SHARPE
Haselton
Boyd file

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT	FHWA NOTICE
Transportation	

October 16, 1967
54-60

Attached is a copy of remarks made by Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, to the American Society for Public Administration.

Mr. Boyd's address is being circulated to all FHWA offices as a basic policy statement by the Secretary which has the enthusiastic endorsement of our Administrator.

Lawrence S. Cassazza
Interim Director of
Administration

Enclosure

DISTRIBUTION: **FHWA Executive Secretariat**
All FHWA Offices
Headquarters
Regions
Divisions

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 NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AT THE PRESIDENTIAL ARMS, WASHINGTON, D. C., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1967, 12:15 P.M.

A few years ago, it was the fashion to think in terms of a day when every commuter would own a helicopter and our traffic problems would vanish. You don't hear that much anymore, but the period left some lasting impressions.

Picture, for example, thousands of commuters taking off from their backyards in Virginia and Maryland one morning and flying off to the Federal Triangle. And picture the whole vast street network of Washington with a single car - one lone automobile racing over the deserted streets from one corner of the city to another - calling Hardin and Weaver with rush-hour traffic reports for the helicopters.

We have outgrown the single-family helicopter phase, but I am afraid too many people have gone on searching for other quick and easy solutions. I know the feeling well. It comes over you while you are waiting for the traffic to start moving again. After all, you say to yourself, this is the age of the "breakthrough."

And the first thing you know, there you are - like Walter Mitty - looking down at a drawing board which has the complete plans for a system that will wipe out traffic jams and - in its spare time - create the parks we forgot to make room for and blow away the smog.

(more)

But I am afraid that sort of wishful thinking just makes an already enormously difficult job even harder to do.

Unfortunately, all of the work that must be done to improve transportation in America's cities must be done the hard way. And anything that encourages us to grasp at the first straw that goes by with wheels on it will just make us more impatient with a job that already requires more patience than we may have.

So I want to make it clear today that at least for the foreseeable future - we must solve our transportation problems with tools very much like the ones we already have.

This country has invested billions of dollars in its urban transportation system and it cannot - if you will pardon my saying so - just walk away from that system.

For the next several years, the "breakthroughs" will come not from radical changes in the transportation system but from learning to use that system more efficiently, with greater safety and more comfort and convenience. Urban transportation will continue to look much like it looks today - automobiles, trains, trucks, buses and airplanes.

This is not to say the drawing boards are absolutely blank. We are experimenting with laser beams for tunneling under cities to carry traffic that cannot or should not go through them. We are studying the linear induction motor to move trains faster and air cushion systems to move them over less expensive roadbeds.

In the meantime, our breakthroughs will be more on the order of cutting one hour off the run from Washington to New York with a high-speed train. And that will be only one of hundreds of ideas we must test and perfect in all parts of the system before we begin to see any dramatic change.

Perhaps the most shocking thing you can say about the urban transportation system of America is that, in many cases, it is in much better shape than the urban school system, the urban park system or the urban housing situation.

What we call the transportation crisis is a crisis of the whole city. Americans have worked very hard for the past two centuries building the most advanced industrial society known to man. But about 30 years ago, they began to look around at

(more)

the cities they had created in the process and say, this is not exactly what we had in mind. It needs more parks and trees. Too many of the people live in squalor. The schools teach, but too many do not educate. What's more, they said, the bus service is not adequate. The freeway spoils the view. The planes taking off from the airport are noisy. And we did not leave anyplace for people to walk in the sun.

Since World War II, we have spent a great deal of time arguing not about what to do to solve the problems of the cities but what to do first. We have broken up into partisan groups, some pushing rapid transit, some pushing stricter planning, others arguing that the only answer is to get the highways out of the cities.

And we got ourselves into much the same situation as a New England contractor who won the bid a few years ago for building a new school. He got the bid on two conditions. First, he had to tear down the old school and use the salvaged materials on the new one. And second--to make the transition as easy as possible for the students --he had to let them use the old school until the new one was finished.

President Johnson was among the first to see that the problem of the cities could not be solved piecemeal but must be dealt with across the board. And he was the first to do something about making it possible for the work to begin.

As a result, the cities of the United States have offers of help from the Federal government on every front where they are fighting against disease, poverty, ignorance and blight. And the offers come in substantially larger amounts than ever before, as well.

The model cities program provides federal assistance to make possible not only new houses but new and more livable design for neighborhoods. The rent supplement program will help make it possible to use the new neighborhoods after they have been built. City schools not only have more money but more creative programs in which to use the money.

(more)

Economic development programs help finance new industries to provide jobs in the cities. There is the program for safer streets--the most comprehensive crime control program ever proposed by a president.

And among these--and many more--is our Department of Transportation.

In his message to Congress asking for the Department, the President pointed out that transportation had grown haphazardly in America; meeting needs as they arose; never taking into account any total economic or social need.

As a result, he said, "both people and goods are compelled to conform to the system as it is. . ." And in the broadest sense, he saw the Department as a means of helping reverse that order to make the system conform to the needs of people.

In general, we will work toward coordinating the future growth of all modes of transportation toward a true system in which travelers and cargo can move from one mode to another with a minimum of delay and a maximum of comfort.

Our role in the cities is no different. A taxicab, a bus, a high-speed highway, serve the same purpose in a city as a school, an art gallery, a theater or an office. They are there because people who visit, work or live in cities need them to live well. Our job is simply to see to it that when it comes to transportation, our contribution to the good life in the cities is a positive one.

In order to get on with this work, there are a number of facts which we must face, no matter how distasteful we find them. One is that most Americans will move out of a city and into a home with a big yard as soon as they can afford it. While we argue over whether this is good or bad, they are buying suburban houses at the rate of 700,000 a year. While we argue about the merits of high density as opposed to dispersal, they are buying automobiles at the rate of more than eight million a year. And most of them plan to drive those new cars to work the morning after they take delivery.

So we come to fact number one: Given the present state of our research, economy and technology, highways are in the cities not only to stay but to spread. American

cities are going to depend even more heavily on the streets and roads they now have and they are going to have to build more.

For a handful of metropolitan areas, new or expanded rail rapid transit systems can and do offset serious congestion, particularly where highways cannot handle peak-hour traffic.

But for the majority of American cities and towns, rail mass transit is not yet economically feasible.

We will, of course, work toward a balance of highways and rail, both on the surface and underground, as the long-range solution to city transportation. But for now, the highway must be the basic tool for most cities.

In accepting the highway, however, we are by no means forced to commit ourselves to our present methods of using it.

Nor are we by any means committed to the methods we have used in the past for choosing the routes over which we build the highways.

The debate over the highway in the city has stirred some powerful emotions and strong language in recent years.

There is one faction that believes all highway engineers should be ridden out of town on a rail--a monorail, if one is available.

The engineers, for their part, insist--and rightly--that they gave us--to the extent that we made our wishes explicit--what we asked for: An efficient highway system to serve travelers and commerce at the lowest cost. They certainly cannot be accused of failing to follow any comprehensive metropolitan plan because we seldom--if ever--gave them one to work from.

But the time has come to change the order, to include social values which cannot be measured by any standard economic formula in the design of our future urban highways. And I am confident that the highway engineers of the nation will once again produce to specification. I just hope that all of us--the Federal government, the cities and the suburbs--will produce more carefully thought-out specifications this time.

(more)

We are now rewriting our procedures for Federal approval of highway routes to reflect this new concern for the cultural and esthetic values of a city. We believe the best judges of routes and designs are the people who will have to live with them. And in order to provide the greatest possible leeway, we are developing methods for measuring the resource values that go beyond the standard cost/benefit analyses.

Existing urban highways and streets have a greater potential than is now being tapped. We are just beginning to realize how much of that potential we waste everyday.

The automobile was not designed with the efficient movement of peak-hour volumes of commuters in mind. Nor is it the only way to use the highway.

Actually, the highway is a remarkably versatile element of transportation and rubber-tired mass transportation is one use of the highway which we are just beginning to discover, or rediscover. There are any number of theories about the kind of fast, comfortable and dependable bus service that will lure commuters from their cars.

Suppose you could buy the morning paper and get a cup of coffee on a bus that passed within a block of your house and then went rather directly to a reserved lane on a freeway and non-stop to the city? Would you leave the car at home?

We don't know the answer. We don't know whether such service is feasible. But we certainly think the concept of reserved lanes should be tested. The incentives are very strong. A lane of freeway reserved for buses could handle between 25,000 and 30,000 people at 35 to 40 miles an hour. That same land full of automobiles now carries 3,000.

The Federal Highway Administration is trying to promote the setting aside of certain lanes of freeway for exclusive use by buses. Federal funds will be available for building special on-and-off ramps for busses. And I intend to see that our efforts in this direction are expanded in the future.

Another example of our effort to make more efficient use of city highways is in a program called TOPICS. Its objective is to help cities, through both Federal funds and technical support, modernize their downtown street systems.

Twelve cities, with populations ranging from 30,000 to a half-million, have now qualified for help in channeling intersections, adding approach lanes, separating grades at "bottleneck" intersections and installing better traffic controls. In some cases, these relatively minor adjustments will increase the capacity of the system by as much as 25 per cent.

We tend to talk in terms of the urban transportation problem, but there are, in fact, many problems. The problem of the suburban commuter, for example, is far differerent from that of the man in the ghetto. Many Americans are too old or too young or too infirm to drive. Others are too poor. And it is the poor who most desperately need good alternatives to the automobile. As the report on Watts stated, inadequate public transportation is one of the public deficiencies that handcuffs the man in the ghetto in his search for jobs, for education, for recreation. The lack of good transportation isolates and confines and frustrates the poor.

We think the idea of free public transportation deserves serious consideration. The Department of Transportation is looking into the possibility of a study of free public transit in metropolitan areas as a public policy alternative. The study will consider the importance of social and economic factors. It will examine the effect of free transit as an incentive for use; the extent to which such a system might be used by low income groups; and the impact of such technological considerations as trip time and convenience.

From this study, we hope to learn whether free transit would make a significant contribution toward relieving rush-hour congestion in the cities. Whether it will help people in the ghetto find jobs and hold onto them. Whether an increased use of mass transit will reduce air pollution and the need for parking facilities.

Finally, we come to the fourth dimension of transportation--the way it affects the quality of the environment in a city while it moves people and goods. The impact of transportation on what we see, hear and smell--on how we live--is harder to measure than its impact on how we move. But the impact is there and it will be given a high priority in decisions on transportation policy.

(more)

Some of the problems can be solved only by technology, the air pollution generated by automobiles, the noise generated by trucks, trains and planes. President of the Electronics Division of Union Carbide, Robert A. Charpie, was quoted recently as saying: "With the proper environment, we can hall off and invent and design anything we want." We intend to take Mr. Charpie up on that; along with the rest of American industry, on those "anythings" determined to be essential to the future of transportation.

Other problems--such as enhancing a city's physical environment--can be solved with present technology, common sense and cooperation.

For example, we can and will take a new look at the way we buy land for urban freeways. Studies have shown that it is frequently possible to buy land for a variety of uses at little more than the cost of buying the right-of-way for the freeway alone. Under joint development, entire city blocks could be acquired along freeway routes for housing, parking and play grounds at a fraction of what the land might otherwise cost. Such joint development could help create new housing for people in poverty areas who are dispossessed by highways. The construction of residential communities, complete with shopping and recreational facilities, over or adjacent to, highways, pose only limited legal and engineering difficulties. This concept already has been used in planning and building municipal centers, schools and other public buildings. It has even more dramatic possibilities applied to highway development. In Washington, for example, feasibility studies have been made on the possibility of building apartments over a portion of the Inner Loop. And in Baltimore, urban, social, economic and transportation planners are preparing to work together as a team to use Interstate 95 as a catalyst for achieving broader community goals in the areas of Baltimore it will pass through.

The catalog of programs for solving the transportation problems of the cities is easier to read than to implement. The effort will put new strains on such contending interests as the central business district and the satellite city; the government plan and the operation of free enterprise. Perhaps the most difficult part of implementation will be the matter

of timing. It will not make much sense to develop attractive new neighborhoods in a city if the school remains second-rate. A smooth-flowing traffic pattern cannot be considered real progress if the air is still filled with smog.

But there are two new elements in the debate over our cities that make me think the jobs can be done.

One is the new spirit of President Johnson's "creative federalism."

The other is the President's insistence that we have no real alternative. As he reminds us: "We must seek, and we must find the ways to preserve and to perpetrate in the city, the individual, the human dignity, the respect for human rights--that has been part of the American character and the strength of the American system."

The Department of Transportation is not an end to our transportation problems; it is a beginning in the search for new solutions. But it gives us, for the first time a logical framework for seeking those solutions.

Thank you.

# # #