

9)

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

REMARKS BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE TRANSPORTATION TASK
FORCE FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AT THE PROUD BIRD
RESTAURANT, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY,
SEPTEMBER 6, 1967, 12:30 P.M.

It takes a certain amount of nerve to come to this state and lecture to you about transportation. It is much like explaining fusion to Dr. Teller or dieting to Twiggy.

Business Week has just rated your airport terminal here in Los Angeles the best-run in the nation. In San Francisco, you are building the first new rapid transit network of this century, with a second on the drawing board. California is the undisputed leader in highway construction. Yours was even the first state - and I suspect the last - to provide security blankets for air travelers.

Among the 50 states, California holds a virtual patent on mobility and the means of attaining and enjoying it. In a nation with the world's best transportation network, that is no small achievement.

Yet here we are, brought together by a common concern that what we have today should be better and that what we have tomorrow must be better.

The root of our problem is not unlike the scene in the small Texas town the day the new railroad started operations. The town skeptic took one look at the locomotive and

(more)

announced: "They'll never get it started." And as the train rattled down the tracks, he said: "Well, they'll never get it stopped."

There are nearly 100-million cars, trucks and buses in the United States today, rolling on nearly three-million miles of streets and highways. There are well over 100-thousand private and commercial airplanes, flying more than one-billion miles a year. As the country grows, so does its need for more transportation. Without it you cannot read a book, serve a meal, sell a vacuum cleaner or fight a war.

But accommodating the growth is no longer as simple as doubling our highway mileage or tripling our runways. The soft jobs in transportation are behind us, just as it was easier in the 1950's to move the Dodgers three-thousand miles than it is to move them a couple of inches up in the standings today.

The job is more difficult because we can no longer afford to ignore the fourth dimension in transportation - its effect on the environment. Transportation today determines not only how well we can move in our cities, it determines how well we can live in them. It can be noisy or silent, cause discord or create harmony, serve us or entrap us. It can - as Lewis Mumford has put it - force us to build our houses in parking lots instead of in parks.

Because of its remarkable growth, California faces many of these problems to a greater degree than most states. So it is no surprise that California has pioneered new approaches to taming its transportation, such as the use of system analysis to try to deal with transportation as a total mechanism rather than a haphazard collection of highways, trucks, runways and docks.

Nobody would dream of showing up for a football game with eleven men, all pursuing some private little plan of their own. Yet that is precisely the way we have gone about building this country's transportation network.

And that is why President Johnson asked Congress to create our department to provide a national base to the work of giving America a transportation system in more than name only.

In his message to Congress, the President said: "Our transportation system has not emerged from a single drawing board, on which the needs and capacities 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."

(more)

The result, he said, is that America "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."

Said the President: "Both people and goods are compelled to conform to the system as it is..."

Our job - in the broadest sense - is to reverse that order - to compel the system to conform to the needs of travelers and the shippers of goods and of the people who live by the side of the road or off the end of the runway.

The art of system engineering probably has not advanced to the point where it can give us printouts on anything so vast as a transportation system for a nation of 200-million people.

But we can use the approach of system analysis, the attitude that takes nothing for granted. If you ask a good system engineer how to get from here to San Diego, the chances are he will ask whether you are sure you have to make the trip.

We do not intend to change everything about American transportation in the next several years, but we do intend to challenge everything about it.

And that will include asking whether, by better planning of neighborhoods, we cannot in many cases eliminate the need for transportation altogether by putting people back on their feet.

The Department's most important role for the next few years will be in research on two levels. We will be gathering the information required to build the kind of system we want 50 years from now. We will be testing ways to improve what we already have.

But the most important factor in all of our research will involve a decision that cannot be made in Washington.

That is the decision on goals - on the kind of transportation system the people of the United States want. These goals cannot be cast in terms of miles of freeway or numbers of cars and trucks or length of airport runways. They must be set in terms of the number of traffic deaths we can tolerate; the amount of noise we can stand; the speed with which we want to move from Los Angeles to New York or from the Civic Center to the airport. And with the setting of these goals must come a decision on what an effective, balanced and safe

(more)

system of transportation is worth to us. How much are we willing to pay to improve our present system and to design a better one for the future?

In order to provoke the discussion that will lead to these long-range decisions, the state government should be prepared to deal with its own transportation facilities as a total system. Many states have created their own departments of transportation to provide closer coordination among agencies concerned with air, sea and land travel.

Without this kind of close coordination, it is virtually impossible to make intelligent choices among transportation alternatives which must be made to produce a balanced system.

The states have another major stake in careful, systematic choices for their transportation investments. Most of the money for public investment in transportation comes now, and will continue to come, from state and local government.

The states should also be promoting greater citizen involvement in transportation decisions.

In that regard, I think the so-called freeway revolts around the United States have been a healthy thing. There has been a great deal of re-thinking in state capitals and in Washington about values that were not taken into account by the cost-benefit formula. Much of the re-thinking has been underway for some time but the recent disputes over freeway routes, particularly in and around cities, did nothing to slow it down.

We are now rewriting our procedures for federal approval of highway routes to reflect this new awareness that the best judges of routes and designs are the people who will have to live with them.

We are developing methods for measuring the resource values that go beyond the standard cost-benefit analyses.

We intend to require in the future that state highway departments get the views of all interested departments in city, state and Federal governments before highway routings are submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads for approval.

If there are objections to a proposed route, we will want to know what they are, in detail, and we will want a well-documented case from the highway department when it believes a route must be approved despite the objections.

These reports, under the new procedures, will be made available for public inspection.

(more)

Another important new procedure will be a requirement for two hearings on each proposed highway route. The first hearing would concern itself with the broad highway corridor. The second would involve the specific highway alignment within that corridor. The two-hearing procedure will permit objections to a route to be voiced before costly commitments are, while change is still practical.

One of the primary aims of these various new procedures is to insure, as much as possible, that route selections reflect local desires and are consistent with local goals and objectives. Where controversies arise, we would hope that they can be settled at the local level with the fullest and widest public discussion. The goal is to resolve such controversies as may arise amicably prior to submission to Washington.

But for cases in which it is necessary for Washington to become involved, we are establishing a basis for informal discussion among the Departments of Transportation, the Interior, Agriculture and Housing and Urban Development in order to assure that we have all of the factors and all of viewpoints we need to make a sound decision.

I intend to take one more step before we give approval to disputed highway routes. I will ask the governor of the state in which the conflict exists to become personally involved in the case.

I realize that in your state, and in others, the responsibility for approving highway routes and design is out of the governor's hands. But his jurisdiction over other vital programs affecting, or affected by, highway construction is an essential factor in the resolution of controversies.

With these changes in procedure, we can insure that the public interest is the major factor in all our future decisions. There is another effort we hope to undertake that may have an even more immediate impact on the substance of our national life.

The problems that affect minority groups can be traced to many causes. It is my personal judgment that the major problem confronting them is their inability to find dignified and well-paid employment. For far too long, entire fields of employment have been closed to them. Nowhere is this more acute than in the construction industry. In some cases this

(more)

discrimination has been the result of bias among the employers. In others, it can be directly traced to an exclusionary policy by labor unions. I think the time for recrimination has passed. It is now time for solutions.

Congress has stated in unequivocal terms that Federal funds shall not be spent on the construction of facilities where employment bias can be proved. I intend to implement that Congressional mandate to the hilt. I shall insist that every construction contract which involves Federal funds, under the control of the Department of Transportation, insures equal employment opportunity on the project covered by that contract. If this means a temporary slow-down in the pace of such construction, so be it. Federal funds cannot be part of whatever imagined rewards allegedly flow from a biased employment policy or a biased union recruitment program.

As I said before, the easy jobs in transportation are behind us. Every year, the amount of vacant and inexpensive land over which freeways can be routed diminishes. More and more, routing decisions involve demolition of homes, dislocation of families, and the danger of damage to the landscape.

I believe such decisions are best made after open debate in which government can be made more aware of the wishes of the people. Such debate also serves to give the people a better idea of the real alternatives in transportation among which they must make their choices.

With this broader approach to highway route selection, we can use a highway construction program not only to improve transportation but to improve a city, Baltimore, for example,

(more)

has put together a team that represents every discipline in urban planning and design as well as transportation. This team will work out the route for the Interstate highway in that city. Architects, planners and engineers on the team are working not only on a highway but on a catalyst for integrating broader developmental goals of the city.

There is another crucial factor in the design of a transportation system which is out of the hands of the Federal government - the zoning of land.

The best of traffic master plans cannot withstand the pressures of thoughtless or opportunistic re-zoning. Yet, all over America, new subdivisions, apartments and office buildings are allowed to go up with little concern for the added burdens they impose on local transportation facilities. Too seldom is there an effort to balance the cost of expanding transportation against the value the new construction will add to the community. The developer takes the profit and the community takes the consequences. Intelligent zoning is not only the key to successful transportation investment, but it represents the best hope for avoiding future transportation problems.

At this point, it may seem that in the warm spirit of intergovernmental cooperation, we have unloaded all of the really tough problems on the cities and states - planning, zoning and finance.

But the Department has saved a few for itself.

There is, for example, the question of how government channels investment in transportation without, in the long run, leaving transportation less competitive, less a part of the free enterprise system.

In the past, government's role have taken the form of prevention of destructive competition or of providing subsidies until a mode was strong enough to operate without them.

It will not be that simple in the future if we intend to arrive at a genuinely balanced system of transportation. But I can assure you that our first priority will be to keep our transportation system in the hands of private enterprise.

We will also make major contributions to transportation research, an area in which we have to make up for a great deal of lost time.

(more)

Very little money - public or private - is now invested in basic transportation research, far less than the investment made by other industries.

Yet no industry needs research more.

Air traffic will triple in the next decade. By 1975, there will be 120 million cars, buses, and trucks on our roads. By 1977, one-million Americans will board a scheduled airliner every day.

What research is underway shows that radically different forms of transportation are within our grasp. For example, one project suggests that laser beams may be used to tunnel under cities, rapidly and at dramatically lower cost than present digging techniques. This could prevent much of the conflict between the city and the freeway. It could make possible the use of high-speed induction-driven trains between our cities with little interference with surface life.

Other research suggests that tracked air-cushion vehicles capable of 250 miles an hour could be built in the near future if we can concentrate more resources on its development.

At present, less than one percent of the annual Federal research budget goes to transportation and most of that is spent on aircraft and other air movement problems. Transportation companies spend less than one-half of one percent of their revenues on research. Fragmentation of the industry, which is characterized by a comparatively large number of relatively small companies, is the main deterrent to research. For the typical trucker, investment in research is viewed as uneconomic, as, indeed it is. A research budget of \$100,000 would be a major item for the typical transport firm and that is too small to permit any useful basic scientific inquiry.

Finally, we will share with you the task of making Americans more aware of what is required to give this nation a true system of transportation, one that will mean less delay, lower cost and higher standards of safety.

Abraham Lincoln said if "we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it." In other words, if you don't know where you are going, any road will get you there.

President Johnson, and the 89th Congress, made it possible, for the first time in this nation's history, to decide where we are going in transportation.

Our job, in Washington, in the states and in the cities, is to build the road that will get us there.

Thank you.