

DISTRICT 4 GROUP MEETING -- ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

HAROLD E. OLSON, *Coordinator*

(North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin)

FEBRUARY 25-26

This two-day meeting was called for the purpose of discussing roadside development practices in the district and also to review the 1941 Coordinating Study-Outline submitted by the Executive Committee on Roadside Development.

The following papers were presented:

- (1) *History of the Cooperative Arrangement of Controlling Erosion Along the Highways*, by Carl T. Nordstrom, Highway Engineer, Public Roads Administration, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- (2) *Public Highways and Erosion Control*, by John S. Glass, Assistant to Chief Engineer, Soil Conservation Service, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- (3) *Summary of Coordinators' First 1940 Reports by Districts and of 1941 Coordinating Study Program*, by Wilbur H. Simonson, Senior Landscape Architect, Public Roads Administration, Washington, D. C.
- (4) *Report on Zumbrota - Pine Island Soil Conservation Project* (inspected on field trip), by A. W. Verharen, Assistant Administrative Engineer, Minnesota Department of Highways, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- (5) *Lecture and Slides on Road Construction in the National Parks* by S. L. Taylor, Senior Highway Engineer, Public Roads Administration, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- (6) After an interesting and profitable discussion of the above presentations, the meeting was adjourned for an inspection trip to Rochester, Minnesota, the city of Mayo Clinic fame, where an evening conference was addressed by the mayor of the city, by the county engineer of Olmsted County, and by Mr. O. L. Kipp, Assistant Chief Engineer and Construction Engineer, Minnesota Department of Highways, who stressed the "Coordination of Roadside Development with Road Design, Construction, and Maintenance." Open discussion was led by Mr. A. R. Nichols, Consultant Landscape Architect, Minnesota Highway Department, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- (7) *Protection of the Roadside by State Zoning Regulations as Recommended by the American Automobile Association*, by Mr. Harold E. Olson, **Engineer of Roadside Development**, Minnesota Highway Department.

EXCERPTS FROM PAPERS

"More general integration of roadside practices into original design and construction of highways should promote more equitable use of the 1-percent Federal-aid roadside improvement funds for distinctly landscape purposes. In some States, a large part of the 1-percent funds is now being used for

heavy grading operations instead of vegetative measures and definite landscape features.

"Preliminary surveys and field inspections should be made collaboratively by highway and landscape engineers before a highway is actually designed in order to (a) protect scenic values (by alignment, adequate right-of-way, etc.); (b) salvage useful vegetation, topsoil, and protect valuable trees, etc.; (c) select appropriate parking or wayside areas; (d) provide adequate cross section for erosion control; (e) provide for disposal of surface excavation including topsoil at vantage points; (f) secure soil analysis for fertility; etc.

"Roadside work should be so thoroughly practical that it will grow in use and expand on a sound engineering basis. In the application of roadside fundamentals it is necessary to analyze the questions from the angle of how they are to be administered so that a program may be broadened and made practicable for application in counties, townships, and other local communities.

"The coordination of comparatively new roadside operations with regular construction and maintenance practices is not as difficult as it may seem but rather is a comparatively simple natural step in highway design. Design practices influenced by roadside development have definitely aided in the construction of modern highway.

"Coordination of landscape design in the original studies of modern road construction is most important from the standpoint of safety, economy, and appearance. Individual consideration of each section of contemplated improvement is necessary.

"One of the biggest jobs ahead of us is the provision of adequate shoulders, that is, adequate both as to surface and width. Under a national defense program and the development of strategic highways this problem of shoulder width and surface is going to be a big one because we must constantly keep in mind the requirements of the future and the relation of the part to the whole completed structure and its environment. A problem solved from any one point of view is only partly solved. It must be a collaborative job of engineering design and landscape design, both essential, both working toward future needs and future objectives, and both fulfilling a public need and use. Such an objective is definitely dependent upon a combination of talent as expressed in experienced technique coupled with sensitive imagination. This is the opportunity that faces us in a sincere collaboration of engineering design with landscape design."

Mimeographed copies of the excellent 31-page Comprehensive Report of Group Conference embracing District 4 are available and may be obtained if desired on direct request to the coordinator. It contains much of particular

interest to roadside engineers, including traffic tabulations and analytical presentation of four main factors considered in determining the need for and priority of construction projects, namely:

1. Deficiencies of sight distance, alignment, and grade;
2. Adequacy of surface type;
3. Adequacy of pavement width;
4. General conditions of the highway.

Ψ Ψ Ψ

DISTRICT 10 GROUP MEETING—COLUMBUS, OHIO

DALLAS D. DUPRE, JR., *Coordinator*

(Delaware, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, District of Columbia)

FEBRUARY 27-28
AND MARCH 1

This meeting preceded the "First Short Course in Highway Development," February 28 and March 1, 1941, at Ohio State University which was also attended by the representatives of the Public Roads Administration and of the various States comprising District 10.¹

Informal discussion covered these questions:

FEDERAL-AID PROGRAM - Adequacy of 1-percent fund. Pennsylvania and Ohio were of the opinion that 1 percent is not adequate to accomplish comprehensive roadside development. Desirability of incorporating as many basic operations in general construction in order that 1 percent may be expended for seeding, planting, and mulching operations.

PLAN PREPARATION - Roadside development with general construction. Separate contract practice in District 10 varies but a greater part is under separate contract, although available topsoil is salvaged under general contract and either stock-piled or placed on fill slopes.

ROADSIDE DEVELOPMENT - BY CONTRACT OR FORCE ACCOUNT:

Maryland has done work by contract.

Pennsylvania has done no work by contract but is preparing now to include basic operations in construction contracts.

Delaware has used a combination of contract and force account.

Ohio has used both methods and favors the contract; since work comes at times when maintenance and repair forces are busiest, force account involves putting on extra men for seasonal work.

1. See Engineering Experiment Station Bulletin No. 109 (Vol. 10, No. 4) July 1941, Highway Development First Short Course on Highway Planning, Directed by Department of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. Price 60 cents.