U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

(34)

REMARKS BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE 56TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE INVESTMENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1967, AT 10:30 A. M., IN MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA.

Satchel Paige's classic warning, "Never look back," has a special meaning for America's transportation investors.
In the historic sense, it reminds us that most of the early canals and railroads in this country went broke.
So did the builder of the greatest of our clipper ships.
And even the celebrated Pony Express stayed in business just over one year.

Given America's fondness for motion, it is difficult to understand why that should be the case.
We tend to think it was the automobile that unleashed America.
But even in 1831, Tocqueville found us a nation of "restless cravings."
Of the American of that day, he wrote:
"He crosses the country in every direction; he visits all the various populations in the land."

By our present standards of technology, it is even more difficult to understand why so many early investments in travel went sour.
In those days, all you needed was an oak tree, a blacksmith and a few days' warning to get a wagon on the road.
Today, industry needs at least a ten year lead-time for a jumbo jet and not much less than that for a new model automobile.
Even at that, the airplane itself is to air travel about what the football is to the professional leagues - the least expensive and least complicated part of the operation.

The full Satchel Paige observation is: "Never look back. They may be gaining on you."

They are, and by the millions.

By 1975, our population will climb from 200 million to 275 million.
The gross national product will increase by 50 percent - past the trillion-dollar mark.
And by then, we will be driving 100 million cars, trucks and buses.
By then, the volume of automobile traffic will be up 40 percent over what it is today.
By then, commercial air traffic will have tripled, with nearly one-million people boarding an airliner in this country every day.

So I come here today to discuss an activity for which there is little comfort in the future and none in the past.
And if that overstates the case, it is deliberate.
I am sure that someone, somewhere has written that, when approaching a banker for money, be serious and, if possible, grim.
And that, in a sense, is what I am doing today.
I have come, in fact, to ask not only for money but time and to ask you to invest both in a new era of transportation for the United States.

The Department of Transportation represents that new era.
The old was described very well by President Johnson in his message asking Congress to create the Department.

"Our transportation system," he said, "has not emerged from a single drawing board, on which the needs and capacities of our economy were all charted.
It could not have done so, for it grew along with the country, itself. . .now restlessly expanding, now consolidating, as opportunity grew bright or dim."

In that early era, he said, "research and development were sporadic, sometimes inconsistent, and largely oriented toward the promotion of a particular means of transportation."

And the result - said the President - is that "America today lacks a coordinated transportation system that permits travelers and goods to move conveniently and efficiently from one means of transportation to another, using the best characteristics of each."

(more)

One of the most difficult aspects of the Department's mission is that it must work to bring about changes in a transportation network which everyone knows is already the best of its kind in the world.
That goes against the human grain.
Zero Mostel, opening the musical "Fiddler on the Roof," explains that the people of his village hold things together with tradition.
"You may ask," he says, "how did this tradition get started?
I'll tell you.
I don't know.
But it's a tradition."
Too often, we take the same position on the way we do things in a far more complicated industrial society - even when we know better.

There are sophisticated techniques now available to us for predicting not only the behavior of the economy but in some detail the products and services that will make it so behave 10 and 20 years from now.
We no longer have to live from one crisis to another.
We can predict - and in most cases - prevent crisis.
But the peak-hour congestion, the air pollution, the noise and the delays that mark too much of our shipment and travel are clear signs that we have yet to apply that knowledge to transportation.

We have yet to pool the talents of business and government to prepare for predictable changes before they arrive rather than frantically trying to patch up the system after the changes hit us.

The relationship between business and government which is essential to such total planning toward a coordinated transportation system already exists.
In fact, no other activity in American involves mutual investments on the scale you find in transportation.
Private industry builds the cars and refines the gasoline; we build the roads and patrol them.
Industry builds airplanes and government builds airports and airways for them.
Government also builds locks and dams, dredges, rivers and harbors and, more recently, has funded equipment for mass transit systems and provided risk capital for the supersonic transport.

(more)

Yet, only in one major program - the development of the Interstate Highway System - has there been a joint planning effort worthy of the name.
Only there, did the two parties measure the need in detail and work out a long-range plan for meeting it.

In other areas, whatever meshing of industry's plans and government's plans has taken place has come about the hard way.
The jumbo jet is a classic example.

Months of precision planning have gone into the design not only of parts for these new jets but of training of workers and even production of plants to make the parts.
But there has been nothing like that precision in the planning of runways and terminals to accommodate the surge of passenger traffic the jumbo jets will bring.
We will be ready, I am sure.
But it will be accomplished through scrambling to catch up and patch up the system, not through a systematic approach to a balanced solution.

We are, in fact, very much in the position of a man who is asked to change a tire not only with the car still on the highway but still on the move.

There is no intent to lay blame for this today.
Until the Department was created, there was no institution in government which could hope to deal with the problems of long-range planning for transportation.
And the creation of the Department did not solve the problem.
It just gave us a tool for solving it, and reason to hope the tool would work.

During the early months of our efforts, we have had to assign priorities.
New safety systems came first.
And I am very much encouraged by the highway reports for the first three quarters of this year which reversed a long-standing trend and showed the first absolute decline in traffic deaths in several years.

Much of our energy has gone and will continue to go into working out better ways to move people into and around our cities and suburbs.

And in the meantime, we have been starting the first research in history that deals with transportation as a total system, rather than as a cluster of sometimes distantly related and independent forms of movement.

(More)

From the public point of view, narrowing the distance in the relationship is all that really matters.
Travelers and shippers are aware that there are problems of rivalry and regulation among the various forms of transportation.
But that is not important to them nor should it be.
What is important is better service, a smoother ride, faster delivery of their cargo.
All the way from point of origin to destination.

The public is also becoming increasingly concerned about the fourth dimension of transportation - the effect the trucks, trains and planes have on the eyes, the ears and the nose.
The reaction that is setting in is another sign that the old era of transportation has died - that it is no longer possible to make transportation decisions on the basis of profit-maximization and engineering efficiency.
Transportation decisions are now deeply involved in the mechanisms of social choice.
And our whole effort must now be to gain the benefits of transportation while escaping the side-effects.

Our success will be measured not in terms of how many miles of concrete we can pour or how many miles of track we can improve but in what we produce in terms of faster, safer and less-congested travel.
And the cost of programs can no longer be measured in terms of direct costs of runways or radar but in terms of indirect costs as well - of costs of displacing people to make room for a highway or of the qualitative effect of jet noises or airplane exhaust over a city.

Because it took us so long to approach transportation as a total system, the work has piled up.
There is not very much research that does not have to be done all over again because we have never before tried to put together a total transportation system.

For example, before we can assign a share of the system to passenger trains, we first must discover whether they meet a travel need.
To do that, we must develop rail service at the level of quality people have found in other forms of public transportation in recent years.
We will start getting answers to that question next year when the new high speed trains begin their runs between Washington and New York.

(more)

But the answer will raise still more questions.
If the train is a success in the northeast, will it do as well in the midwest or even the far west?
And if the answer to that proves to be yes, what are the implications for short-haul airline service in those corridors or for the future of short takeoff-and-landing aircraft?

We are experimenting with a tracked air-cushion vehicle which our engineers believe could operate with a linear induction motor at speeds up to 300 miles an hour on roadbeds that could be built for one-fourth to one-half the cost of a strip of highway.
If this vehicle proves out, then it, too, will raise questions about airline service over even longer distances.
And those, in turn, will have implications for the level of airport and terminal construction we need during the next decade or more.

In the months ahead, we will go through the same process with every phase of American transportation - documentation, containers, highways, airports, pipelines.

But it is one thing to bring together a group of system analysts and engineers as we have and ask them to design a better system.
It is something else, entirely, to finance and build the system they create.
At some point, the academic theory must be translated into something people can use to ship cargo or travel.
And given the time lag of 5 to 15 years between planning and actual operation of a transportation system, we are very near the point where theory must be moved into the marketplace.

As I said before, the computer has given us the ability to forecast economic behavior and even future commodities.
It has also given us the ability to predict the consequences of decisions not only in transportation but in other areas.
It has taken some of the agony out of the long lead-time that modern technology requires.
It has removed some of the uncertainty associated with a new product or a new technique.
We no longer invent for the sake of inventing.
We can now invent for specific results.
It is no longer necessary for us to build larger airplanes and then cross our fingers in hope the airports and terminals will be ready for them when they take to the air.

(more)

There remains only one step for us to take - and that is to start doing what we already know how to do.
We can start making long-range plans to meet the needs of 10 and 20 years from now.
But to do it right, we must pool the knowledge and talents of the people who will design the transportation, the people who will finance it, the people who will build it, the people who will operate it and the people who will use it.

And we must make plans that take into account that all of these groups are moving not only in the same direction but at the same pace.

I confess I do not know precisely how to achieve this kind of coordination for a nation of more than 200-million people.
But I think I know where we can start.

We could make a trial run by selecting one region of the country - one representative of our increasingly urban society - and starting a joint analysis of its economy, its potential and its transportation needs.
We would ask about this area:

"What kind of transportation network should it have in 1980?"
And we should get the answer in as complete detail as our technology will permit; not in the vague sense of "a balanced network," but in specifics.

This is the way transportation decisions must eventually be made as we look back and find those millions of people and cars and trucks and yards of concrete gaining on us.

And since it must happen, I propose that we start now.
We have discussed this with government officials; with labor leaders; with some friends in the business community.

Most of the people I have talked with think it is worth trying.
I intend to talk to many others.
When we are ready to put the task group together, I hope investment banking will be strongly represented.
Despite its shortcomings, America's transportation system still is the best in the world and still relies primarily on private ownership and private operation.
We want to keep it that way.
With your help and the help of others in government and industry, we will do so.

#######

U S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

TESTIMONY BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 5, 1967, 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I appreciate the opportunity to review with this Committee the problems of the District Highway program.

It is my understanding that your scheduled hearings for this week will include area Congressmen and representatives of the highway departments of the District and the neighboring States of Virginia and Maryland.
The issues involved in building highways to serve the District and the surrounding metropolitan region are also of substantial concern to local governmental officials.
If time permits, you may wish to hear from officials of these political jurisdictions who are entrusted with highway and street programs as part of their responsibility for the general welfare of the citizens of the region.

During the past few months the Department of Transportation has had under way a review of several Interstate highway location problems in the Washington metropolitan area which grew out of a request made to the Department by the National Capital Planning Commission.
As a result of this review, certain issues have been raised and preliminary conclusions reached internally on how to treat these locational problems.
The Department is consulting and intends to continue consulting with the States and local governmental officials to resolve these issues so that highway transportation development in the region can proceed at a rapid pace.
Thus the opportunity to share with your committee these views prior to further consultations within the region is welcomed.

My advice was solicited in large measure because of the Congressional directive contained in the recently enacted Department of Transportation Act.
Specifically, Section 4(f) of that Act provides, and I quote:

"After the effective date of this Act, the Secretary shall not approve any program or project which requires the use of any land from a public park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge or historic site unless (1) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land, and (2) such program includes all possible planning to minimize harm to such park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge or historic site resulting from such use. "

A similar provision of law was inacted in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966 which when taken in conjunction with the above citation is a clear indication of public concern as reflected in actions taken by our duly elected officials.

As you can see, this section places a number of projects, both urban and rural, in a category requiring added review.
It was for this reason that the National Capital Planning Commission last May requested that I review the need for the Three Sisters Bridge.
Although planning had been underway for some years on the facility, the Commission realized that on a question over which many citizens and experts disagreed, I, as Secretary of Transportation, would ultimately have to consider very carefully whether the need for a Potomac bridge at the Three Sisters Island site was so compelling and the alternatives so impractical as to require that it be built at this time.

Requests for Departmental advice on projects prior to receipt of a request for formal approval are not common.
I agreed to the review requested by the Planning Commission only because of (1) the substantial Federal interest in the Potomac River and its shoreline, (2) the uncertainty which has existed over the implementation of Section 4(f) provisions, and (3) the opportunity to expedite review of the project and avoid further delay at such times as a request for approval of the bridge might be made by the District.

(more)

The proposed plan for Federal Interstate Route 266 is to construct it along a corridor which runs through parklands in Arlington County, across the Potomac River at the Three Sisters Island site into the District, and along the Georgetown waterfront to the West Leg of the proposed inner loop in the vicinity of 26th and K Streets, N. W.

This proposal will involve substantial encroachment upon parklands, recreational areas and historic sites on both the Virginia and District shoreline of the Potomac.

Thus if Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act has meaning at all, it must have particular applicability to projects which are planned through an area where protection of scenic, historic and recreational values have in the past received a high priority.

The impact of a major freeway facility on the environment of the Potomac River must receive careful consideration in the light of President Johnson's March 1965 directive to the Secretary of the Interior requesting that he review the multiplicity of proposals for the Potomac River Basin and devise a program for a deliberate land use pattern to preserve its natural setting and beauty and provide adequate recreational facilities.

A task force report to the Secretary of the Interior, made pursuant to this directive, expresses serious concern over further encroachment of freeways and bridge approach ramps upon the River in the Washington urban area and referred specifically to the Three Sisters Island bridge crossing as a major threat.

It categorically stated that construction of the proposed bridge would be completely incompatible with the type of development recommended for this sector of the urban Potomac.

In this instance, the Secretary of Interior has jurisdiction over land on both sides of the Potomac River at the points that would be needed for the Three Sisters bridge heads.

I should like to make it clear that even without Section 4(f) I would, of necessity, have to seek the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior on any final proposal involving construction of the Three Sisters Bridge.

Because of the urgency of this question presented to me by the National Capital Planning Commission, I asked for a complete staff review of the Three Sisters project and its relationship to the freeway program in the District of Columbia.

(more)

It is my considered judgment that, even if we resolve the questions related to Section 4(f), the present design of the District freeway system, as it relates to the Three Sisters Bridge, is inadequate.

I could not, therefore, approve the Three Sisters Bridge, until several basic questions have been answered.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move to the exhibits and explain to you why I believe that I cannot approve this project at the present time.

First, I should like briefly to review with you the history of freeway design and location in the District of Columbia.
We have here a series of maps which portray the routes that have been proposed for the northwest extension of I-70S, intended to provide a freeway from downtown to the beltway and subsequently connect with I-70S where it now joins the beltway approximately at Wisconsin Avenue.

As you can see, this freeway has gradually been moved from close to the Potomac River to a point now north of the Capitol.
It has been successively relocated in an effort to overcome the opposition which characterized each proposed location.

The freeway as it is now designed is a tremendously expensive and inadequate artery.
Since it is planned to traverse part of the right-of-way of the existing Baltimore and Ohio trackage, it will require extremely costly retaining walls.
It is designed for six lanes, as is the incoming section of I-95.
These twelve lanes of traffic are designed to funnel in at this point to eight lanes on the so-called "North Central Expressway."
I don't need to point out to you the congestion, delay and safety hazard that would be created by this design.
Finally, it traverses that portion of I-495 which is considered the least adequate portion, the section also with the highest accident rate.

Second, I call your attention to the present design for the so-called "south leg" of the inner loop.
The most viable plan for this section of the inner loop is this tunnel carrying three lanes in each direction.
At this point, the tunnel is designed to join the Southwest Expressway.

Here again we have the prospect of six lanes of traffic, three on the Southwest Expressway and three on the so-called "south leg" tunnel, funneling into 4 lanes of traffic on the remainder of the Expressway eastward to the junction of I-95.

In support of this, I should like to point out that the Southwest Expressway was originally designed without taking into account the traffic that would be generated by the south leg tunnel and the third 14th Street bridge, which is now under way.
Neither of these facilities was even contemplated when the Southwest Expressway was planned.

Mr. Frank Turner, Director of the Bureau of Public Roads, has characterized this tunnel expressway as a "cannon" which will literally fire three lanes of traffic at three lanes which are already on the expressway.

The cost of this proposed tunnel is in excess of $100,000,000 for a distance of one mile.
At best this massive expenditure would obtain only a marginal improvement over the surface streets we already have.
At worst it would severely overload the Southwest Expressway.

Third, I should like to point out to you that the major justification for the Three Sisters Bridge involved its tying into two major corridors of traffic, one an intermediate loop and the other a radial flow.

There was to be the Glover-Archbold Parkway which would have traversed this route.
For the same reason that we have progressively located I-70S to the east, the Glover-Archbold Parkway has been abandoned.
There was enormous opposition from the citizens in the Glover-Archbold vicinity.

Second, the Bridge was intended to channel traffic into the northwest quadrant of the core city by the north leg, at this point.
There is at this moment no acceptable agreement for the construction of that freeway.

I believe we must find a route for the north leg across the inner city.
I do not believe that the route proposed at present, over K Street provides an acceptable solution.

(more)

The expressway will severely disrupt commercial activity around this area for at least three years; and it will not provide a distribution of cars into the inner city since it is designed at present as a through connection from the interchange of 26th and K to the center of the inner loop.

I have informed all interested parties in the District of Columbia of the commitments of the Department of Transportation to find acceptable solutions and have pledged the full resources of the Department in an intensive effort to find the new location.

The net effect of these two factors makes it unwise at this time to construct the Three Sisters Bridge at its planned location.
It is my judgment that its construction at this time simply would transfer a growing traffic jam from the Virginia side of the Potomac to the interchange at 26th and K Streets.

It is my conclusion, therefore, that we should await answers to the following questions prior to a final decision on the construction of another Potomac River crossing and its location.

1 - Is it not appropriate that we delay any final decision until we have a final design and approval of the location and design of the inner loop?

As I have said before, I have pledged the full resources of the Department to help find agreement on a new route.

2 - Will it be possible to design a comprehensive freeway system in the District of Columbia until we have reached a final decision on the location and design of a northwest arterial route.

I propose we finish the construction of the District of Columbia side of the George Washington Parkway - known also as the Palisades Parkway.

I would further propose that this new route be designated as I-70S and be made part of the Interstate System.
This project would be 90% federally funded and would insure a swift completion of the project.
That route is now complete from the beltway to the D. C. line.
We have several alternative design plans before us to finish construction from the D. C. line to the interchange at 26th and K.
I believe we can move quickly to begin construction of the final segment of this parkway and I have been assured the full support and cooperation of the Secretary of the Interior in that undertaking.

A substantial number of motorists in the northwest section of Washington and the northwest suburbs of Montgomery County would be able to use the artery for faster trips into the downtown area.
This, in turn, would lessen the demand for a quick, and perhaps ill-advised, decision on the precise location of another radial to the northwest.

It is my intention to place these questions before the three highway commissioners.
When I have their comments on these questions, I will then proceed to further discussion with them and with other interested government officials.
I do not believe that this process should take very long and I believe we can move quickly to implement whatever decisions are reached.

In the meantime I should like to make it clear that the interstate system in the Washington metropolitan area has not, as some have claimed, been hopelessly bogged down in controversy between local and Federal officials.

For example, the Capital Beltway, one of the first completed in the Nation, provides a basic traffic artery, which has already begun to influence substantially the economic development of the region.
Its completion has provided a highway facility that has significantly improved the efficiency and effectiveness of transportation service for movement of people and goods in this region.
Completion of this circumferential belt also provides a continuous and connecting link in the Interstate System.

Progesss also has been made in bringing to early completion certain radial corridors into the District itself and construction continues on these and other components which are critical to the District of Columbia's traffic needs.

This is the question that I propose to put before responsible officals in the Washington metropolitan area and those in the state capitols who must join in this determination: I offer these proposals as a means to put an end to the present stalemate on major arterial construction in this area.
I offer it as a means for swift action that will solve some of our most pressing problems.

But there is much work ahead before we can say that metropolitan Washington has a balanced transportation network.
Some of it involved major construction and expense, and the subway system which is now in the design stage is in that category.
Some of it can produce significant benefits at relatively low costs.

For example:

-- In any area as vital and dynamic as the Washington metropolitan region, bus travel represents a most efficient and flexible transportation service.
We must, however, make bus travel more attractive.
To this end, we plan to discuss with HUD, WMATA, and local bus lines the possibility of a HUD grant to WMATA for the purchase of new bus equipment.
The equipment, in turn, could be leased by WMATA to local bus companies.

-- The Department is considering draft legislation in January which would provide Federal funds for the construction of fringe area parking lots.
In this way, commuters from distant points in the suburbs could drive to these fringe area lots where they would switch to bus for the trip downtown.
Experiments in other cities have shown that with adequate scheduling and pricing, the provisions of these fringe area lots makes bus travel quite attractive.

-- Also being considered in the Department is legislation to provide Federal funds for traffic operation improvements.
Much can be done to improve the efficiency of existing streets and highways through better traffic control, grade separated intersections, channelized turn lanes, etc.
I can think of no more appropriate place to use these funds than in the Washington metropolitan area.

-- The Bureau of Public Roads has recently announced that Federal funds are available in the construction of new highways for the development of reserved lanes for bus usage.
The plans of the Virginia State Highway Department for the reconstruction of the Shirley Highway now make provision for such lanes.
Similar action might well be taken on other major highways coming into the city.

-- Studies by the D. C. Highway Department in support of the Three Sisters Bridge indicated that much of the traffic using the Three Sisters Bridge would wish to move not along the Potomac River Freeway to the downtown area, but rather laterally through local streets to the North Central and Northeast portion of the District.
Currently there are few efficient arterials for doing this.
We propose that the District Highway Department explore with the Bureau of Public Roads the possibility of substantial upgrading of local East/West arteries to improve the flow of that traffic which is to move laterally through the District.

There is no doubt in my mind that even with the subway, improved bus service and expanded capacity of existing streets, the Washington area will need new and better highways in the years ahead.

Our concern is simply that the highways we build be as carefully designed and as relevant to need as possible so that they provide a foundation for growth in future decades, not an obstacle to that growth.

# # #