any other crossing in respect to both total and through traffic. The George Washington Bridge, although carrying only a little more than half the total traffic volume of the Holland Tunnel, had almost as much through traffic as the latter.

Relatively more New Jersey traffic crossed the Camden-Philadelphia Bridge than at any other crossing, but through traffic was comparatively unimportant at this crossing. Traffic at the Phillipsburg-Easton Bridge was greater in volume than that at the George Washington Bridge but was almost entirely local—80 percent of it either originated or terminated in the county in which the crossing is located, and only 8 percent was through traffic. The Delaware-Portland Bridge carried 42 percent through traffic, a greater proportion than any other crossing. One-fourth of all vehicles crossing the Trenton-Langhorne Bridge had both termini outside New Jersey, and one-sixth of all cars crossing the Trenton-Morrisville Bridge were of this class. Through traffic was relatively unimportant at the Columbia-Portland, Burlington-Bristol, and Palmyra-Philadelphia Bridges, at both railroad ferries between Camden and Philadelphia, and at the Bridgeport-Chester Ferry. More than one-fourth of the traffic over the Pennsville-New Castle Ferry was through traffic.

The relative importance of the contribution of each New Jersey locality to the traffic traversing the 15 principal Hudson and Delaware River crossings is given in detail for each county and principal city in table 1. This information is also presented graphically in figures 7 and 8, in which the areas of the circles are proportional to the percentage of total traffic which originated or terminated in the designated cities and counties. The greatest percentage of this traffic centered in Camden County, where 14 out of every hundred vehicles entering or leaving New Jersey each day by way of these principal crossings either ended or began their journeys. Warren County was the origin or destination of almost 12 percent of all such traffic, 10 vehicles out of the 12 representing traffic to or from Phillipsburg. Mercer County, which accounted for 10.5 percent of total principal river-crossing traffic, is third in importance in this classification, with Trenton taking more than 90 percent of total county traffic. More than 9 percent of total river-crossing traffic was to or from Essex County, with Newark alone taking more than half that volume. Atlantic and Hudson Counties each accounted for more than 6 percent of



Areas of circles are proportional to percentage of total traffic originating and terminating in designated localities. An asterisk indicates localities for which traffic was less than 0.1 percent. Values for these localities are included in general county total wherever possible. No traffic was reported for cities or counties on left bank. Through traffic, neither originating nor terminating in New Jersey, is shown only in the table above.

Daily average number of vehicles using these crossings, 124,277

	Number	Percent
Through traffic	20, 282	16.3
New Jersey traffic	103, 995	83.7
Principal counties: Camden Warren Mercer Essex Atlantic Hudson Bergen	17, 495 14, 893 13, 056 11, 342 8, 000 7, 766 6, 186	14. 1 12. 0 10. 5 9. 1 6. 4 6. 3 5. 0
Total	78, 738	63.4
Other counties	25, 257	20.3

FIGURE 7.—AREAS SERVED BY FIFTEEN HUDSON AND DELAWARE RIVER CROSSINGS.

the total, and Bergen County, 5 percent. Traffic of Burlington, Gloucester, Passaic, and Union Counties each furnished between 2 and 4 percent of the total; Monmouth, Middlesex, Morris, Cumberland, and Cape May Counties, furnished between 1 and 2 percent each; and Ocean, Salem, Hunterdon, Somerset, and Sussex Counties furnished less than 1 percent each. RIDGEWOOD HAWTHORNE PATERSON CLIFTON PASSAIC HACKENSACK RIDGEFIELD PARK ENGLEWOOD RUTHERFORD CLIFFSIDE PARK MONTCLAIR BLOOMFIELD NUTLEY NUTLEY BELLVILLE KEARNY HUDSON CO. WEST NEW YORK UNION CITY UNION CHY HOBOKEN WEST ORANGE ORANGE EAST ORANGE SOUTH ORANGE HARRISON IRVINGTON NEWARK O_{4} ç NEWARK JERSEY CITY BAYONNE 4 AC SUMME WESTFIELD ROSELLE ELIZABETH PLAINFIELD AI RAHWAY SCALE OF MILES

FIGURE 8.—AREAS SERVED BY FIFTEEN HUDSON AND DELAWARE RIVER CROSSINGS.

TRAFFIC FROM PRINCIPAL CITIES OF NEW JERSEY TO STATE OUTLETS STUDIED

The two chief factors which determined the route followed by traffic between outside States and certain New Jersey cities, by way of the principal Hudson and Delaware River crossings, were the proximity of the crossing to the city and the general nature and direction of the highways which connected them. The flow of average daily traffic to and from selected cities, shown in table 2, distinctly indicates this tendency. Figures for the 8 cities which have the greatest amount of traffic by way of the Hudson and Delaware River crossings here considered, are arranged in the general order of their location. The first 4 cities are in the Hudson River area, the next 3 on the Delaware, and the last on the Atlantic seaboard in the southern part of the State. Within the Hudson and Delaware River groups, the cities are arranged from north to south, Paterson and Hackensack being north of Jersey City and Newark, and Phillipsburg, Trenton, and Camden at about equal intervals from north to south on the Delaware, while Atlantic City is across the State southeast of Camden.

The Holland Tunnel and the George Washington Bridge are approximately the same distance from Paterson, but the highway to the bridge is much more direct. Hence almost half the Paterson traffic by way of Hudson and Delaware River crossings passed over the George Washington Bridge and something more than a third through the Holland Tunnel, which traffic, together with the small amount crossing on the Alpine-Yonkers Ferry, accounted for about seven-eighths of the total. Hackensack, on the other hand, which is about twice as far from the Holland Tunnel as from the George Washington Bridge, and is connected with both by equally good roads, received more than three-quarters of its river crossing traffic over the George Washington Bridge and about one-fifth through the Holland Tunnel.

121777-----2

TABLE 1.—Daily average traffic using Hudson and Delaware River crossings analyzed by origin or destination

	Daily	Des		Daily	Per-
	average	Per-	Oninin an destination	average	cent
Origin or destination	number of ve-	total	Origin or destination	of ve-	total
	hicles	trame		hicles	traffic
Total	124, 277	100.0	Union County: Elizabeth	1 179	0.0
Through traffic	20, 282	16.3	Linden	132	.1
New Jersey traffic	103, 995	83.7	Plainfield Rahway	565 198	.5
Sussex County, total	298	. 2	Roselle	79	(1)
Passaie County:			Westfield	215	.2
Clifton	167	. 1	Other Union County.	297	.2
Passaic	830	.7	Total	2, 873	2.3
Paterson	1, 622	1.3	Middlegov County:		
County	234	2.2	Carteret	43	(1)
Total	2 904		New Brunswick	644 279	.5
I Ubal	2,034		South River	49	(1)
Bergen County: Cliffside Park	117	.1	County	497	2.5
Englewood	933	. 8	rn - 4 - 1	1 510	
Garfield	86 1,735	(1) 1.4	Total	1, 512	1.2
Lodi	68	(1)	Mercer County:	19 109	0.0
Ridgewood	489	.4	Other Mercer	12, 192	9.8
Rutherford	498	. 4	County	864	.7
County	2, 163	2 1.8	Total	13,056	10.5
Total	6,186	5.0	Monmouth County:		
Warman Country			Asbury Park	715	.6
Phillipsburg	12,085	9.7	Red Bank	$\frac{191}{212}$.1
Other Warren	9 000	0.3	Other Monmouth County	806	7
Coulty	2,000	2.0	m + 1	0.00	. /
'1'otal	14, 893	12.0	Total	2,014	1.6
Morris County:	900	9	Burlington County:		
Morristown	443	.4	Other Burlington	657	. 5
Other Morris	749	6	County	3, 749	3.0
Obdity	0110		Total	4,406	3.5
Total	1,400	1.2			
Essex County:	100	- 1	Ocean County, total	J, 174	. 9
Bloomfield	330	.3	Camden County:	10 041	0.0
East Orange	755	.6	Collingswood	1,032	8.0
Montclair	1, 108	.9	Gloucester.	607	. 5
Newark Nutley	6, 926 196	5.6	County	5, 215	4.2
Orange	382	.3	Total	17 405	14 1
South Orange West Orange	490	.4	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	17, 100	14.1
Other Essex County_	554	.4	Gloucester County, total.	4,024	3.2
Total	11, 342	9.1	Atlantic County:		
Hudson County:			Atlantic City Pleasantville	6, 396 74	5.1
Bayonne	665	.5	Other Atlantic	1.000	
Harrison Hobokep	136	.1	County	1, 530	¥ 1.3
Jersey City	5,035	4.0	Total	8,000	6.4
Kearny Union City	211 456	.2	Salem County total	050	0
West New York	460	.4	G 1 1 2 G	909	. 0
County	194	.2	Bridgeton	442	4
Trotol	7 700		Millville	238	.2
1 U tal	7,700	0.3	County	611	. 5
Hunterdon County,	693	6	Total	1 901	
Somerset County, total	375	.3	Cape May County, total.	1, 291	1.1

Less than 0.1 percent.
 Includes cities for which traffic was less than 0.1 percent.

Since the Holland Tunnel emerges in Jersey City, it is not surprising to find that 80 percent of the Jersey City river-crossing traffic passes through the tunnel, and about 13 percent over the George Washington Bridge, which is the second nearest principal crossing. Newark's nearest river crossing is also the Holland Tunnel and is connected with it by highly improved roads, with the result that 74 percent of its traffic is through the tunnel and 11 percent by way of the more distant

near the George Washington Bridge and distant from the Holland Tunnel while the reverse is true of distances from Newark to the crossings. In both cases the percentages of traffic using the near and far crossings are about the same. Each city is also about the same distance from its next most important crossing, but almost twice as great a part of Hackensack's total traffic came from this secondary source. The greater importance of Newark as an industrial and commercial center, as well as its more direct accessibility to the principal crossings on the Delaware River, may explain a more general dispersion of its traffic with outside States than was found in the case of any other of the principal cities. Approximately half of Newark's daily traffic from river crossings other than the Holland Tunnel, came over the Hudson and the other half came over Delaware River crossings.

In marked contrast, the river-crossing traffic of Phillipsburg was confined almost exclusively to the Phillipsburg-Easton Bridge. Phillipsburg is not one of the larger cities of New Jersey, its population in 1930 being only 19,255. Its situation directly across the Delaware from Easton, Pa., which is about twice as large, and within 20 miles of Bethlehem and Allentown, Pa., both of which are of considerable importance industrially, accounts for an interchange of traffic over this principal river crossing similar to the shuttle-flow of traffic within the boundaries of a large city. On this account it is necessary to discount considerably the apparent importance of Phillipsburg as the point of origin or destination of a volume of river-crossing traffic which was exceeded only by similar traffic at Trenton. The traffic at Trenton is over its two important bridges, with 13 other crossings contributing small amounts.

As already indicated, the daily river-crossing traffic which originated or terminated at Trenton, averaging 12,192 cars a day, was greater than that of any other New Jersey city. Although Trenton is exceeded in population by Paterson, Newark, and Jersey City, it enjoys a unique position in being of historical interest, the State capital, an important industrial city, and it is at the head of tidewater navigation on the Delaware River. All of these factors contributed in varying proportion to its out-of-State traffic. Ninety-three percent of this traffic either entered or left the city by way of its two bridges across the Delaware, about 3 percent crossed the Hudson, and the remaining 4 percent used the other 10 Delaware River crossings.

As an important manufacturing and shipbuilding center directly across the Delaware from Philadelphia, and within the metropolitan area of Philadelphia, Camden is one of the most important New Jersey terminals of interstate highway traffic. More than 94 percent of Camden's traffic which came by way of Hudson or Delaware River crossings entered or left the city by one or another of the 3 principal crossings between Camden and Philadelphia; 73 percent of such traffic used the Delaware River Bridge; and the traffic from the Pennsylvania and Reading Railroad ferries amounted to more than 10 percent each. Almost half the remaining Camden traffic crossed the Palmyra-Philadelphia Bridge in going to or coming from Philadelphia, with the other 3 percent unevenly distributed among all other principal crossings.

Atlantic City is a middle Atlantic beach resort of widespread popularity. The daily ebb and flow of tourist traffic combined with the supplementary com-George Washington Bridge. Hackensack is relatively mercial traffic, a large part of which came from Phila-

TABLE 2.-Daily average traffic which originates or terminates in designated cities using each principal Hudson or Delaware River

crossing

Crossing	Pate	erson	Hacke	ensack	Jerses	7 City	Nev	vark	Phillip	osburg	Trei	nton	Can	nden	Atla Ci	ntic ty
Fifteen crossings, total	Num- ber 1, 622	<i>Per-</i> <i>cent</i> 100. 0	Num- ber 1,735	Per- cent 100.0	Num- ber 5, 035	<i>Per-</i> <i>cent</i> 100. 0	Num- ber 6, 926	<i>Per-</i> <i>cent</i> 100.0	Num- ber 12, 085	Per- cent 100. 0	Num- ber 12, 192	Per- cent 100. 0	Num- ber 10, 641	<i>Per-</i> <i>cent</i> 100. 0	Num- ber 6, 396	Per- cent 100.0
Hudson River crossings: Holland Tunnel George Washington Bridge. Alpine-Yonkers Ferry.	582 803 23	35.9 49.5 1.4	332 1, 314 30	19.1 75.8 1.7	4,048 651 24	80. 4 12. 9 . 5	5,131 781 36	74.1 11.3 .5	23 4 (²)	, 2 (1) (1)	292 56 3	2.4 .5 (1)	97 24 1	.9 .2 (1)	258 44 2	4.0 .7 (1)
Total	1,408	86.8	1,676	96.6	4,723	93.8	5,948	85.9	27	. 2	351	2.9	122	1.1	304	4.8
Delaware River crossings: Columbia-Portland Bridge Delaware-Portland Bridge. Phillipsburg-Easton Bridge. Trenton-Langhorne Bridge. Trenton-Morrisville Bridge. Burlington-Bristol Bridge. Camden-Philadelphia Bridge. Camden-Philadelphia Firdge. Camden-Philadelphia Firty (Pennsylvania Railroad). Camden-Philadelphia Ferry (Reading Rail- road). Bridgeport-Chester Ferry. Pennsville-New Castle Ferry.	9 63 73 28 26 1 2 5 	.6 3.9 4.5 1.7 1.6 (¹) .1 .3 (¹) .1 .3	3 11 13 10 13 1 5 (?) 3	.2 .6 .7 .6 .7 .1 .3 (1) .3 (1) .2	$ \begin{array}{c} 6\\ 78\\ 74\\ 60\\ 58\\ 1\\ 3\\ 17\\ 1\\ 1\\ 5\\ 8\\ \end{array} $.1 1.5 1.5 1.2 1.2 (¹) (¹) .3 (¹) (¹) .1 .2	15 185 246 220 215 5 5 44 3 4 8 28	.2 2.7 3.6 3.2 3.1 (1) (1) .6 (1) (1) .1 .4	2 55 11, 997 1 2 (²) (²) 1	(1) 	2 71 78 3,347 8,048 21 24 207 11 10 10 12	(¹) . 6 . 6 27.4 66.0 . 2 . 2 1.7 . 1 . 1 . 1	1 15 8 6 40 61 288 7,815 1,082 1,123 53 27	$(1) \\ (1) $	(2) 13 8 3 12 26 754 4,577 46 226 142 285	(¹) .2 .1 (¹) .2 .4 11.8 71.6 .7 3.5 2.2 4.5
Total	214	13. 2	59	3.4	312	6.2	978	14.1	12, 058	99.8	11, 841	97.1	10, 519	98.9	6,092	95.2

¹ Less than 0.1 percent.

² Less than 1 vehicle a day.

delphia, explains the large volume of daily river-crossing traffic to and from this city. Almost 72 percent of this traffic entered or left New Jersey by the Delaware River Bridge at Camden, and about 12 percent by the Palmyra-Philadelphia Bridge. The Pennsville-New Castle ferry, the southernmost Delaware River crossing, carried 4.5 percent, and the Holland Tunnel carried 4 percent of such traffic. The Reading Railroad ferry at Camden and the Bridgeport-Chester ferry in Gloucester County, were the only other crossings carrying more than 1 percent of the Atlantic City total traffic, with all other crossings contributing something to its traffic.

CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUCK AND BUS TRAFFIC DETERMINED FROM SAMPLE COUNT

Trucks and busses were stopped and detailed information relating to their movement was recorded at 78 representative points throughout the State and at regular intervals during the year. Although information regarding only a part of total traffic was obtained, these sample data represented an average cross-section of truck and bus traffic in New Jersey at the time of the survey. Occasionally all the required information was not obtained and it may be found that figures for a given item of information in one tabulation differ slightly from those for the same item in another.

The following data relate to the selected sample of traffic passing over New Jersey highways and not to the actual number of individual vehicles of a certain type. For example, a bus making several trips a day would be counted as many times as it passed an occupied survey station. Statements regarding the proportions of various classes of vehicles refer to the sample of traffic under consideration, without taking account of the number of times an individual vehicle may be included therein. Thus, while it is correct to say that 30 percent of New Jersey bus traffic consists of 1929 model busses, this does not mean that 30 percent of the busses in New Jersey are 1929 models.

In the total sample, comprising 267,025 vehicles, there were 239,368 trucks and 27,657 busses, or almost 9 times as many trucks as busses. Approximately 53 perby New York firms as well as a smaller number owned

cent of the total number of trucks and busses operated in the northeast section of the State adjacent to New York City, a large part of this section being included within the New York metropolitan area in New Jersey. The southwest section of the State, including the cities of Trenton and Camden and other districts in the neighborhood of Philadelphia, was traversed by about 22 percent of the total truck and bus traffic of the State, and the northwest and southeast sections, by about 10 and 15 percent, respectively.

Of the total sample of truck and bus traffic throughout the State, trucks represented 89.6 percent and busses 10.4 percent. In the northwest section, consisting of Sussex, Warren, Hunterdon and Somerset Counties, 91.6 percent of the combined traffic was by trucks, indicating a relatively greater transportation of commodities than passengers. On the other hand, in the southwest section which is traversed by a large part of the tourist traffic to New Jersey beach resorts, busses represented 11.8 percent of the combined truck and bus traffic of the section.

TRUCKS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO OWNERSHIP

Slightly more than half the trucks operating over New Jersey highways were owned by business organizations located in cities or towns of 2,500 inhabitants or more. Private individuals living in such urban areas owned 39 out of every 100 observed trucks. Trucks owned by persons living in rural districts or on farms represented less than 10 percent of the truck traffic, and trucks owned by governmental agencies represented only a little more than 1 percent. Table 3 shows the classification of trucks observed according to ownership.

The greater part of the northeast section of New Jersey is included within the New York metropolitan area. In this section trucks owned by city companies constituted a higher percentage than in any other part of the State. City companies owned about 57 out of each 100 trucks operating in this area. The companies were principally manufacturing and business organizations located within this district, but many trucks owned by New York firms as well as a smaller number owned TABLE 3 .- Trucks observed on New Jersey highways, classified according to ownership

Class of ownership	Number	Percent
Total, all classes	239, 368	100. 0
Farm ownership	22, 515	9, 4
Total city ownership.	214, 228	89.5
Company Private	$121, 463 \\ 92, 765$	50, 7 38, 8
Government ownership	2, 625	1.1

by establishments in Philadelphia and other cities were observed. Individuals living in northeastern New Jersey cities owned 36 percent of the trucks in the traffic sample, and were principally engaged in small businesses. Farm-owned trucks constituted about 7 percent of trucks operating in this area which has fewer farms than any other section of the State.

The northwest section of the State is largely a farming district, and its percentage of farm-owned trucks was almost twice as great as that of the northeast section. But even in this more rural district, 86 percent of observed trucks were city-owned.

The proportion of city-owned trucks operating in southeastern New Jersey was only slightly higher than that in the northwest section of the State, but there was a preponderance of company-owned trucks, which comprised almost 48 percent of truck traffic in this section. About 40 percent were privately owned. Although there are many business and industrial establishments in this district, the prevalence of companyowned trucks on its highways was partly due to the operation of trucks owned by large supply houses in New York City, Philadelphia, Camden, and other cities engaged in trucking to coast resorts. The farming industry is of considerable importance in this district and 11 percent of the trucks operating in this section were farm-owned.

The extensive rural areas in Burlington, Gloucester, and Salem Counties accounted for a large part of the 14 out of each 100 trucks operating in southwestern New Jersey which were farm-owned. This section had the smallest proportion of city-owned trucks, 84 percent being of this class, and these were almost evenly divided between company and private ownership.

OWNER-OPERATED TRUCKS MAKE UP GREATER PORTION OF TRUCK TRAFFIC

There are three principal classes of truck operation, if the small number of Government-operated trucks is included in the owner-operated class. The owneroperated class includes those trucks, whether of company, private, farm or Government ownership, which are operated by their owners either personally or by their employees in the business of the owner. Trucks operated as contract haulers are engaged in the business of trucking for others for hire, trips being made when and where desired at rates agreed upon by the contracting parties. Trucks operated as common carriers follow established routes between definite points, operate on a regular schedule, and charge standard published rates. Throughout the entire State, owneroperated trucks constituted 79 percent of the sample count, contract-hauler trucks 17.7 percent, commoncarrier trucks 2.2 percent, and Government-operated trucks 1.1 percent.

Of the total volume of truck traffic included in the

than one-third interstate traffic. This means that about 66 out of each 100 trucks have both their origin and destination within the State. In the northwest section of the State 42 percent of trucks were found to be operating in interstate traffic. This section of New Jersey lies in the path of traffic en route from central and western Pennsylvania to points in New Jersey, upper New York, or the New England States, and truck traffic between New York City and points in northern Pennsylvania, or beyond, also passes through this section. Only about 16 percent of trucks operating in the southeast section of New Jersey are engaged in interstate traffic.

Another analysis of the figures relating to trucks engaged in State and interstate traffic, according to class of truck operation, is given in table 4, and is also presented graphically in figure 9. In general, contracthauler and common-carrier trucks operated more frequently in interstate traffic than did owner-operated trucks. This classification shows that 72.5 percent of owner-operated trucks were engaged in State traffic and that only 27.5 percent went outside of New Jersey. Among both contract-hauler and common-carrier trucks, only about one-third were engaged in State and two-thirds in interstate operation. Of the few Govern-ment-operated trucks recorded, 90 percent travel within the State and 10 percent between States.

TABLE 4.—State and interstate traffic by class of truck operation

	Total tra	affic	State tra	affic	Interstate traffic			
Class of operation	Number of trucks	Per- cent ¹	Number of trucks	Per- cent ²	Number of trucks	Per- cent ²		
All classes, total	239, 368	100. 0	156, 732	65.5	82, 636	34. 5		
Owner operator Contract hauler Common carrier Government operation	189, 15942, 2785, 2732, 658	$79.0 \\ 17.7 \\ 2.2 \\ 1.1$	$137, 152 \\ 15, 474 \\ 1, 715 \\ 2, 391$	$\begin{array}{c} 72.\ 5\\ 36.\ 6\\ 32.\ 5\\ 90.\ 0\end{array}$	52,007 26,804 3,558 267	$ \begin{array}{r} 27.5 \\ 63.4 \\ 67.5 \\ 10.0 \end{array} $		

Percent of all classes of operation, total.
 Percent of total for each class of operation, respectively.





TRUCKS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO COMMODITIES HAULED

Thirty-two percent of all trucks included in the New Jersey sample were running empty; 2.2 percent carried passengers; 65.7 percent carried commodities; and 0.1 percent had no load capacity, the latter group including chassis, tractors, or other vehicles without bodies designed for hauling loads. The loads carried by trucks were classified according to fixed commodity groups and the results are shown in table 5 and figure 10.

The loads of trucks classified according to type of operation are presented in table 6. Among trucks of the owner-operated class, 33 percent were found to be running empty, in contrast with about 30 percent of contract-hauler trucks, and only 12 percent of commoncarrier trucks. Relatively more owner-operated trucks sample, almost two-thirds is State and a little more were found carrying passengers. It appears that there

TABLE 5.—Nature of truck loads carried

Nature of load	Number of trucks	Percent- age of all trucks	Percent- age by groups
All trucks, total No commodity or commodity not classified	239, 368 82, 328	100.0 34.4	100. 0
Running empty Carrying passengers No load capacity Loaded, commodity not classified	76, 499 5, 338 368 123	32.0 2.2 .1 .1	92.8 6.5 .5
Commodity specified, total	157,040	65.6	100.0
Manufactured products, wholesale delivery, etc Agricultural products. Products of mines (coal, oil, etc.). Household goods. Forest products (lumber, trees, strubs, etc.) State highway construction materials, etc. Valuables, mail, armored cars, etc.	87, 437 32, 002 17, 595 9, 277 5, 156 4, 073 1, 182 318	$\begin{array}{r} 36.4\\ 13.4\\ 7.4\\ 3.9\\ 2.2\\ 1.7\\ .5\\ .1\end{array}$	$55.7 \\ 20.4 \\ 11.2 \\ 5.9 \\ 3.3 \\ 2.6 \\ .7 \\ .2$





is less waste of truck capacity in common-carrier and contract-hauler operation than in owner operation. Owner-operated trucks carried a greater percentage of agricultural products, retail delivery, coal, oil, and forest products than either of the other two classes. In hauling these commodities the truck is usually loaded at a fixed point, deliveries are made, and the truck returns empty to the point of origin. In both contract and common-carrier hauling, on the other hand, trips are planned so as to have the truck loaded on both the outgoing and return trip whenever possible.

As shown in table 7, approximately 66 out of each 100 trucks were expected to bring back a return load; 31 were expected to return empty; 3 were not expected to return; and only 6 per 1,000 were expected to carry passengers, or had no load capacity.

CAPACITY OF TRUCKS STUDIED

Trucks observed in this survey were of many kinds and capacities, ranging from small roadsters of only a fraction of a ton capacity used for local light delivery to large trailer vans used for long-distance hauling. In order to reduce this great variety of sizes to a few comparable groups, trucks have been classified as light, medium, and heavy. Light trucks include all trucks of 1½ tons capacity and under; medium trucks include all trucks of capacities between 1½ and 5 tons; and heavy trucks include all trucks of 5 tons capacity and over. For the entire State, light trucks, including passenger cars used for delivery or other hauling, comprised 55.5 percent; trucks of medium capacity comprised 23.3 percent; and heavy trucks comprised 21.2 percent of the total.

TABLE 6 .- Nature of load carried by class of truck operation

Nature of load	3 classes of operation		Ow: opera	ner ator	Cont hau	raet ler	Common carrier		
All kinds, total	Num- ber 236, 710	<i>Per-</i> <i>cent</i> 100. 0	Num- ber 189, 159	Per- cent 100.0	Num- ber 42, 278	Per- cent 100.0	Num- ber 5, 273	Per- cent 100.0	
Running empty Carrying passengers No load capacity Loaded, commodity not	76, 034 5, 006 354	32.1 2.1 .2	62, 840 4, 831 311	33. 2 2. 6 . 2	12, 569 158 43	29.7 .4 .1	625 17	11.9	
specified Commodity specified total ²	101 155, 215	(1) 65. 6	90 121, 087	(¹) 64. 0	11 29, 497	(1) 69.8	4,631	87.8	
Manufactured products, wholesale delivery, etc Agricultural products Retail delivery	86, 624 31, 462 17, 617	$ \begin{array}{c} 2 & 55.8 \\ 2 & 20.3 \\ 2 & 11.3 \end{array} $	63, 137 26, 117 17, 246	$ \begin{array}{c} 2 & 52. \ 2 \\ 2 & 21. \ 6 \\ 2 & 14. \ 3 \end{array} $	19, 297 5, 118 323	265.4 217.4 21.1	4 , 190 227 48	290.5 24.9 21.0	
Products of mines, coal, oil, etc Household goods Forest products, lumber,	9,094 5,100	² 5.9 ² 3.3	7,853 2,694	26.5 22.1	1, 162 2, 442	2 3.9 2 8.3	79 64	2 1.7 2 1.4	
State highway construction materials, etc	4, 039 982	² 2. 6 ² . 6	3, 670	² 3. 0 ² . 3	360 558	² 1. 2 ² 1. 9	9 10	² .2 ² .2	
etc	297	2.2	56	(1)	237	2.8	4	2.1	

 1 Less than 1/10 of 1 percent. 2 Based on number of trucks for which commodity carried was specified.

TABLE 7.—Nature of return load by class of truck operation

Nature of return load	3 classes of operation		Ow oper	ner ator	Cont hau	ract ler	Common carrier		
All kind, total	Num-	Per-	Num-	<i>Per-</i>	Num-	<i>Per-</i>	Num-	<i>Per-</i>	
	ber	cent 1	ber	<i>cent</i>	ber	<i>cent</i>	ber	<i>cent</i>	
	236, 710	100.0	189, 159	100.0	42, 278	100.0	5, 273	100. 0	
Returning empty Not returning Carrying passengers No load capacity Returning loaded,	72, 612 6, 743 1, 035 369	30.7 2.8 .4 .2	57, 688 5, 277 872 327	30. 5 2. 8 . 5 . 2	$14,080 \\ 1,466 \\ 67 \\ 42$	33.3 3.5 .2 .1	844 96	16.0	
total ¹	155, 951	65.9	124, 995	66.0	26, 623	62.9	4, 333	82.2	
Commodity not specified	142, 430	1 91.3	114, 327	1 91.5	24, 336	1 91.4	3, 767	¹ 86.9	
Commodity specified	13, 521	1 8.7	10, 668	1 8.5	2, 287	1 8.6	566	¹ 13.1	

¹ Based on number of trucks returning loaded.

It may be interesting to compare the capacities of trucks making up New Jersey traffic during 1932-33 with similar data compiled for other States during previous years. A survey of transportation on the State highway system of Ohio made in 1926, showed that 71.8 percent of all trucks were light capacity; 26 percent were medium capacity; and 2.2 percent were heavy capacity. The composition of New Jersey traffic is definitely affected by the large amount of heavy hauling to or from New York City and Philadelphia which lie at the termini of the principal traffic arteries of the State.

A survey of traffic on the Federal-aid highway system of 11 Western States was made during 1929-30 by the Bureau of Public Roads and the highway departments of the respective States. Nebraska, all the Mountain States except Montana, and the Pacific States were included in this survey. The classification of truck traffic of each of these States, according to the same capacity groups as those used for New Jersey, is presented in table 8.

A grouping of the truck capacities in New Jersey and the western States according to the percentage of farm and village ownership, as opposed to city ownership, indicates that the percentage of lighter trucks tends to increase with an increase in the percentage of farm and village ownership, while medium- and heavy-capacity trucks increase with an increase in city ownership, as shown in table 9. California stands alone as group 1, since it is the only one of the 11 western States for which the classification of trucks by ownership shows oneTABLE 8.—Percentage distribution of trucks in various States by capacity

State	1½ tons	From 1½	5 tons and
	and under	to 5 tons	over
New Jersey, 1932-33. Ohio, 1926. 11 western States, 1929-30. California. Colorado. Idaho. Nebraska. New Mexico. Nevada. Oregon. Utah.	Percent 55.5 71.8 67.9 64.7 58.6 73.5 72.5 74.4 79.8 66.1 63.1 77.2	Percent 23. 3 26. 0 26. 3 31. 8 30. 2 20. 7 20. 8 24. 1 18. 7 25. 8 30. 9 20. 1	Percent 21, 2 2, 2 5, 8 3, 5 11, 2 5, 8 6, 7 1, 5 1, 5 8, 1 6, 0 2, 7
Washington	64. 6	27.0	8.4
Wyoming	78. 3	19.9	1.8

third farm and village owned and two-thirds city owned. The second group is made up of Oregon, Utah, Arizona, Washington, Idaho, and Colorado, the relative percentages of ownership varying from about 40 to 60 percent farm and village ownership, with an average of 53.7 percent. The third group consists of Nebraska, New Mexico, Nevada, and Wyoming, for which the percentages of farm and village ownership range from 60 to 80 percent, with an average of 70.4 percent.

 TABLE 9.—Percentage of light and medium and heavy trucks compared with percentages of city and farm and village ownership

	Average p	ercentage	Average p	percentage			
	of own	ership	of tr	rucks			
	Farm and village	City	Light	Medium and heavy			
New Jersey	9.5	90. 5	55.5	45. 5			
Group 1.	33. 9	$ \begin{array}{c} 66.1 \\ 46.3 \\ 29.6 \end{array} $	58.6	41. 4			
Group 2.	53. 7		69.3	30. 7			
Group 3.	70. 4		74.7	25. 3			

ONE-HALF OF TRUCKS MAKE ONE OR MORE TRIPS A DAY

The frequency of trips made by trucks over New Jersey highways ranged from a maximum of more than 10 trips a day to a minimum of only one trip at intervals of more than 30 days, as shown in table 10. Exactly one-half of the trucks made one trip or more a day, while the other half made trips at longer intervals. Of each thousand trucks observed 413 made one trip a day, 79 made from 2 to 5 trips a day, 7 made from 6 to 10 trips a day, and only 1 made more than 10 trips a day.

Table 11 shows the frequency of truck operation by classes of operation.

TABLE 10.-Frequency of trips by class of truck operation

Trip frequency group	3 class	ses of	Ow:	ner	Cont	ract	Common		
	opera	ition	opera	ator	hau	ler	carrier		
All frequencies, total	Num-	Per-	Num-	Per-	Num-	Per-	Num-	Per-	
	ber	cent	ber	cent	ber	cent	ber	ccnt	
	236, 710	100.0	189, 159	100. 0	42, 278	100.0	5, 273	100.0	
More than 10 trips a day 6 to 10 trips a day One trip a day One trip every 2 days One trip every 3 days One trip every 4 days One trip every 5 days One trip every 5 days One trip every 5 days One trip every 7 days One trip every 8 to 14 days One trip every 15 to 30 days Trips more than 30 days apart.	$\begin{array}{c} 251\\ 1, 685\\ 18, 598\\ 97, 681\\ 33, 354\\ 36, 352\\ 1, 197\\ 479\\ 780\\ 38, 203\\ 4, 505\\ 3, 524\\ 101 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} .1\\ .7\\ .9\\ 41.3\\ 14.1\\ 15.4\\ .5\\ .2\\ .3\\ 16.1\\ 1.9\\ 1.5\\ (^1)\end{array}$	$109 \\ 1, 157 \\ 16, 049 \\ 76, 725 \\ 25, 418 \\ 28, 895 \\ 1, 023 \\ 386 \\ 674 \\ 32, 108 \\ 3, 676 \\ 2, 852 \\ 87 \\ 87 \\ 87 \\ 87 \\ 87 \\ 87 \\ 87 \\ 8$	$\begin{array}{c} .1\\ .6\\ 8.5\\ 40.6\\ 13.4\\ 15.3\\ .2\\ .4\\ 17.0\\ 1.9\\ 1.5\\ (!)\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} 133\\518\\2,353\\17,754\\7,037\\6,879\\160\\84\\104\\5,784\\802\\656\\14\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} .3\\ 1,2\\ 5,6\\ 42,0\\ 16,6\\ 16,3\\ .2\\ .2\\ 13,7\\ 1,9\\ 1,6\\ (^1)\end{array}$	9 10 196 3, 202 899 578 14 9 2 2 311 27 16	$\begin{array}{c} & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 3.7 \\ 60.7 \\ 17.0 \\ 11.0 \\ & 3 \\ & 2 \\ (^1) \\ & 5.9 \\ & 5 \\ & 3 \end{array}$	

1 Less than 140 of 1 percent.

TABLE	11.—Frequency	of truck	operation	by	classes	of	operation
-------	---------------	----------	-----------	----	---------	----	-----------

Class and frequency	Number of trucks	Percent	Average trip- frequency
3 classes, total	236, 710	100. 0	Days 3. 03
More than 1 trip a day 1 trip a day Less than 1 trip a day	20, 534 97, 681 118, 495	8.7 41.3 50.0	. 39 1. 00 5. 17
Owner operators, total	189, 159	100. 0	3.09
More than 1 trip a day 1 trip a day Less than 1 trip a day	17, 315 76, 725 95, 119	$9.2 \\ 40.6 \\ 50.2$. 40 1. 00 5. 27
Contract haulers, total	42, 278	100. 0	2.95
More than 1 trip a day 1 trip a day Less than 1 trip a day	3,004 17,754 21,520	$7.1 \\ 42.0 \\ 50.9$.34 1.00 4.91
Common carriers, total	5, 273	100. 0	1.87
More than 1 trip a day 1 trip a day Less than 1 trip a day	215 3, 202 1, 856	$\begin{array}{r} 4.1 \\ 60.7 \\ 35.2 \end{array}$. 35 1. 00 3. 54

These same figures are presented in a different arrangement in table 12 for the purpose of showing the distribution of trucks in the respective trip frequency of groups among the various classes of operators. Nearly 80 percent of all trucks were operated in the business of owners; 17.4 percent were contract haulers; and only 2.8 percent were common carriers. The average trip frequency of these groups was 3.09 days, 2.95 days and 1.87 days, respectively, which means that common carriers as a class made the most frequent

TABLE 12.-Average trip frequency by class of truck operation.

Frequency and class	Number of trucks	Percent	Average trip frequency
All trip frequencies, 3 classes	236, 710	100. 0	Days 3. 03
Owner operator class Contract hauler class Common carrier class	$189, 159 \\ 42, 278 \\ 5, 273$	$79.8 \\ 17.4 \\ 2.8$	3. 09 2. 95 1. 87
More than 1 trip a day, 3 classes	20, 534	100.0	. 39
Owner operator class Contract hauler class Common carrier class	17, 315 3, 004 215	84. 4 14. 3 1. 3	. 40 . 34 . 35
1 trip a day, 3 classes.	97, 681	100.0	1.00
Owner operator class Contract hauler class Common carrier class	76, 725 17, 754 3, 202	78.3 17.6 4.1	$1.00 \\ 1.00 \\ 1.00$
Less than 1 trip a day, 3 classes	118, 495	100.0	5. 17
Owner operator class Contract hauler class Common carrier class	95, 119 21, 520 1, 856	80. 3 17. 7 2. 0	5. 27 4. 91 3. 54

trips, contract haulers the next most frequent, and owner operators made the least frequent trips. Among trucks that made more than one trip a day, there was a considerably greater proportion of owner operators, 84.4 percent being of this class, but the average trip frequency for owner operators was less than that of either contract haulers or common carriers. Of the one-trip-a-day frequency group, owner operators represent the smallest percentage and there is a greater proportion of common carriers in this group than in any other group. Contract haulers appear in about the same proportion in both the one-trip-a-day and the lessthan-one-trip-a-day groups. In the latter group, common carriers make trips more frequently and owner operators less frequently than any other class.

MANY TYPES OF BODIES FOUND ON TRUCKS

A great variety of truck bodies is now seen upon our highways. Trucks are being adapted to many types of hauling requiring special equipment, of which the tank truck and the ready-mixed-concrete truck are familiar types. In the total volume of truck traffic in New Jersey, however, 7 out of every 8 vehicles used as trucks have a standard covered, stake, or open body. The covered truck was observed more frequently than any other type and represented 46.5 percent of all New Jersey truck traffic. Stake- and open- body trucks were in approximately equal proportions, comprising 21.4 percent and 19.8 percent of all trucks, respectively. Among the types which were found less frequently the truck with trailer appeared most often, about 5 percent being of this class. Tank trucks constituted 3.2 percent of New Jersey truck traffic and were in large part serving the extensive refining industry of the State. Trucks with unusual types of body occur less than 3 times in each 100 trucks, and one in every 100 vehicles classified as trucks was a passenger car used as a truck, often for retail delivery or other light hauling. Only 3 trucks per 1,000 had platform bodies. Table 13 shows the data on truck bodies in detail.

TABLE 13.—Truck body types

Type of body	Number of trucks	Percent of total
Covered Stake. Open Tank Special body. Passenger cars (used to haul commodities). Platform Refrigerator. None (tractor without trailer). Bus (used to haul commodities).	$111, 376 \\ 51, 078 \\ 47, 439 \\ 7, 714 \\ 6, 806 \\ 2, 278 \\ 764 \\ 307 \\ 290 \\ 188$	$\begin{array}{c} 48.7\\ 22.4\\ 20.8\\ 3.4\\ 3.0\\ 1.0\\ .4\\ .1\\ .1\\ .1\end{array}$
Total	228, 240	100.0

ONLY 5 PERCENT OF TRUCKS HAULED TRAILERS

The extent to which trailers are used is shown in table 14. Passenger-car trailers are not included and no distinction is made between semitrailers and full trailers. Trailers are of relatively minor importance since 95 percent of all trucks operate without trailers. Only 1 truck in 20,000 hauled more than 1 trailer.

TABLE 14.---Number of trailers observed

Class	Number of trucks	Percent of total
All trucks, total	239, 368	100. 0
Without trailers	228, 240 11, 117 11	95. 4 4. 6 (1)

¹ Less than ¹/10 of 1 percent.

80 PERCENT OF TRUCKS FOUND TO BE NOT OVER 5 YEARS OLD

The age of trucks operating in New Jersey at the time of this survey is shown in table 15 and figure 11. Since the survey was in progress from August 1932 to August

TABLE 15.—Age of trucks

Age	Number of trucks	Percent of total	Cumula- tive per- centage
Less than 1 year (1933 model)	9, 337 33, 807 43, 540 40, 540 43, 012 22, 947 15, 596 11, 965 6, 979 4, 115 2, 725 2, 519 2, 519 1, 639 612 135	$\begin{array}{c} 3.9\\ 14.1\\ 18.2\\ 16.9\\ 9.6\\ 6.5\\ 5.0\\ 2.9\\ 1.7\\ 1.1\\ 1.1\\ .7\\ .3\\ (2)\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 3.9\\ 18.0\\ 36.2\\ 53.1\\ 71.1\\ 71.1\\ 80.7\\ 87.2\\ 92.2\\ 92.2\\ 95.1\\ 96.8\\ 97.9\\ 99.0\\ 99.0\\ 99.7\\ 100.0 \end{array}$
All ages, total	239, 368	100.0	

10 of this number were models of years prior to 1910.
 Less than ½10 of 1 percent.



FIGURE 11.—PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TRUCKS IN OPERA-TION IN 1932-33 BY AGE GROUPS.

1933 all trucks of the 1933 model are classified in the first age group as less than 1 year old. A 1932 model purchased in December of that year was not a year old at the latest date of this survey, but for the sake of simplicity and because the actual date of purchase of trucks was not known, all 1932 models were classified as 1 year old, and so on, for each of the other age groups. According to this classification, the median age, or an age so chosen that half the trucks are above and half below that age, is 3 years, 53 percent of all trucks being not more than 3 years old. The average life of a truck is probably about 5 years, although trucks depreciate more or less rapidly according to the nature of their construction and the kind of use to which they are put. Eighty percent of the trucks on New Jersey highways were not more than 5 years old. Ninety-nine percent of all trucks were not more than 12 years old, but a scattering of old-timers was observed, 4 trucks per 100,000 of those recorded being models of years prior to 1910.

NEEDED RESEARCH ON FLEXIBLE-TYPE BITUMINOUS **ROADS**¹

By E. F. KELLEY, Chief, Division of Tests, Bureau of Public Roads

I bituminous roads it will be well to define first what is meant by the word "flexible." It is a term which is quite generally applied to road surfaces, without much regard to its exact meaning, to designate those types which have little or no flexural strength, as contrasted with the truly rigid types which have high flexural strength. Thus, a flexible-type surface may not be flexible in the true sense of the word but all surfaces of this type have the common characteristic of low beamstrength. Also, they have the ability, in varying degree, to adjust themselves to minor settlements without structural failure.

The function of a bituminous road surface of the flexible type is to carry the wheel loads of vehicles without failure of the bituminous wearing course, the base course, or the subgrade. These three component parts of a flexible type bituminous road are interdependent and the characteristics of each affect the performance of the whole.

MORE SATISFACTORY TESTS NEEDED FOR IDENTIFICATION OF BITUMINOUS MATERIALS

Subgrades.—During recent years great progress has been made in increasing our knowledge of soils and their use as subgrade materials. We have learned to differentiate with some precision between good subgrade soils and poor ones; we have learned something regarding frost action and the means for eliminating its detrimental effects; we are increasing our knowledge of the consolidation of fill materials; and, finally, we have learned much regarding the stabilization of soils, particularly by means of suitable combinations of soil materials. But soil science is still in its infancy and, in the larger sense, the research that is needed is barely under way. The possibilities of stabilization with admixtures of chemicals or bituminous materials are particularly promising.

Base courses.—What has been said with respect to subgrades is also generally applicable to base courses. Our knowledge of bases of the macadam type, which depend primarily on internal friction for stability, is largely the result of experience. But soil science, coupled with experience, has greatly extended our knowledge of the essential characteristics of such basecourse materials as sand-clay, gravel, limerock, and caliche. Here, also, the possibilities of stabilization with other than soil materials merit careful investigation

Bituminous wearing courses.—In bituminous wearing courses, as in subgrades and base courses, stability or resistance to lateral displacement is an essential characteristic. But here we have a part of the road structure in which other qualities are of increased importance. The wearing course is subjected to the direct action of traffic and weather. Adequate strength and durability of the mineral aggregate and durability of the bituminous binder are necessary.

Numerous investigations have developed valuable information regarding stability as affected by character

IN INTRODUCING a discussion of flexible-type | and grading of mineral aggregate and character and quantity of bituminous binder. Further research on these materials is needed. The development of a test for stability, preferably a simple one, that will simulate the action of a paving mixture under wheel loads, would go far toward solving some of the questions that now confront the engineer.

> With respect to mineral aggregates, much has already been learned regarding strength characteristics and durability, but further work remains to be done. The relative affinity of aggregates for water and for bitumen is a characteristic that has not yet received the attention it deserves.

> The present question of pressing importance in the field of bituminous surfacing has to do with the durability of the bituminous material itself. The large programs of highway construction, involving a large mileage of the low-cost type, have focused attention on a problem that previously has not been of great concern.

> It is known that some bituminous materials lack durability or resistance to weathering. In the road surface they soon lose their cementing properties and the friable mixture which results may fail rapidly under traffic. In the absence of a definite method of differentiating between good and poor materials, specification writers are now requiring compliance with test requirements which are primarily for the identification of the source of the material. While these requirements may exclude certain poor materials, they are so little a measure of quality that they may also exclude materials that are known to be satisfactory. There appears to be needed an accelerated weathering test which can be made in a few hours. Research on suitable test methods is under way and should be continued.

> Inference should not be made that bituminous materials of low resistance to weathering are necessarily valueless. With a full realization of their limitations, economic considerations may sometimes dictate their use in preference to more expensive materials. It may be possible to use them advantageously in mixtures that are protected by weather-resistant wearing courses. However, we must have some means of identifying them so that they may not be used improperly.

RATIONAL METHOD FOR DESIGNING FLEXIBLE SURFACES NEEDED

The road structure.—We have learned much, both from practical experience and from research, regarding the design of the component parts of the flexible-type road. Concerning the design of the road structure as a whole we know very little except what has been taught us by experience. For roads of the rigid type the analyses of Westergaard, supplemented by research, have given us the basis for a rational theory of design applicable to concrete pavements. For roads of the flexible type no rational method of design exists and rule-of-thumb methods are still used. Attempts have been made to develop a rational theory but these are based on questionable assumptions of such far-reaching importance that they can scarcely be accepted without verification by further research.

From the structural standpoint, the function of a pavement of the flexible type is to distribute the wheel

¹ Presented before Highway Research Board on Dec. 7, 1934, as an introduction to symposium on flexible-type bituminous roads.

load to the subgrade in such manner that the intensity of pressure will cause neither permanent nor elastic deformations of the soil sufficient in magnitude to produce failure of the pavement surface. The rational design of a pavement to perform this function requires a knowledge of the mechanics of load support. The characteristics of the applied loads, the magnitude and distribution of the forces of subgrade reaction, and the physical behavior of the pavement under these two sets of forces must be determined.

This problem is of outstanding importance. Its complicated nature is indicated by the following brief analysis of some of its details.

The more important variables which must be considered are:

1. The magnitude of the load.

2. The position of the load on the pavement.

3. The area of load application and the distribution of pressure over the loaded area.

4. The time duration of loading.

5. The thickness of the pavement (base course plus wearing course).

6. The internal stability of both base and wearing courses.

7. The distribution of pressure on the subgrade.

8. The supporting power of the subgrade.

The vehicle load, which is important in the design of any pavement, is known to be the maximum wheel load. Within resaonable limits the maximum wheel load likely to operate over a given road can be determined. This, of course, is the maximum static load and must be considered since heavy vehicles may stop on the highway surface for considerable periods of time. The impact forces produced by the wheels of moving vehicles must also be considered since these are greater than the forces due to static wheel loads and may exceed them many times. Researches extending back over the past 15 years make it possible to predict, with a fair degree of accuracy, the magnitude and frequency of the impact reactions that may be expected for specific conditions of wheel load, tire equipment, vehicle speed and road roughness.

The position of the applied load on the pavement is also a factor which must be considered. A load applied near the free edge of the pavement will have a different effect from that of one applied in the interior portion where continuity exists. Rational design requires that there be equal resistance to load in all parts of the structure and this can be obtained only by systematic study of the mechanics of pavement action.

The area of load application and the distribution of pressure over the loaded area are two separate though related factors. The effect of the area of load application has been quite thoroughly investigated with respect to the design of concrete pavement slabs. It seems quite probable that not only the size but the shape of the loaded area may be an even more important factor in its relation to flexible pavements. The effect of variations in intensity of pressure over the loaded area is also a detail which must be investigated.

Between standing or static loads, slowly rolling loads, and suddenly applied impact forces there is a difference in time duration which is probably quite important in flexible-type pavements. For example, under certain conditions it is very probable that a standing vehicle of given wheel load may subject the pavement to a more severe condition than will the same vehicle moving at speed and producing impact reactions greatly exceeding the static wheel load. Certainly the factor of time

duration of the load application is one of the important details to be investigated in the development of a rational method of design.

The ultimate object in developing a theory of design is the determination of the required thickness of pavement. The supporting power of the flexible-type pavement is intimately related to its thickness, and researches designed to develop basic principles will necessarily include thickness as one of the variables of major importance.

ONLY FRAGMENTARY INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON LOAD DISTRIBUTION

The stability of the base course and the bituminous wearing course have already been mentioned. Stability in the wearing course is necessary to prevent surface failures such as shoving and rutting. Stability in the base course is necessary for the distribution of load to the subgrade. The combined stability of these two component parts of the road structure is another one of the major variables that will require intensive study. It appears that one of the important problems to be solved is the development of a suitable method for measuring this combined stability in road surfaces.

The distribution of load to the subgrade is doubtless affected by all the variables that have been mentioned as well as by the elastic characteristics of the subgrade itself. Only fragmentary information exists regarding load distribution, and very comprehensive investigations will be required to evaluate the many variables involved.

Assuming that research has solved all the problems that have been enumerated thus far, there is still the problem of determining the supporting power of the subgrade. The supporting power of a soil, or its resistance to distortion under load, is dependent on the resisting forces of internal friction and cohesion. The relative importance of each and the net result of their combined action varies widely, depending upon conditions. Subgrade research has already suggested means for increasing the load-carrying ability of soils. Needed in the development of methods of pavement design is some test which, when applied to a given subgrade, will determine the pressure intensity that can safely be imposed on the soil.

Past investigations of the bearing capacity of soils have related primarily to the foundations of buildings or other structures in which dead load is the principal burden. Therefore, the theories which have been developed from these investigations may not be applicable to pavements, where the conditions differ in two important respects. Under a structure the load is practically constant, while under a payement the transient live load is the principal burden on the soil. Furthermore, under buildings it is permissible to anticipate foundation settlements which, if they occurred under a wheel load, would cause pavement failure. For these reasons, the requirements of a test to determine the safe bearing capacity of subgrades may be somewhat different from those of a test to determine the bearing capacity of soils in deep foundations.

It is apparent that the flexible-type bituminous road offers a fertile field for future research. The experience of the past few years justifies the expectation that further rapid progress will be made in advancing our knowledge of subgrades, bases and bituminous wearing courses. The most urgent need is for research aimed at the development of a rational method of design of the road structure as a whole.

ROADSIDE PLANTING SURVIVES DROUGHT

By J. M. HALL, Landscape Engineer, Iowa State Highway Commission

Iowa highways during the spring of 1934, financed with funds provided by the National Recovery Act. The Iowa highway commission selected as the first project a section of Primary Road No. 15 extending north from Ames 32 miles to the junction with US 20 at Blairsburg. This road had recently been constructed and for the greater part of its length has a 100foot right-of-way.

The general plan for grading and planting is an informal development tending to restore the natural character of the Iowa countryside. Backslopes and ditches were rounded; unsightly refuse dumps were eliminated; and several varieties of native trees, shrubs, and vines were planted. It is hoped that the final result will be an attractive roadside, blending with the adjacent topography and with existing plants.

Surveys, plans, and estimates were prepared in Feb-ruary and March 1934 and preliminary clearing and grubbing were started early in March prior to the completion of plans.

Planting began about May 1, immediately upon arrival of the nursery material. All stock was inspected in the nursery before contracts were awarded, and checked again upon delivery. Native Iowa peat was used as a fertilizer and mulch on the entire project.

The possibility of a dry spring and summer seemed to warrant the use of a liberal amount of peat. No accurate record was kept of the amount of peat used, but a conservative estimate is that 30 percent of the backfill was peat which was mixed with the existing soil; in addition a 2-inch layer of peat was used for mulching. The shade and flowering trees were given a close pruning to cut down moisture loss by transpiration. These two treatments, together with two complete waterings, were probably the determining factors in saving these plants through the period of drought. It is interesting to note that even after dust storms and extremely hot winds there was a sufficient supply of moisture around the plant roots 2 weeks after watering.

The preliminary survey revealed that the majority of plants would necessarily be located in areas stripped of topsoil. Because of the poor soil, late planting, and possible dry weather it was thought that plant loss might run as high as 25 percent. The spacing between plants was therefore made somewhat smaller than other-wise would have been made. The results show the plant losses to be approximately as estimated with the exception of losses of the shade trees and evergreens. These two kinds of trees survived the adverse conditions better than was expected, contrary to the usual experience in this part of the country. The use of labor unfamiliar with planting work caused some difficulty and probably resulted in some losses that otherwise could have been avoided. Table 1 shows the varieties planted and the percentage of survival at the end of the growing season last fall.

On delivery from the nursery all plants, with the exception of balled and burlapped trees, were puddled in a thick clay loam mixture and then heeled in. Each plant was watered in the temporary nursery and again puddled before being dispatched to the planting forces. A covered truck was used for transportation to the used in planting seem to merit their continued use.

OADSIDE IMPROVEMENT was first initiated on site of planting to prevent drying, as the wind was unusually hot and dry at planting time. An effort was made to order only sufficient material from the heeling in nursery each day for 1 day's planting to avoid carrying unplanted stock over-night. Watering was done with two tank trucks. Each truck was equipped with a hand-operated force pump between tank and hose, and the hose was fitted with a 2-foot length of gas pipe for a nozzle. This nozzle was pushed down to the bottom of the original excavation and water was pumped until it soaked up to the surface. This method prevented the washing of large holes around the plant and made less work in renewing the mulch on top.

> TABLE 1.—Percentage of survival of plants at end of first growing season

	Number planted	Percent- age of survival
Shade trees (1 to 2 inches in diameter at planting): Sugar maple (acer saccharum) Hackberry (celtis occidentalis) White ash (fraxinus americana) Black walnut (juglans nigra) American sycamore (platanus occidentalis) Pin oak (quercus palustris)	82 115 27 36 66 78	100 88 96 72 92 80
A merican elm (ulmus americana) Evergreens (4 to 5 feet in height at planting): Scotch pine (pinus sylvestris) 1	536 15	91 93
White pine (pinus strobus) ¹ . Small flowering trees (2 to 5 feet in height at planting): Red bud (cercis canadensis).	3 190	100 100
Washington hawthorn (crataegus coccinea) ²	89 16 80 85 30	81 100 89 80 53
Flowering erab (malus floribunda) Prairie crab (malus ioensis) Wild plum (prunus americana) Purble plum (prunus pissardi)	50 355 40 173	26 48 96 74
Pussy willow (salix discolor). Laurel leaf willow (salix pentandra). Cathay cab (malus, oensis cathay). Shrubs:	172 75 15	41 16 87
Red dogwood (cornus alba sibirica)	$\begin{array}{c} 590\\ 10\\ 655\\ 175\\ 150\\ 730\\ 2,285\\ 405\\ 215\\ 125\\ 350\\ 145\\ 185\\ 2,647\\ 275\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 14\\ 0\\ 26\\ 7\\ 93\\ 77\\ 72\\ 72\\ 72\\ 79\\ 83\\ 78\\ 44\\ 95\\ 79\\ 62\\ 56\\ 56\end{array}$
Nannyberry (viburnum lentago).	215	24
virginia creeper (ampeiopsis quinquélolia) Bittersweet (celastrus orbiculatus) Matrimony vine (lycium chinense)	50 715 480	50 78 99

Balled and burlapped.
 About half received balled and burlapped.
 Collected stock.

In the fall all plants were pruned by an experienced workman. The plants are now in shape to start a directed growth and little maintenance will be required for another year.

Few conclusions can be drawn from the results shown to date. The plant varieties used will, in many instances, serve as experiments which will be helpful in planning future roadside work. This report deals only with experience with new planting during an abnormally dry year and is not indicative of general adaptability to roadside use. However, the care and methods

CURRENT STATUS OF UNITED STATES PUBLIC WORKS ROAD CONSTRUCTION

AS PROVIDED BY SECTION 204 OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY ACT (1934 FUNDS) AND BY THE ACT OF JUNE 18, 1934 (1935 FUNDS)

CLASS 1.--PROJECTS ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM OUTSIDE OF MUNICIPALITIES

	35 Works nds	1.715 0.526 0.748	6.857 7.774	9, 234 1,045 9,942	2.171 8.855 1.103	3,495 1.970	0.370 5.890 6.735	2,064 7,409 6,100	7.127 9.888 2.340	3,022	0,004 6,788 5,690	8,932 6,489 4,690	2,003 6,4497 6,115	5.247 1.395 6.659	3.111 7.278 0.358	1,926 6,856 0,985	6,271 5,807 6,308	8,778	6,473
FUNDS AV EW PROJEC	s Publi	*****	1,1	1,0	1,25	9	~	0 ma	0.4.4	~ m-	indt in	1,1	04.4	t.0	1,6	ິ N N	20.01		19,9
BALANCE OF FOR N	1934 Public Work: Funds	\$ 18,924 21,806 108,037	19.265	362 24,811 107,992	9,477 27,255 100,217	40,411 37,661 17,842	18,459 37,459 193,536	38,434 26,661 44,021	73,735 68,886 15,377	11, 149 35,117	9.279	353,955 142,239 142,569	3,263 140,062 86,562	33.535 97.925 72.614	29,078 35,866 5,318	7,901 89,111 33,482	50,255 50,379 2,809	6,791	2,483,205
CTION	Milcage	19.3 17.8 15.9	28.8 6.7 1.8	д, 31.0	8.8 18.2 129.9	25.5 13.0 37.2	15.3 6.8	10.1 37.6 69.9	61.5 17.7 36.4	15.6 42.9	3.0	25.3 291.2 11.4	5.7	•7 •1 137.1	7.7 98.4	5.4 25.7	9.2 31.1 62.6		1.407.4
FOR CONSTRUC	1935 Public Works Funds	\$ 422.187 249.673 384.472	667,585 172,487 126,327	67,730 385,213	86,565 952,525 1,991,746	484,574 365,819 532,536	421,633 204,636	538,520 990,550 595,121	911,917 368,429 326,627	229,004 315,883 18,673	466, 246 374, 950	244,600 537,494 427,500	151,103 26,403 675,357	25,194 1,637 875,077	244,625 1,329,523 8,000	166,538 193,721 80,535	286,931 615,848 293,125		18,834,839
APPROVED	1934 Public Works Funds	\$ 57.928 39.563	18,307	8,734 58,578	25,000 36,045 58,760	21,000	45,353 17,142 39,135		102,503	11,046 92,734		184,337 65,172 93,600	5,228	20,920 125,166	48,798	123,412	134,828		1,436,900
	Milcage	133.0 73.8 74.5	122.1 95.3 21.7	6.8 35.7 129.1	37+0 51+3 52+7	121.9 164.2 58.1	15.5 13.5 21.5	9.2 126.2 125.1	136.5 77.1 173.3	92.3 97.6 12.5	18.0 96.6 136.9	150.1 138.8 59.3	101.8 60.2 86.3	13.6 71.1 186.5	46.3 348.1 61.6	13.9 65.7 29.5	20.0 59.0 162.0	27.2	4,030.0
RUCTION	1935 Public Works Funds	# 840,130 903.326 791.679	1,897,200 1,736,717 1,53,399	274,891 727,825 1,161,590	425.881 879.391 523.839	1,634,873 1,781,320 329,247	738,415 563,118 206,358	1,858,325 1,858,325 683,012	875,532 1,624,109 1,762,011	1,656,146 585,899 422,874	105,129 1,101,806 2,829,030	428,862 244,802 2,587,065	1,557,777 1,280,914 3,611,625	414,131 462,445 185.542	1,083,566 3,844,088 502,487	249,114 1,423,549 1,005,609	426,074 856,992 1,008,808		50,988,812
UNDER CONST	1934 Public Works Funds	\$ 733,587 159,724 798,211	957,601 67,121 608,934	194,891 1,407,053	171.151 2,421.646 1,639,608	390,400 56,400 363,396	820,107 239,455 758,097	1, 348, 200 179, 056	916,171 1,065,079 4,129	23,149 91,948 79,730	1,472,042 85,700 1,844,670	684, 321 52,853	706,289 10,790 1,108,705	46,205 371,161 588,537	236,562 363,560 84,632	10,670 153,288 164,108	111,669 239,442 209,202	1,438,169	25,830,106
	Estimated Total Cost	\$ 2,173,060 1,105,498 1,855,221	4,123,249 1,913,760 1,324,901	287.746 972.872 2,603.644	614.395 3.301.037 2,164.158	2,138,416 1,838,085 762,859	2,072,324 802,573 964,455	546,799 3,221,325 913,868	2,534,648 2,910,307 1,835,098	2,069,944 677,847 524,341	1,766,328 1,258,400 7,889,958	1,388,466 370.290 2,913,930	2,446,342 1,366,101 4,936,181	542,465 833,606 795,486	1,416,530 4,396,559 797,662	277.219 1.673.721 1.630.765	554.635 1.195.677 1.244.177	1.838.793	87,785,721
	Mileage	311.7 299.0 154.8	277.5 185.1 14.5	42.1 115.8 252.9	186.0 38.2 106.1	288.6 577.7 244.3	75.1 43.8 15.3	37.4 223.4 869.6	230.7 187.9 1426.3	366.£ 272.1 10.8	31.6 297.5 211.6	1,023.9 192.4	290.6 182.8 123.2	20.5 198.2 458.5	182.7 998.1 237.8	47.9 151.6 99.4	71.2 213.1 488.4	12.4	11,965.0
ED	1935 Public Works Funds	\$ 35.889 75.187 137.100	515.300	177-572	107,2 94 19,269	54,420 206,992 33,571	16+517	1,198,010	87,605 473,230	131,852	128,175 168,930	207,673 60,698	61,708 8,928 100,985	146.543	64,152 27,364 365,500	28,464 28,568 196,077	60,892 3.324 228,127		5,109,925
COMPLET	1934 Public Works Funds	\$ 3,137,314 3,697.024 2,388.356	6,955,132 3,332,568 795,279	868,470 2,249,668 3,471,969	1,961.230 1,957.517 3,220,336	4,597,019 1,950,741 3,349,367	1,826,216 1,323,504 791,495	1,010,595 4,676,672 4,337,933	2.,396.927 4.103.568 4.444.343	2,868,837 2,689,588 612,389	1,691,699 2,760,948 8,528,190	3,538,534 2,641,961 7,041,589	3.893.618 3.002.596 5.493.801	899.627 2.239.577 2.219.422	3,931,870 11,189,217 2,277,255	909.613 3.342.567 2.558.858	1,851,481 4,272,869 2,038,652	248,384	155,586,385
	Total Cost	\$ 5.788.947 4.371.570 2.994.549	9.264,016 3.950.311 797.612	1.052.795 3.076.359 3.669.629	2.134.554 1.994.217 3.261.636	4,814,486 5,326,052 3,621,058	1,831,624 1,358,189 808,265	1,403,571 4,819,084 5,652,988	4,466,193 4,641,195 5,463,559	5.102.140 2.878.778 638.684	1,711,231 3,033,052 10,438,447	4,597,102 3,130,825 7,439,668	4,050,182 3,293,723 5,820,309	968,005 2,299,905 2,729,908	4,618,926 11,732,477 2,768,227	970.709 3.600.369 2.776.537	1,930,305 4,398,085 2,435,315	344, 446	180,269,814
IMENTS	Act of June 18, 1934 (1935 Fund)	\$ 2,129,921 1,338,712 1,714,000	3.713.643 2.424.504 607.500	461,697 1,116,600 2,556,745	1,131,910 3,060,041 2,816,687	2,217,361 2,354,131 1,527,324	1, 380, 419 793, 644 289, 609	1,632,874 3,226,284 2,642,244	2,832,182 2,132,426 2,714,208	1,982,182 1,350,356 484,731	951.379 1.676.769 3.748,600	2,040,068 1,469,484 3,539,256	2, 342,590 1,452,741 4,554,082	464,572 1,385,477 1,523,821	2,105,1453 6,858,253 1,066,345	466,042 1,882,693 1,553,206	1,140,167 1,751.970 1,686.368	598.778	640.063.46
APPORTIO	Sec. 204 of the Act of June 16, 1933 (1934 Fund)	\$ 3.947.753 3.878.555 3.334.167	7.912.928 3.437.265 1.404.213	877,566 2,469,370 5,045,592	2,166,858 4,442,467 5,018,921	5,027,830 5,044,802 3,751,605	2,710,135 1,617,560 1,782,263	1,101,716 6,051,532 4,561,011	3,489,337 5,237,532 4,463,849	3,914,481 2,909,387 692,119	3,173,019 2,846,648 10,465,672	4, 761, 147 2,902, 224 7, 277, 758	4,608,399 3,053,448 6,691,194	979,367 2,729,583 3,005,739	4, 246, 309 11, 588, 643 2, 367, 205	928,164 3,708,379 3,057,934	2,013,405 4,697,513 2,250,663	1,693.344	185.336.596
	STATE	Alabama Arizona Arkansas	California Colorado Connecticut	Delaware	Idaho	Iowa	Louisiana	Massachusetts	Mississippi Missouri Montana	Nebraska	New Jersey New Mexico New York	North Carolina North Dakota Ohio	Oregon Oregon Pennsylvania	Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota	Tennessee Texas. Utah	Vermont	West Virginia	District of Columbia Hawaii	TOTALS

1935 Public Works Funds BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR NEW PROJECTS 176.668 358.904 991.063 121.850 ,405.778 41,412 132.765 149.668 56.699 201.065 279.977 344.931 111.546 111.556 111.555 442.779 218.546 634.275 113,240 565,794 618,506 665,790 ,244,427 150,915 55.134 314.231 159.871 469,968 339,785 12,500 17,070 785,408 267,886 421,439 539.328 245,016 291,106 .286,224 .081,306 688,616 550,079 399.785 333.539 452.515 571.587 215,292 870,258 21.538.100 1934 Public Works Funds 32.318 54.647 132.271 26.552 87.574 96.143 30,719 197 63,158 60.634 141.278 248.444 10.960 170.189 550 1,153 5,795 29,713 238,365 46.786 15.166 535.925 86,453 119,729 24,120 47,417 24,744 91.013 1,686 147.751 27.549 141.583 \$ 47.255 141.604 29.185 14,909 24,663 4,332 127 61,498 181,279 12,053 43,983 21,790 3.076.488 AS PROVIDED BY SECTION 204 OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY ACT (1934 FUNDS) AND BY THE ACT OF JUNE 18, 1934 (1935 FUNDS) Milcage 11.5 29.0 6.0 3.4 3.6 6.5 .4 4.9 • # 4.5 23.1 4.6 5.5 1.40 2.2 6.6 11.0 1.2 1.2 7.3 2.6 13.8 2.9 2.6 11.6 261.7 1.7 APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION CLASS 2.--PROJECTS ON EXTENSIONS OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM INTO AND THROUGH MUNICIPALITIES 1935 Public Works Funds 95,119 65,196 40,139 359,532 108,192 290,143 191,720 170,138 607,200 36,796 2,156 608,346 947,178 474.385 441.588 192.738 174,807 223,765 223,700 146,992 227,303 69,432 ,242,050 386.851 210.187 429.390 530,421 281,669 103.764 142.044 222,337 364,166 135,000 72,008 712,101 10,287 12,630,725 342.738 980 39. CURRENT STATUS OF UNITED STATES PUBLIC WORKS ROAD CONSTRUCTION 1934 Public Works Funds 96,952 271,045 518 33,889 22,715 95,770 106.005 123.176 5.130 80.542 57,163 63,000 14,950 283,775 23,343 25,051 3.957 2,282,352 1,000 170,504 9,237 28.935 £22.9 162,272 \$ 101. 129. 12.5 23.8 12.0 14.5 6.3 4.8 6.0 8.9 24.2 439.9 Milcage 3.2 22.6.51 11.8 13.5 6.1 14.6 8.2 17.2 9.1 7.1 16.6 4.5 56.4 3.9 2.5 ¢, 28.2 1.6 6.9 1.7 10.3 5.4 12.6 1.5 11.5 6.2 6.570 74.749 116.330 52.246 1,069.750 207.518 109,358 146,476 31,541 367,714 49,331 131,613 370.289 75.250 ,423.860 179,928 357,482 294,105 141.760 23.180 1.192 77.285 268.150 347.239 109,414 28,309 92,849 1,072,832 176,594 137,740 25,221 621,266 107,823 140.914 975.460 211.760 169,968 381.132 180.097 .870.240 233,663 186,407 181,357 14,816 281,052 6,629 1935 Public Works Funds 13,128,461 UNDER CONSTRUCTION \$ 671.058 20,500 379.392 1,593,239 1,152,876 774.302 275.108 492.577 861.500 47.071 98.129 3,086,851 1412,750 172,113 729.905 1,690.009 34.716 184,907 142,175 226,500 456.168 66.635 480.091 286,289 423.730 1.826.520 124,000 97,248 486,618 32,500 426.725 113.026 120.070 250,164 1934 Public Works Funds 789,009 977.161 118 71.559 764.347 193.167 .864.756 24,054,088 OF MARCH 31, 1935 nated Total Cost 780,472 58,592 472,541 2,174,878 176,594 137,740 6,570 74,749 1,093,491 2.214.505 1.260.877 976.612 1,410,724 709,298 1.058.149 47.071 911.650 3,164,075 1,520,400 387,831 884,821 1,882,322 90,811 367.832 49.331 203.382 1,260,270 373,264 3,943,331 593, 591 217,425 639.282 1412.749 .863.552 141.760 309.469 114.329 657.393 2.177.881 321.105 185,602 961,195 379,739 467,074 394,078 127,280 250,164 454.292.68 Sati Milcage 46.7 35.9 10.3 18.7 19.4 63.1 60.6 53.8 38.8 31.4 25.4 50.6 33.2 36.2 36.2 15.9 21.0 75.3 43.1 57.8 40.6 28.0 55.0 7.4 33.2 11.9 25.6 34.8 16.5 52.3 22.3 1,710.1 17.6 16.4 12.3 38.8 108.1 23.1 110.1 20.2 6.5 38.5 AS 1935 Public Works Funds 131,080 54.054 104.400 27,695 15,000 18,167 10,281 88,130 68.823 13,293 1.582.075 299,400 38,551 168 65.900 226,390 47,610 28,077 \$ 8,996 13,406 7,085 2,643 COMPLETED \$ 1.570.269 613.556 1.454.881 3.410.067 1.693.970 798.075 460,282 1,398,151 1,120,140 5,771,026 2,878,912 1,839,170 2,203,065 1,371,099 679,010 833,094 384,134 1,873,562 3,057,771 3,003,452 644.536 2,186,421 1.032,075 1,945,069 456,068 668,776 2,327,022 1,384,181 6,294,762 2,051,298 1,013,147 4,018,173 1.817.313 1.459.374 3.277.850 518,991 1.011,509 1.045,519 1.582.459 4.522.978 649.146 1,233,053 1,913,253 886,610 ,438,534 ,005,262 1934 Public Works Funds 86.380.559 696,281 \$ 1.570.382 627.286 1.553.688 1,926,082 2,227,367 1,395,790 3.955.814 1.764.404 809.564 516.399 1.676.174 1.497.427 1,162,117 5,922,535 2,943,189 1.915.107 3.240.199 3.235.674 685,196 2,256,778 1,039,847 907.870 2,496,191 1.008,227 680,143 839,187 390,127 2,101,399 479,965 726,187 2,457,304 1,384,181 7,018,668 2.097.487 1.020.031 4.528,865 1.882.766 1.496.763 3.512.419 519.889 1.013.288 1.045.688 419,125 1.331.616 2.012,160 1.597.471 4,630.666 778,624 922,671 91.219.997 Cost **Fotal** \$ 1,064,961 305,191 857,025 230,849 501,200 ,278,373 7444.560 490.045 452.515 1,210,236 734,742 2,359,503 255,000 692,738 761,911 321,126 2,515,835 2,136,306 1,311,000 1,432,949 954,578 847,600 1,613,142 1,421,494 354.022 1.617.451 113.092 991,091 100,000 242,366 1,809,500 529,506 3,756,621 1,171,295 867,977 2,397,703 1,121,790 1,795,000 533,173 240.611 941.347 776.603 570,085 ..348,513 29,416 243,460 5003 48,879,361 Act of June 18, 1934 (1935 Fund) 190, 190, 1426, APPORTIONMENTS Sec. 204 of the Act of June 16, 1933 (1934 Fund) \$ 2,389,928 807,982 1,964,534 1.708.577 909.878 891.132 1,744,669 4,019,501 1,115,962 1,957,240 500,051 740,335 2.304.200 1.526.724 4.854.988 1.342.270 2.596.143 1.125.332 4,213,986 1,718,633 802,407 1,459,648 2,724,620 1.197.829 7.476.075 4.287.050 2,614,472 2,522,401 1,927,828 5,007,199 3,500,638 3,719,143 3,117,921 1,674,158 8,255,661 2,380,573 1,451,112 4,335,686 579.625 2,123,155 6,642,863 778,826 500.509 2.008.458 1.977.260 968.235 115.793.487 District of Columbia Massachusetts... Michigan..... Minnesota North Carolina. North Dakota Ohio Rhode Island.... South Carolina. South Dakota... STATE Nebraska Nevada New Hampshir Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania TOTALS. New Jersey.... New Mexico... New York.... California Colorado Connecticut. West Virginia Vermont Virginia Washington. Mississippi Missouri Montana.... Louisiana Maine Maryland Delaware.. Florida.... Towa. Kansas Kentucky Tennessee... Texas..... Utah..... Wisconsin. Wyoming. Alabama... Arizona.... Arkansas. Idalfo Illinois Indiana

CURRENT STATUS OF UNITED STATES PUBLIC WORKS ROAD CONSTRUCTION

AS PROVIDED BY SECTION 204 OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY ACT (1934 FUNDS) AND BY THE ACT OF JUNE 18, 1934 (1935 FUNDS)

CLASS 3.-PROJECTS ON SECONDARY OR FEEDER ROADS

| | | and the second se

 | and the second division of the second divisio | | |

 |
 | | | | | | |
 | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--
--
--
---	--
--
--
---|--|--|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|--
--|--|---|---|---|--|
| NDS AVAILABLE
PROJECTS | 1935
Public Works
Funds | \$ 324,803
338,143
473,185

 | 889,569
46,072
185,099 | 39,813
92,466
1,033,613
 | 238,476
14,290 | 12,925

 | 263,923
7,920
466,351 | 754.630
12,817
266.303 | 252,283
557,340
79,007 | 80,152
311,442
24,909 | 348,037
98,759
190,571 | 207.234
473.816
573.933 | 293,457
601
137,603
 | 82,438
569,839 | 520.476
909.975
47.645 | 37
267,554
82,680 | 349,876
644,237
217,526 | 219,039
351,000
 | 13,351,864 |
| BALANCE OF FU
FOR NEW | 1934
Public Works
Funds | \$68.444
68.378

 | 1,701 | 27,182
176,719
 | 16,707
4,285
27,421 | 57.010
14.731

 | 3,907
2,478 | 18,444
16,370
17,321 | 52,416
48
77,413 | 43.224
43.224 | 29,559 | 27.530
62.173
85.778 | 2,874
 | 40,014
48,881 | 75,075 | 2,078
30,315 | 5,193
16,269
40,267 | *
 | 1,184,364 |
| CTION | Miléage | 21.7
27.5
17.4

 | 21.3
8.1 | 22.4
17.6
 | 7.8
53.1
11.5 | 158.9
19.6
70.8

 | 27.4
•7
9•5 | 5.5
52.7
21.1 | 27.1
183.8
34.6 | 11.9
28.3
3.4 | 1.7
18.4 | 42.0
130.3
13.5 | 8.8
10.4
14.6
 | 7.6 | 3.9
89.5
20.6 | 8.0
38.3
12.0 | 1.7
142.6
29.9 | π.
 | 1.523.6 |
| FOR CONSTRU | 1935
Public Works
Funds | \$ 303.770
318.360
179.612

 | 442,178
244,625 | 493,061
113,485
 | 70,156
1,311,814
121,680 | 679.300
1443.529
1454.997

 | 481,555
16,526
355,208 | 115,370
899,525
116,545 | 101.740
914.384
327.939 | 91,040
170,922
57,479 | 111,963
184,277
1,039,550 | 296,409
240,629
703,270 | 182,048
119,430
399,232
 | 46,021
93,820 | 139,129
1.213,663
152,355 | 111,102
265,289
344,673 | 59,141
826,770
207,128 | ° 65.390
 | 15,631,089 |
| APPROVED | 1934
Public Works
Funds | \$ 5,473

 | | 33,125
 | 9,848 | 28,200
27,493

 | 128,782
25,953 | | 87,197
39,613 | | | 165,596 |
 | 35,170 | 4.504 | 8,850 | 25,237
68,000 |
 | 693,041 |
| | Mileage | 96.1
27.6
56.8

 | 37.1
145.2
16.4 | 33.0
25.7
60.1
 | 52.5
298.4
43.4 | 205.1
80.9
112.1

 | 17.6
20.9
24.1 | 41.5
115.0 | 58.2
182.3
141.0 | 74.5
20.4 | 67.9
186.6 | 143.4
85.3
92.3 | 87.2
51.0
206.4
 | 6.7
120.6
102.7 | 57.0
141.6
65.5 | 8.4
35.2
40.7 | 20.6
15.1
12.9 | 3+8
 | 3,445.7 |
| RUCTION | 1935
Public Works
Funds | \$ 436.388
279.107
204.227

 | 667,456
505,358
235,769 | 118, 329
1458, 016
131, 275
 | 459,147
2,033,711 | 787.975
819.857
865.149

 | 93.475
256.412
246.375 | 684, 400
910, 050 , | 818,570
490,934 | 672,110
218,290
82,590 | 417,698
2,564,490 | 1,086,994
20,297
678,850 | 695,789
627,732
2,014,101
 | 212.563
646.718
50.100 | 416,143
1,509,361
218,373 | 113,646
399,751
342,156 | 161,065
321,763
72,591 | 315,899
 | 25,361,050 |
| UNDER CONST | 1934
Public Works
Funds | \$ 953, 1411
9,030
267, 263

 | 110,000
110,000
198,838 | 262.563
810,729
 | 3.603.673
310,433 | 396,650
381,253
107,202

 | 319.555
172.531 | 341.727
155.444 | 750,282 | 29,000 | 36,931
625,700 | 215,387
310,175
73,810 | 582,509
19.526
1,145,021
 | 255,654
320,417 | 729,642
270,911
92,945 | 123,775
36,153 | 386,859
202,460
27,126 |
 | 15,625,158 |
| | Estimated Total
Cost | \$ 1,389,829
330,329
472,332

 | 1.284.274
947.720
740.403 | 381,126
458,016
942,004
 | 477,984
5.637,384
310,433 | 1, 348, 910
1, 201, 110
988, 618

 | 413,030
277,470
418,906 | 1,041,027 | 750,282
1,059.762
1490.934 | 672,110
218,290
114,607 | 454,629
3,989,410 | 1, 331, 929
330, 472
757, 760 | 1, 442, 619
687, 640
3, 222, 796
 | 212.563
941,408
370.517 | 1,145,785
1,780,272
387,521 | 118,931
534,709
389,538 | 547,924
580,381
99,718 | 315,899
 | 43,206,904 |
| | Milcage | 77.2
51.3
140.1

 | 164.3
189.0
3.1 | 26.7
74.8
97.0
 | 156.1
133.5
44.2 | 318.2
214.0
210.0

 | 45.3
87.4
52.1 | 15.2
205.6
256.9 | 99.5
602.8
229.9 | 402.5
148.6
28.4 | 212.9
83.8 | 224.2
280.1
298.6 | 224.8
113.2
544.0
 | 33.2
113.1
338.0 | 111.8
756.6
185.6 | 37.2
210.8
63.7 | 42.0
170.4 | 10.8
4.9
 | 8,291.1 |
| ED. | 1935
Public Works
Funds | \$ 62,422

 | 75, WI 7 | 72.707
 | 56,671 | 109,800
67,209
16,263

 | 147,039 | 16,400
68,916 | 133.569 | 147.789
151.347
77.387 | 34,691
28,089 | 10,200 | 29.332
88.067
 | 48,151 | 114,800 | 16.569
8.753
7.095 | 48,583 | 130.054
 | 1,886,587 |
| COMPLET | 1934
Public Works
Funds | \$ 1.034.114
516.393
1.108.519

 | 2,984,134
1,608,632
160,282 | 218,550
1,275,634
1,300,400
 | 1,104,855
2,034,422
39 ^h ,018 | 1,931,498
2,113,655
1,715,993

 | 957,635
840,001
692,648 | 469,741
2,825,960
2,203,650 | 854.774
2,687,673
1,782,524 | 1,956,988
1,093,255
147,963 | 55,099
1,235,198
2,953,509 | 2,137,656
913,168
3,711,559 | 1,718,816
1,507,131
6,199,801
 | 399,703
1,060,256
1,147,283 | 1,313,934
5,694,644 | 436,802
1.536,980
1.044,520 | 701.270
2.144.491
1.057.939 | 950,234
177,718
 | 75.367.354 |
| | Total Cost | \$ 1,035,011
592,872
1,111,962

 | 3,583,430
1,877,058
160,282 | 295,307
1,284,205
1,303,408
 | 1,330,051
2,054,913
395,321 | 2,101,503
2,190,456
1,825,311

 | 959,544
1,072,024
733,524 | 469,741
2,877,165
2,318,291 | 854.774
2.896.461
1.829.552 | 2,109,659
1,295,902
571,499 | 56,528
1,269,889
3,316,753 | 2,138,433
913,405
3,977,797 | 1,823,427
1,697,774
6,431,620
 | 409.735
1.060.256
1.195.457 | 1,369,700
6,170,005
1,194,178 | 474.394
1.598.958
1.075.591 | 733,482
2,311,887
1,152,941 | 1,080,288
178,209
 | 80, 759, 933 |
| IMENTS | Act of
June 18, 1934
(1935 Fund) | \$ 1,064,960
998,032
857,024

 | 1,999,203
871,502
420,868 | 230,849
1,043,543
1,278,373
 | 824,450
3.345,525
135,970 | 1,590,000
1,330,595
1,336,409

 | 838,953
427,897
1,067,934 | 870,000
1,613,142
1,361,813 | 2,423,863
2,423,863
942,434 | 991,091
852,000
242,365 | 460,000
735,425
3,822,700 | 1,590,637
734,741
1,966,253 | 1,171,295
777,096
2,639,003
 | 295,000
692,739
761,911 | 1,075,748
3,638,000
533,173 | 241,354
941,347
776,603 | 570.083
1.841.354
571.928 | 730,382
351,000
 | 56,230,590 |
| APPORTIO | Sec. 204 of the Act
of June 16, 1933
(1934 Fund) | * 2,032,452
525,423
1,449,634

 | 3,480,440
1,718,632
659,120 | 481,113
1,302,816
2,320,973
 | 1,121,562
5,652,228
731,872 | 2,413,358
2,522,401
1,837,926

 | 1,409,879
842,479
891,132 | 488, 185
3, 184, 057
2, 376, 415 | 1, 7µ4, 669
2, 923, 273
1, 859, 937 | 1.957.240
1.136.479
477.385 | 55.099
1.272.129
3.608.768 | 2,380,573
1,451,112
3,871,148 | 2, 304, 199
1, 526, 724
7, 344, 822
 | 439,716
1,364,791
1,502,870 | 2,123,155
6,012,518
1,048,677 | ^{1,58,880}
1,699,920
1,080,673 | 1,118,559
2,431,220
1,125,332 | 950.234
177.718
 | 92,869,917 |
| | STATE | Alabama
Arizona
Arkansas

 | California
Colorado
Connecticut | Delaware.
Florida
Georgia
 | Idaho
Illinois.
Indiana | Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky

 | Louisiana
Maine
Maryland | Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota | Mississippi
Missouri
Montana | Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire | New Jersey.
New Mexico
New York | North Carolina
North Dakota | Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
 | Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota | Tennessee Texas.
Utah | Vermont
Virginia
Washington | West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming | District of Columbia
Hawaii
 | TOTALS |
| | APPORTIONMENTS COMPLETED UNDER CONSTRUCTION APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTS | APPORTIONMENTS COMPLETED UNDER CONSTRUCTION APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE State Sec. 2046 fthe Art
(1935 Fund) Total Cost 1934
Public Works 1934
Public Works APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE State Sec. 2046 fthe Art
(1935 Fund) Total Cost 1935
Public Works 1935
Public Works Public Works <t< td=""><td>APORTIONMENTSCOMPLETEDUNDER CONSTRUCTIONAPPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTSSTATE
StrateStrate
(1934 Fund)APPROVEDAPPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTSSTATE
(1934 Fund)Strate (1934 Fund)APPROVED (1934 Fund)APPROVED (1934 Fund)BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTSBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTSStrate
(1934 Fund)Strate (1934 Fund)APPROVED (1934 Fund)APPROVED (1934 Fund)BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTSPablic WorksPablic WorksPablic WorksPablic WorksAlabama$\frac{5}{6}$ 2,025 Lapp
(1934 Fund)$\frac{1}{6}$ (1055 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)Alabama$\frac{5}{6}$ (1032 Lapp
(1034 ott)$\frac{1}{6}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)Alabama$\frac{5}{6}$ (1032 Lapp
(1111 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)Alabama$\frac{5}{6}$ (1022 Lapp
(1112 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)Alabama$\frac{5}{6}$ (1022 Lapp
(1112 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)Alabama$\frac{1}{7}$ (1034</td><td>APORTIONMENTSCOMPLETEDUNDER CONSTRUCTIONAPPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NUW PROJECTSSTATE
STATESt. 264 of the Art
(1934 Fund)June 16, 1333June 18, 1334June 18, 1334June 18, 1334BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NUW PROJECTSSTATE
of st. 264 of the Art
(1934 Fund)June 16, 1333June 18, 1334June 18, 1334June 18, 1334Plune 19, 1334</td></t<> <td>APPORTIONMENTSCOMPLETEDUNDER CONSTRUCTIONAPPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLESTATEStratea_{100} (1004 the Art of
(1004 Funds)a_{100} (1004 the
(1004 the Art of
(1004 the Art of)a_{100} (1004 the
(1004 the Art of
(1004 the Art of)a_{100} (1004 the
(1004 the
(1004 the Art of)a_{100} (1004 the
(1004 the
(1004</td> <td>AFATE
STATEAPPORTIONNENTSCONFLETTDUNDER CONSTRUCTIONAPPORTIONBALANCE OF PUNIS AVAILABLE
POINT CONTRUCTIONMALANCE OF PUNIS AVAILABLESTATE
StateSee 304 of the Adv
(1035 Puni)Mate of
(1035 Puni)Mate of
(1035 Puni)Malage
PunisPoint Vote
PunisAPPONED FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF PUNIS AVAILABLE
POINT CONTRUCTIONMALANCE OF PUNIS AVAILABLE
POINT CONTRUCTIONMALANCE OF PUNIS AVAILABLESTATE
(1034 Puni)Mate of
(1035 Puni)Mate of
(1035 Puni)Malage
PunisPoint Vote
PunisMalage
PunisPoint Vote
PunisPoint Vote
Punis<!--</td--><td>FIATE APPORTIONARIYE CONTRATION APPORTIONARIYE APPORTIONARIYE</td><td>FATAL APPROFINENTY CONTACTION MANAGGG WART MANAGGG WART</td><td>FATA APPOTTONENTY CONTRACTO ADACCCC PROPER VERTORIAL STATE PROPER VERTORIAL STATE<</td><td>FILT APPORTING CONTINUENTS CONTINUENTS CONTINUENTS APPORTING Partonic Partonic</td><td>Motor: Interface Amore: Interface Amore: Interface Amore: Interface Matter Interface</td><td></td><td>Image: constrained by the part of the part</td><td>Homemonia Amemonia Amemonia</td><td>Image: constrained by the state of the state o</td><td>International problem International problem Internation problem International problem</td><td>International problem (a) and the problem</td><td>Montania Montania Montania</td><td>Matrix Matrix Matrix</td></td> | APORTIONMENTSCOMPLETEDUNDER CONSTRUCTIONAPPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTSSTATE
StrateStrate
(1934 Fund)APPROVEDAPPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTSSTATE
(1934 Fund)Strate (1934 Fund)APPROVED (1934 Fund)APPROVED (1934 Fund)BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTSBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTSStrate
(1934 Fund)Strate (1934 Fund)APPROVED (1934 Fund)APPROVED (1934 Fund)BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NEW PROJECTSPablic WorksPablic WorksPablic WorksPablic WorksAlabama $\frac{5}{6}$ 2,025 Lapp
(1934 Fund) $\frac{1}{6}$ (1055 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)Alabama $\frac{5}{6}$ (1032 Lapp
(1034 ott) $\frac{1}{6}$ (1034 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)Alabama $\frac{5}{6}$ (1032 Lapp
(1111 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)Alabama $\frac{5}{6}$ (1022 Lapp
(1112 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)Alabama $\frac{5}{6}$ (1022 Lapp
(1112 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott) $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 ott)Alabama $\frac{1}{7}$ (1034 | APORTIONMENTSCOMPLETEDUNDER CONSTRUCTIONAPPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NUW PROJECTSSTATE
STATESt. 264 of the Art
(1934 Fund)June 16, 1333June 18, 1334June 18, 1334June 18, 1334BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLE
FOR NUW PROJECTSSTATE
of st. 264 of the Art
(1934 Fund)June 16, 1333June 18, 1334June 18, 1334June 18, 1334Plune 19, 1334 | APPORTIONMENTSCOMPLETEDUNDER CONSTRUCTIONAPPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABLESTATEStrate a_{100} (1004 the Art of
(1004 Funds) a_{100} (1004 the
(1004 the Art of
(1004 the Art of) a_{100} (1004 the
(1004 the Art of
(1004 the Art of) a_{100} (1004 the
(1004 the
(1004 the Art of) a_{100} (1004 the
(1004 | AFATE
STATEAPPORTIONNENTSCONFLETTDUNDER CONSTRUCTIONAPPORTIONBALANCE OF PUNIS AVAILABLE
POINT CONTRUCTIONMALANCE OF PUNIS AVAILABLESTATE
StateSee 304 of the Adv
(1035 Puni)Mate of
(1035 Puni)Mate of
(1035 Puni)Malage
PunisPoint Vote
PunisAPPONED FOR CONSTRUCTIONBALANCE OF PUNIS AVAILABLE
POINT CONTRUCTIONMALANCE OF PUNIS AVAILABLE
POINT CONTRUCTIONMALANCE OF PUNIS AVAILABLESTATE
(1034 Puni)Mate of
(1035 Puni)Mate of
(1035 Puni)Malage
PunisPoint Vote
PunisMalage
PunisPoint Vote
PunisPoint Vote
Punis </td <td>FIATE APPORTIONARIYE CONTRATION APPORTIONARIYE APPORTIONARIYE</td> <td>FATAL APPROFINENTY CONTACTION MANAGGG WART MANAGGG WART</td> <td>FATA APPOTTONENTY CONTRACTO ADACCCC PROPER VERTORIAL STATE PROPER VERTORIAL STATE<</td> <td>FILT APPORTING CONTINUENTS CONTINUENTS CONTINUENTS APPORTING Partonic Partonic</td> <td>Motor: Interface Amore: Interface Amore: Interface Amore: Interface Matter Interface</td> <td></td> <td>Image: constrained by the part of the part</td> <td>Homemonia Amemonia Amemonia</td> <td>Image: constrained by the state of the state o</td> <td>International problem International problem Internation problem International problem</td> <td>International problem (a) and the problem</td> <td>Montania Montania Montania</td> <td>Matrix Matrix Matrix</td> | FIATE APPORTIONARIYE CONTRATION APPORTIONARIYE APPORTIONARIYE | FATAL APPROFINENTY CONTACTION MANAGGG WART MANAGGG WART | FATA APPOTTONENTY CONTRACTO ADACCCC PROPER VERTORIAL STATE PROPER VERTORIAL STATE< | FILT APPORTING CONTINUENTS CONTINUENTS CONTINUENTS APPORTING Partonic Partonic | Motor: Interface Amore: Interface Amore: Interface Amore: Interface Matter Interface | | Image: constrained by the part of the part | Homemonia Amemonia Amemonia | Image: constrained by the state of the state o | International problem Internation problem International problem | International problem (a) and the problem | Montania Montania | Matrix Matrix |

1,331,260 2,103,006 272,759 1.780.712 1.549.610 1.589.877 1,941,926 716,555 1,295,372 2,577,754 46,072 457,889 225,715 772,415 3,034,618 1,041,753 2,495,079 1,396,699 884,078 367,349 985,601 1,978,281 605,518 1,302,661 255,939 677,832 124,792 1,929,106 825,524 911,192 1.308.239 355.644 937.993 220,925 1,487,189 1,605,004 1,899,377 3,811,680 388,918 77,097 818,641 513,536 1.186.115 236,109 949,778 745.036 1,182,049 54.846.437 BALANCE OF FUNDS AVAILABI FOR NEW PROJECTS. 1935 Public, Works Funds 1934 Public Works Funds 58,502 86,191 259,909 97,421 81.889 33.726 28,161 69,650 431,901 103,664 58,197 597.267 212,604 188,663 116,910 23, 754 122, 324 122, 324 35,831 87,574 218,515 428,902 229,156 319,360 36.856 40.326 149.720 134,183 191,084 321,058 6.744.057 111,077 66,412 205,600 16,805 143,932 14,332 .489 113,491 1465,990 115,113 253,018 5,868 55.448 111.231 43.076 21,790 6,791 11,665 267,177 61,031 AS PROVIDED BY SECTION 204 OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY ACT (1934 FUNDS) AND BY THE ACT OF JUNE 18, 1934 (1935 FUNDS) 15.1 69.7 122.02 125.57 16.8 47.4 8.9 10.0 17.8 97.0 97.6 99.5 202.7 74.6 34.7 21.0 78.7 21.3 10.6 15.0 206.2 24.9 56.5 23.1 37.2 13.6 # 3.192.7 APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION 25,194 151,422 ,110,941 877.654 .113.775 858.658 1,108,776 1,348,010 694,705 679.576 1487,805 76,152 805.513 253.709 656.550 927.860 988.310 .560.160 863.572 1427.503 1455.781 606,090 .912.352 295.355 385,832 749,153 616,927 418,081 .154.718 510.540 65,390 896,094 568,033 906,822 ,716,964 417,112 163,122 600,260 669,678 158.877 .872.685 .060.603 ,638,259 ,250,936 ,180,272 .077.996 377.668 355.208 47.096.653 1935 Dic Works Funds CURRENT STATUS OF UNITED STATES PUBLIC WORKS ROAD CONSTRUCTION 159.273 129.322 146.112 172.245 25.000 103.056 181.751 281,289 501,814 93,600 5,228 518 36,015 43,635 8.734 29,200 27,493 84,000 336.407 17.142 235.592 14,950 473,475 62,955 25,051 11,046 159.308 123.176 5.130 273.297 5.442 54,172 4,412,293 9,237 1934 blic Works Funds 18,307 45.6 81.6 257.4 103.0 138.2 177.0 243.8 39.2 39.9 91.2 360.1 107.8 338.8 258.6 176.3 148.3 14.6 180.3 250.2 218.5 173.1 24.0 08.2 32.3 68.8 198.1 118.3 309.3 21.8 09.3 26.2 3.9 1.915.6 Mileage \$1,385,932 1,210,742 1,088,755 1,088,755 3,637,488 2,418,670 826,908 1,886,145 340,348 4,689,775 2,433,494 2,919,831 399,791 ,260,590 910.249 3.534.368 631.661 2.563.762 576.637 1,001.858 819.530 452.733 494.538 3.612.475 1.800.579 984,890 2,589,155 2,284,486 2,695,971 853,520 637,077 1,699,602 7,263,760 768,453 1.132,343 236,835 1.733.372 5.539.857 902.217 1440,045 2,091,450 315,899 89,478,323 955 807 028 1935 Public Works Funds 601 1459 088 UNDER CONSTRUCTION AND \$ 2.358.085 189.254 1.444.866 2,241,216 177,121 1,107,773 262,563 194,891 ,194,943 216,522 7,618,558 3,102,917 .561.352 712.761 963.175 .,001,162 286,526 1,028,757 ,139,538 ,102,677 506,613 2,396,358 2,951,026 38,846 23,267 91,948 180,288 ,236,389 315,798 ,335,126 .,084,614 505,203 300,310 1.744.966 96.950 3.733.817 46,205 913,104 022,090 ,389,935 ,460,991 301,578 107.918 763.682 532.762 925.253 554.927 356.398 356.398 1.438.164 1934 Public Works Funds 65.509.352 1, 2, SUMMARY OF CLASSES AS OF MARCH 31,1935 nated Total Cost 4, 343, 362 1, 494, 419 2, 800, 094 1,505,637 4,639,138 1,162,972 11,152,926 3,735,468 4,463,938 4,449,920 2,460,774 3.313.985 918.186 5.428.700 7.582,401 3.038.075 2.203.044 3.543.503 1.127.115 2.295.011 3,710,874 5,782,752 2,499,292 4,169,751 5,852,391 2,416,842 3,109,886 945,468 842,330 3,026,598 2,086,293 15,822,699 4,528,242 2,496,490 10,022,529 2,084,483 1,280,332 3.219.708 8.354.712 1.506.289 581,752 3,169,625 2,400,043 1.569.633 2.170.135 1.471.176 566,063 170,756,079 427.4 362.6 335.5 76.0 361.5 65.0 467.8 1.234.6 877.6 547.1 488.5 410.0 27.8 660.5 830.6 485.8 147.6 355.6 805.5 430.1 55.2 541.8 351.3 556.0 61.1 344.4 317.6 ,864.8 443.6 97.0 388.0 197.8 129.6 435.8 667.9 17.3 966.2 Mileage 1935 Public Works Funds 246,224 60,698 25,200 64.152 27.364 546.200 120,800 35,889 146,605 137,101 604.153 6.949 28,078 166,607 171.305 290,102 49,834 147.039 115,300 133,569 517,784 332,878 283,199 131,441 162,865 496,419 79.875 148.540 277.183 94,862 106.144 280.945 74,185 67,483 302,810 356.444 8.578.587 COMPLETED 5.741.697 4.826.973 4.951.756 13, 349, 334 6,635, 170 1, 753, 636 3.353.899 10.560.404 9.545.036 1,547,303 4,923,452 6,258,007 4.186,225 9.762.965 6.493.266 8.367,687 9.267,460 6.436,458 3,462,861 2,996,599 1,868,277 3.896.237 8.977.662 7.258.942 7.770.894 4,238,911 1.729,128 4.073.819 5.380.327 17.776.460 7.727.488 4.568.276 14.771.322 7,429,747 5,969,102 14,971,452 1,818,321 4,311.341 4,412,224 6,828,263 21,406,839 3,882,132 1.747.990 6.112.600 5.516.631 3,439,361 8,855,894 4,101,853 1,646,515 317.334.298 1934 Public Works Funds 4,626,722 9,971,665 6,600,146 8,842,071 9,743,874 6,842,159 3.471.312 3.269,400 1.931.916 3,788,419 10,936,447 11,206,953 6.006.163 9.794.434 8.332.958 9,313,198 4,654,645 1,936,370 4,225,064 5,687,122 20,773,868 8,833,022 5,064,260 15,946,330 7.756.375 6.488.260 15.764.348 1,897.629 4,373,449 4,971,053 8,394,340 5,591,728 5,660,198 16,803,261 7,591,774 1,767,458 1,864,501 6.036,737 6.470,464 7.586.097 22.533.149 4.741.028 1,864,228 6,530,943 5,864,289 3,571,657 9,206,165 4,596,483 2.002.959 352.249.744 Cost Total 3,540,227 6,173,740 3,769,734 3,964,364 2,302,356 969,462 3,220,879 2,941,700 11,327,921 4,840.941 2,938,967 7,865,012 4,685,180 3,097,814 9,590,788 1,014,572 2,770,954 3,047,643 4,259,842 2,641,935 3,428,049 7.932.206 3.486.006 1.454.868 2,277,486 8,921,401 5,088,963 1118,361 1117,675 8,818,311 2.963.932 1.711.586 1.810.058 3,350,474 6,452,568 5,425,551 948,007 3,765,387 3,106,412 2,661,343 5,113,491 4,302,991 12,291,253 2,132,691 941.837 941.837 287.712 973.842 949.778 .000,000 Act of June 18, 1934 (1935 Fund) APPORTIONMENTS 200. . 204 of the Act June 16, 1933 (1934 Fund) 8.370.133 5,211.960 6.748.335 15,607,354 6,874,530 2,865,740 1,819,088 5,231,834 10,091,185 4,486,249 17.570,770 10.037,843 10,055,660 10,089,604 7.517.359 5.828,591 3.369.917 3.564.527 6,597,100 12,736,227 10,656,569 6.978.675 12.180,306 7.439,748 7.828.961 4.545.917 1.909.839 6, 346, 039 5, 792, 935 22, 330, 101 9,522,293 5,804,448 15,484,592 9.216.798 6.106.896 18.891.004 1,998,708 5,459,165 6,011,479 8,492,619 24,244,024 4,194,708 4,474,234 9,724,881 4,501,327 1,918,469 1,867,573 7,416,757 6,115,867 000,000,468 Sec. Rhode Island South Carolina. South Dakota North Carolina. North Dakota. Ohio STATE Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Nebraska Nevada New Hampshi District of Col Hawaii Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming TOTALS New Jersey New Mexico New York Vermont Virginia Washington. Mississippi. Missouri Montana Louisiana. Maine Maryland. Tennessee Texas Utah California Colorado... Connectici Alabama... Arizona.... Arkansas. Delaware. Florida Georgia Iowa Kansas Kentucky Idaho.... Illinois... Indiana.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1935



