WHAT DID YOU DO WITH YOUR ROAD FUNDS?

Discussion by William Mitchell,
Perry County Highway Superintendent.

In the maintenance of Perry County highways, instead of using assistant highway superintendents under a specific salary, I have divided our roads into sections of about seven miles each, and placed these in care of a patrolman who lives in the vicinity of his patrol section. I often procure these patrolmen for $2.00 to $2.50 per day, thereby saving the county the difference between these figures and $3.00 per day, the fixed salary of an assistant superintendent.

Our main work has entailed the reconstruction of several newly built roads as well as some of the older ones. This has included the lengthening of culverts, widening the road bed, and resurfacing with river gravel, also the easing of some of our dangerous curves and moving stumps and large stones from side ditches and drains.

Resurfacing can not be done at a very rapid rate with our present maintenance funds in view of the fact that this work costs us about $800.00 per mile. This is based on an average five mile haul and about 250 cubic yards of gravel per mile.

It is true that we have some roads that have not been properly constructed, and I presume that many other counties are confronted with the same conditions, but these roads are a part of our system and have to be maintained along with the better built roads. We have a little more than 82 miles, mostly inferior type roads, and the maintenance proposition which confronts the taxpayers of our county is one of deep concern. As I see it, either the legislature will have to relieve our poorer counties by giving us more gas tax, or a still heavier burden must be placed on the taxpayers in order that our roads may be properly maintained.

You can see that with only ten million dollars assessed value of property in our county what a burden has been placed on our people to build 82 miles of improved road that we have, and the maintenance problem is a still greater burden than the first cost.

The following table shows how our maintenance funds were used in 1924:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxable property</td>
<td>$10,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel road repair rate</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money derived from taxes</td>
<td>$19,462.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas tax from state</td>
<td>3,155.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total money available</td>
<td>$22,618.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW HUNTINGTON SOLVED THE PROBLEM OF PAVING ITS CITY APPROACHES

By W. F. Eberhart,
Huntington County Highway Superintendent.

The improvement of the approaches to the City of Huntington has been the subject of discussion for a number of years.

In 1922 a petition was filed to improve one of the approaches to the city under the County Unit Road Law. The figures in Table I were compiled and attention directed to the fact that the wealthiest township (Huntington) in the county had only spent about an equal amount with the other townships for roads. Expenditures under the Three Mile Road Law were used in the table for comparison.

About 225 miles of road had been built by taxing costs against farms one and one-half to two miles on each side of the roads improved. However, it was thought best to limit comparisons to more recent construction.

The attention of civic and business organizations such as Kiwanis, Rotary and Exchange clubs and the Chamber of Commerce was directed to the relative amount of road work done by the various taxing units of the county. Their co-operation was secured in making out an equitable solution of the problem of city approaches.

By common consent it was agreed that Huntington Township should bear the expense of hard surfacing the main approaches to the city.

Petitions were circulated simultaneously for the improvement and each person was asked to sign all of the petitions. Between six and seven hundred names were signed on each petition. A remonstrance under such conditions seemed practically