

shortfall. And after that occurs, why then the...it stills remains optional by statute whether or not the Board of Equalization will act. But the reason I want to tell you that I would oppose the amendment because I do have an amendment...an A bill prepared which will, in fact, reflect the reduced revenue to the Department of Roads by whatever action you choose. And the reason is this. Some talk was given about the one and six-year program back in the sixties and I don't want to take a lot of your time but I will tell you this, those of you that attend highway hearings yet today will know it is still true. The purpose of the one-year program and the six-year program was in order to give citizens some idea about when their road will be constructed. Now if we are going to reduce the revenue to roads, then the appropriations should be reduced reflecting that and then they should take the appropriate and will take the appropriate action of removing those roads from the one-year program that are necessary in order to stay within that budget. Now to add some confusion maybe but so you know all the facts, right now the money going into the highway user revenue for the Department of Roads, including the variable and the other sources, is down 3 million from their original projections as it is. Now they can't spend...they were going to make a 3 million reduction regardless in the current year's road program. You cut it with this bill by another 3.2 and there is going to be 6.2 million of construction that will not occur because the money is not there. In addition, I can tell you that the federal funds when we did the budget was anticipated to be \$119 million received this year. The current appropriation and the continuing resolution before Congress is at 108. So that is \$11 million down and there is speculation that it may go down another 4 million. That is 15 million down. So to presume as some are presuming that roads have not incurred any reduction in construction, is just not accurate. As a matter of fact, they will occur. The question is how much you want to do it. But the clean way so that citizens know is to reduce the appropriation, reduce that 133 to whatever level that you want to do it and then have the Department of Roads adjust that one-year program that reflects that ability to pay. I would hope you would not adopt the Senator Vickers' amendment so you even preclude...it could work either way, you understand, at the current variable rate and if the price of gasoline goes up and if you keep the rate where it is, you automatically are increasing the gas tax. If the price of gas goes down and