

69

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 THIRD ANNUAL ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATES GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE AT THE WESTERN SKIES MOTEL, ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO, SEPTEMBER 7, 1967, 12:00 NOON.

It was not too long ago when most American political opinion could conveniently -- and not too inaccurately -- be divided into two parts.

There was the view vehemently held by many that the Federal Government was at best a necessary evil which we needed for delivering the mail and defending the country, but which otherwise exhibited an inordinate appetite for expansion which had to be ruthlessly resisted.

And there was the view vociferously advanced by many that our states and localities had long since either outlived their usefulness or abdicated their responsibilities as effective political instruments for meeting the critical needs of our citizens.

There are still some today who hold one of these extreme views. But their number -- and their influence -- has drastically dwindled.

For, on the one hand, the partisans of Federal effort have come to understand that Federal programs -- no matter how amply financed or ingeniously fashioned -- cannot succeed except through the state and local governments, the private institutions and individuals, which alone can make these programs relevant and responsive to local needs and local conditions.

(more)

And the partisans of States rights, on the other hand, have come to understand not only the need for greater emphasis on States responsibilities, but also the need for broad Federal programs to attack a whole host of problems so acute and so widespread that they have long since passed beyond the boundaries of purely state or local concern.

Indeed, we have discovered that the great public problems before us -- poverty, traffic jams, unemployment, inadequate education, crime, poisoned air and polluted streams -- that these problems have a way of ignoring all boundaries, of spilling over from one jurisdiction to another, of refusing to adapt themselves to the established pigeon-holes or our organizational charts and political subdivisions, or indeed of our political prejudices.

The new Federal Department of Transportation, and the Federation of Rocky Mountain States, have at least one thing in common: both are products of this new political climate.

For the new Department is not simply another example of a burgeoning Federal bureaucracy, of creeping or galloping centralization, of another attempt on the part of the Federal Government to extend its sway over areas more properly reserved to other levels of government or to private enterprise.

President Johnson intended -- the Congress intended -- and I intend -- the new Department to be a working example of the approach the President has termed "creative federalism."

That approach rests upon the conviction -- in the President's words -- that "to survive and serve the ends of a free society, our Federal system must be strengthened -- and not alone at the national level. . . . We began as a nation of localities. And however changed in character those localities become, however urbanized we grow and however we build, our destiny as a Nation will be determined there."

What the new Department gives us, for the first time, is a national framework, a national focal point, for developing a coherent and cooperative approach -- involving all levels of government and all segments of our society -- toward insuring a transportation system that meets the total needs of our society.

It is not that we have done so badly in transportation -- we have, in fact, developed a transportation system far superior to any other in the world.

It is simply that, in the decades ahead, we have to do far better.

(more)

In transportation, as in most other areas, our concern must center principally upon our urban areas -- almost three out of four Americans live in these areas today. And the proportion grows every year.

Indeed, I must confess I was somewhat surprised to discover how rapid has been the rate of urbanization in the Rocky Mountain States -- and how extensively urban you have already become.

Three-quarters of the citizens of three of your States live in urban areas -- and even in your least urbanized States, roughly half of the people live in urban areas. In fact, your percentage of urbanization is about equal to the national average.

And if there is one thing that most urban areas in the country have in common it is a transportation problem. And each can learn something about solving its problems by observing the experience of others. But it is equally true that Denver, say, and Chicago and Los Angeles have fundamentally different transportation problems for the simple reason that they are fundamentally different cities.

Every important aspect of a city's life is affected and influenced -- often deeply and directly -- by its transportation system. For that reason, any decision to alter a city's transportation system must follow upon a host of other decisions involving the very size and character of the city itself.

It is the people of the city themselves who -- through their officials -- can alone make these decisions.

We intend, therefore, in the Department of Transportation to keep in close touch with our State and local officials throughout the Nation, and with those who operate and those who manage our transportation system.

Within my immediate office, I have established liaison units for State and local governments and transportation industry and labor. The men who head these offices have what I regard as one of the most important jobs in the Department-- to maintain a constant line of communication with our Governors and Mayors and leaders in the transportation field.

Let me repeat here what I have said elsewhere: I am one who believes there is some truth to past charges that the Federal Government has sometimes acted in ways that can only be considered arbitrary by State and local officials. I do not believe it possible to sit in Washington and come up with programs custom-tailored to the particular needs faced by cities and counties and States hundreds and, sometimes, thousands of miles away. All too often I believe it has been the practice of too many Federal officials to ask State and local officials to conform to national standards established without regard for the frequently very different needs of very different areas of the country.

I am convinced, as I know President Johnson is convinced, that it is time to amend these attitudes and to end these practices wherever they exist. And we are taking action in this area -- in my Department and throughout the Federal government.

With one important exception. 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. For example, in the construction industry with which we have substantial dealings, there is a severe problem. In some cases this problem of 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.

It is national policy that Federal funds shall not be spent on the construction of facilities where employment bias can be proved. I intend to implement that policy 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.

We have in this country far and away the best highway system in the world. Yet, as we are beginning to realize, we have sometimes been too concerned with economy in our highway program and have overlooked the enormous economic and social impact that highways and railroads have upon the cities and even the wide open spaces through which they pass.

All too often we have tended to select that route that will give us the straightest possible line at the lowest possible cost.

We have become increasingly aware of the severe social and economic dislocation that can result from that kind of narrow approach.

We -- all of us -- must begin to take a far more comprehensive approach to transportation.

We have to look at transportation as a whole -- as a single, integrated system. We can't, for example, simply build more and more highways to move more and more cars into our cities without considering where we are going to put the cars when they get there -- or without considering whether these highways will generate more traffic than they can handle. We can't consider any aspect of transportation in isolation from any other -- private transportation in isolation from public transportation, personal transportation in isolation from commercial transportation, airports in isolation from highways and rail systems, and so on.

(more)

To build a balanced transportation system that will serve all of us, we all have to get involved. A transportation choice is a total choice -- it affects the total environment in which we live and work. For that reason, I am convinced that the nation's governors are going to have to take far firmer hold of the decision-making reins on transportation issues in our states -- and take hold at the outset, not merely at the end when an issue has become so critical that they can no longer avoid taking a stand. If we are to make real inroads upon the transportation problems confronting us in this country, we must realize that a transportation decision is not simply a technical decision -- it is an economic decision, a social decision, a political decision. And those whom, through the political process, we entrust with the responsibility for making these public decisions must become involved -- as we all must -- in shaping the transportation system that serves our cities, our States and our nation.

I recognize that one of the prime purposes of the Federation of Rocky Mountain States is to insure -- and I quote from your articles of incorporation -- the "personal involvement of the governmental leadership of the region through cooperative participation by the Governors of the Rocky Mountain States and their representatives and such other Federal and State officials whose involvement may be required." Indeed, in its idea, its aims and its endeavors, your Federation seems to me a model example of the kind of thing other regions of the country might well consider doing.

In some parts of the United States, of course, it is too late to accomplish what you hope to accomplish, and to avoid what you seek to avoid -- to plan ahead for the economic, social and cultural growth of your region on a continual and comprehensive basis and thus to avoid a great many of the unhappy side-effects that have accompanied the growth of other parts of the United States.

I understand that one of your present intentions is to undertake a comprehensive inventory of your regional educational resources in the sciences -- an inventory that will enable you to identify any gaps which may exist and to encourage the appropriate institutions to fill these gaps. I would urge you not only to include transportation in this inventory, but to consider as well one of the most critical needs our country will face over the next few decades -- the need for planners, for people whose competence is not confined to some narrow specialization but is instead inclusive, comprehensive, and multi-disciplinary.

We are turning out all kinds of specialists throughout the country, but very few people who can coordinate the specialists. There are two obvious reasons for this vacuum: lack of money, and the system of separate disciplines in our universities. We desperately need these specialists, but even more we need people who can think in terms of total systems -- of transportation, for example, as a total system, of a city as a total environment.

(more)

I do not think it appropriate -- or useful -- to comment in any detail on the transportation problems and prospects for your region. You know these far better than I, and I hope to learn a great deal about them from you.

Let me make just one observation: this is one of the fastest growing regions in the country. And as this region grows, its transportation needs change. In the past your transportation needs have differed rather drastically from those in the more densely populated regions of our country. Your transportation concerns have centered, not about the problems of congestion but about the problems of distance. But as this region grows over the next few decades, your transportation needs will come more to resemble those in other parts of the country -- although certainly important differences will remain.

And you have one enormous advantage: you can look at some other areas of the country, and see the awful things that can happen when you don't look where you're going. In institutions such as the Federation of Rocky Mountain States, and in other ways, you are making it very clear that you don't intend to repeat other people's mistakes.

The Department of Transportation will do all it can to help you build a transportation system that meets the total needs of your citizens. We can do no more than help, but we will do all we can. It is you who are close to your people, and close to your problems. And we must rely on you to tell us what your problems are and what your people need.

I look forward to working with you in the months ahead -- to seeking your advice and your assistance. And I make you this promise: I will never ask for your assistance without first seeking your advice.

#####