

307

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

REMARKS BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE SEATTLE CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE, FORWARD THRUST, AND CENTRAL ASSOCIATION,
AT THE OLYMPIA HOTEL, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, JULY 21, 1967
7:30 A. M.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to visit Seattle -- a city which at this moment is attacking a problem which I consider to be at the apex of my new responsibilities -- urban transportation. So I am here to learn as well as enjoy the gracious hospitality you have extended me. Although the distance between Seattle and Washington, D. C. is considerable, I assure you I am never far from the transportation problems you face. Your fine Congressional delegation makes sure of that.

Senator Magnuson, both personally and as chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, has been a leading force in formulating every piece of transportation legislation in recent years, including that which established the new Department of Transportation -- and I would not for a second overlook his role in getting that Department started.

The Department of Transportation was proposed by President Johnson to promote national transportation policies and programs -- and the key word here is national. The United States has always had one of the most aggressive and forward-looking transportation industries in the world. And

boydas 67 002A

OCT 15 1967

FR
0328

2/28/69

FAA-S-41

00041

the expansion and improvements in transportation have played an important role in spurring industrial and business growth in our nation. The Government's efforts in regulating and promoting transportation -- through nearly thirty agencies or bureaus -- I believe accurately reflected the Nation's transportation strength and weaknesses. It was that reflection -- of many separate agencies and many separate goals -- that led to the realization that a coordinated and unified approach to transportation was needed. Providing that type of leadership and coordination is our role -- and in the brief tenure of the Department, almost four months, it has become increasingly clear that the challenges and opportunities before us are unlimited.

But also of substantial proportions, are the tools with which we have to work. We have the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration, the United States Coast Guard, and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. When the Congress passed the Department of Transportation Act, it saw fit to exclude the Maritime Administration. I think that this was a mistake and I hope that the maritime programs will eventually be brought into the Department. Here in this great port and harbor area we are especially conscious of the fact that transportation does not stop at the water's edge. It is an integrated process and in exercising our responsibility for moving goods and people, considerations about the mode which transportation takes are secondary to those about the service which it provides.

Seattle is a major industrial center, and as such, is experiencing most of the problems which have become associated with metropolitan growth. I speak of air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion and an area of prime concern to me, urban congestion.

It is a great paradox that transportation, probably more than any other factor, led to urbanization; yet it is that urbanization itself which is strangling transportation. The problem is not only finding the room to move, but a place to stop. Seattle, with a metropolitan population that exceeds one million, finds its situation further perplexing because of the straight jacket effect of Puget Sound and Lake Washington.

A television comedian recently suggested that New York make the George Washington Bridge one way, so that after a few days the entire traffic problem would be New Jersey's.

But what you have done, and are doing, is vastly more reasonable and highly commendable.

Your planning for a regional transit system could become a model for many other cities. Certainly, you have faced, and made, many decisions that other cities are finding difficult to deal with. Not the least of these, is the proper balance between private and public transportation in the light of existing conditions. This is a problem we are studying on the national level, but one which can only realistically be decided locally, according to travel patterns and personal desires.

Here in Seattle, which is geographically ribbon in nature rather than circular, the industrial complex is primarily consolidated in the southern part of the city while the residential districts are in the northern and eastern parts. Thus you have a rush hour convergence on a central area that is horrendous. But you also have the opportunity to build a mass transit corridor to fulfill all of the requirements of a public transportation system -- to carry the greatest number of people in the shortest length of time, and to do so efficiently, economically and safely.

I am pleased to note that your transit plans have been coordinated with your highway plans and that your stated goal is an integrated transportation system. This, we believe, provides the key to transportation efficiency.

The fact that your preliminary planning specifies that feeder bus lines will serve outlying rail rapid transit stations, and that facilities are provided at these stations for parking of automobiles, illustrates the integration I refer to.

The city of Seattle has been served well by the efforts of Congressman Brock Adams and Senators Magnuson and Jackson in their urging of a complete rapid transit study. Their coordination with Mayor Dorn Braman, who is providing great service to this country as chairman of the Transportation Committee of the National League of Cities, and the foresight of the Washington State Legislature in providing a vehicle for handling the project, exemplify the type of cooperation needed to get such an undertaking underway.

The problems of urban transportation encompass many, and sometime varied, aspects of city life -- from the esthetic value of highway corridors to airport access. Consequently, there is much work to be done in determining traffic patterns, individual preferences, financing programs, and a host of other factors.

The population in urban places of all sizes has increased from six percent in 1800 to 70 percent in 1960. From 1950 to 1960, when the population increased by 28 million, 84 percent of this growth took place in the nation's 212 metropolitan areas. Here in Seattle the population increased 30 percent in that 10 year period. By 1975, it is expected that 73 percent --- 164 million people -- of the Nation's population will be concentrated in metropolitan areas.

This is an explosion accompanied by economic and sociological factors that still haven't been fully evaluated for all their possible ramifications.

Now, I don't mean that we should do nothing until we know all the answers. For while a wrong decision could be costly, the cost of doing nothing could be much greater. We must remain flexible and this is why I emphasize the integrated transportation system.

Within the Department of Transportation, we are approaching the urban congestion problem from the viewpoint that all transportation sectors must be improved. Manifestations of the transportation problem in urban

areas include the mass movement between work and home and the cost it represents in money, time, frustration, and wasted energy. The transit industry is experiencing rising costs and financial difficulties, while the rider is the victim of an antiquated equipment and poor service. Obsolescence and inadequate capacity have become characteristics of much of our urban highway network -- in many cases built years ago to standards which couldn't possibly have anticipated this country's future reliance on the automobile. Past mistakes, however, are valuable lessons for the future.

For a Nation with more than 94 million motor vehicles, relatively little has been accomplished to help the city and the automobile get along with each other. I consider it a responsibility of the Department of Transportation to help reverse this trend.

We have already made a start in this direction. The Federal Highway Administration has undertaken a special program called TOPICS -- a program which allows cities to use Federal funds, in cooperation with their state highway departments, to improve streets, terminals and other areas which may be hindering the free flow of urban traffic.

On the other hand, we are devoting tremendous effort in the Department toward adapting the highway to the city. There are plans in several cities around the country to utilize the highway program to meet a wide range of society's needs. In fact, as you know, right here in Seattle

studies are underway to determine the feasibility of building housing over Interstate 90 between Corwin Place and Lake Washington. This joint use concept is an exciting one and one which we think will provide tremendous opportunities in the future.

We have set automotive standards for vehicle safety -- the results of which will be evident in all 1968 model cars. Only a few weeks ago we released standards for state highway safety programs -- thus bringing to full cycle our concern for the car, the driver, and the highways. We must stretch that concern to include all modes of transportation and their related influences on the urban environment -- air pollution, noise, and parking.

A little more than three years ago, when President Johnson summoned America to the building of a Great Society and to an all-out attack on urban problems, he stressed -- and I quote -- that: "The solution to these problems does not rest on a massive program in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the national capital and the leaders of local communities."

And the President has labored long and hard to encourage that kind of cooperation. I am here to do the same -- beginning with the problems of urban transportation, where the need for cooperation is so great.

I sense a widespread and growing awareness in this country that we can no longer afford to indulge in arid, ideological arguments about the "evils of big government" or the obsolescence of state and local governments.

We have begun to abandon the erroneous notion that there is some kind of inherent enmity or incompatibility between the Federal Government on the one hand and state and local governments on the other -- that somehow we must choose between one or the other -- that we must swear eternal and undivided allegiance to one and eternal and undivided opposition to the other.

We have begun to understand that an extension of Federal activity does not mean an erosion, of state or local authority -- as if there is some sort of fixed and immutable quantity of total government involvement, so that one level of government can grow only at the expense of the other.

We have come, instead, to appreciate the very simple truth that an effective system requires that every level of government be strong and supple, and that all levels of government share jointly the common task of improving the lot of our citizens.

We must jointly meet the challenge of a new urban era with vigor and imagination. An excellent beginning is being made here in Seattle.