

5)

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

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ALAN S. BOYD, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION BEFORE THE 50 CLUB AT THE UNION CLUB OF CLEVELAND, OHIO, ON MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1968, 6:30 P.M.

I had the pleasure of coming to Cleveland several months ago to talk to the Greater Cleveland Development Association - and to discuss with Mayor Stokes and some of your city officials the transportation problems that Cleveland faces.

I'm delighted to visit Cleveland again - and to meet with a group that can, I am told, do more than any other 50 or 500 or 5,000 men in the entire area to help Cleveland cope with its problems in transportation as in other fields.

The one thing that Cleveland shares with every other metropolis in America is problems - problems of poverty and slums, of delinquency and crime, of schools, of housing, of race relations, of traffic and transportation, of polluted air and water.

Here, as in urban areas throughout the nation, 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 pigeonholes of our organizational charts and political subdivisions, or indeed our political prejudices.

For these problems, in short, affect us all in common - and their solution will require that we act in common. And, as we are discovering, we cannot deal with any of these problems in isolation - the solution to one cannot successfully be sought without seeking the solution for the others as well.

The result is that neither in government nor in the private sector can we proceed with business as usual - or more accurately, business as it used to be; for relations between the public and private sector have undergone radical alterations during the decade of the Sixties.

For its part, the Federal government has deliberately designed its policies and programs - economic and social - to enlarge and enhance the role of the private sector in the pursuit of our national goals.

And for their part, the leaders of the business world have come to accept and exercise their responsibilities for helping solve the problems that confront cities and communities throughout the land as well as the nation as a whole.

Both government and business have discovered the remarkable feats they can accomplish when they work as allies rather than as antagonists - when they seek, not cause for senseless conflict, but common cause in the national interest.

And this is not simply a pious proclamation. It is - and must increasingly continue to be - a fact of national life.

Recently Dr. Harvey Brooks - Dean of the Harvard Engineering School - put it this way: "One of the central issues of our time is how to deal with our pressing social problems, the problems brought about by the growth of population, urbanization and the rapid application and diffusion of technology itself. These are public problems. They represent needs that cannot currently be expressed in terms of a market demand that can be satisfied for somebody's profit."

"There is," he goes on to say, "no lack of ideas for dealing with many of these problems, but there is nothing analogous to the pull of the market to induce the development of solutions, or to do the sorting out of alternative innovations that is achieved more or less automatically through the probing of the market in the private sector."

Economists tell us there are two kinds of goods: private goods and social goods. Private goods each individual buys for himself are a matter of entirely free economic choice. Social goods we own and buy in common: like national defense, education, clean air, flood control and the like.

Not too long ago we could make fairly clear-cut distinctions between these kinds of goods and these kinds of choices.

But those days are gone forever.

As more and more people crowd into proportionately less and less space - so that it's getting hard to put your foot down without stepping on someone's toe - and as anything that happens anywhere in the world is only an instant electronic impulse away, we are beginning to find out that we are having to make more and more choices in common.

We are beginning to face up to the fact that the choices available to each of us individually depend on the kind of environment we create for all of us together. Our ability to make any genuine individual choices at all, in fact, will depend on how sensibly we act in building our educational and health and recreational facilities; upon our transportation system; upon the quality of the air we breathe and the water we drink; and upon the extent to which all of our citizens have ample incentives and opportunities for a decent education, a decent home and a decent job.

Transportation, for example, is one of the great choice mechanisms of our society. In the past we have, in effect, exercised our choice without really knowing it - buying automobiles and building highways without really being aware of many of the implications of these decisions.

For these are private decisions with immense public consequences - consequences we can no longer avoid or ignore.

No family, for example, considers a move to a suburban home with a two-car garage as having any consequences beyond the benefits it brings them. Yet the effect of a hundred thousand such decisions may be the relative decline of a downtown business district; relocation of firms; disintegration of the central city's school system; the isolation of the poor and the disadvantaged within the central city; removal of valuable land from city tax rolls as more and more freeways are built; and innumerable other adverse consequences.

The same pattern prevails in the spread of air and water pollution - and, most importantly, in the sometimes unintended but devastatingly effective isolation of the Negro American from even the most ordinary opportunities available to almost every other American of a different color.

The moral is very simple:

--First, both in the public and private sectors we are going to have to accept responsibility for the broad public and social consequences of all our policies and programs. We must foresee these consequences - and forestall those that threaten to undo any good result the program was intended to produce.

--Second, we are going to have to work together in this task, you in the private sector and we in government, each of us doing what each can do best.

The private market works wonders - it is the most efficient and appropriate machine ever invented by man for satisfying individual needs. But it is not always so satisfactory in meeting public needs. At the same time, no amount of Federal money - no panoply of Federal programs - can meet these needs either.

What is required - even for the success of Federal programs - is that partnership I have mentioned between the public and private sectors: the partnership President Johnson has termed "creative federalism" - federalism with a small "f".

And when we talk about transportation, we talk about people - for it is people that transportation is designed to serve - and cities - because that is where most people live and work.

And that means that when we talk about transportation we talk about all the problems people have in cities.

It means:

--First, that each urban area itself must decide what kind of transportation system best serves and suits its particular needs. Obviously, the system that works best in Las Vegas or Los Angeles is not likely to be the system that works best in Philadelphia or San Francisco.

--Second, any assessment of the role of any segment of our urban systems must be made in the context of the system as a whole. We should not build airports without adequate access roads or rails - or undertake extensive road building to accommodate autos without taking into account the feasibility of rail or other mass transit.

--Third, as I have suggested, transportation exerts as powerful and pervasive an effect upon the air we breathe as it does upon the way we live. It enables the affluent to enjoy the blessings of suburban living and convenient access to all the services of the city without really paying for it. But that pattern of life condemns the poor to the inner city and cuts them off from access to the jobs and other opportunities they must have to sustain themselves; maintain their dignity. Because, therefore, transportation has such a powerful impact upon the total environment in which it operates, then that impact must be the most important factor in deciding the direction and shape a transportation system ought to take.

What we must do, therefore, is replace the old accidental approach to transportation planning with a systems approach - looking at transportation as a system, as an organic whole, whose job is to serve the city in which it operates and the people who live there.

And we must broaden the old cost-benefit formula to include a kind of social cost accounting - that considers the broad social costs and consequences and benefits of transportation decisions, as matters not of secondary but of supreme concern.

And my Department is engaged in hundreds of programs, and projects and investigations to aid our urban areas and our transportation industry achieve these ends. But we can do no more than aid.

Our urban areas must decide for themselves what kind of transportation system they need. And before they can do that they must decide what kinds of cities they want to be, how they want to grow and what shape they want to take.

We are encouraging them to make these kinds of decisions. We are supporting them in their efforts to develop systems that suit their total needs and serve their people - witness our support of so-called "design concept" teams in Baltimore and Chicago.

We are fully aware of the handicaps under which most of our urban areas labor - the overlapping and obsolete jurisdictions, the lack of funds, and so forth, which increasingly impede their efforts to cope with the incredibly difficult problems before them.

We are also fully aware - in transportation and other fields - Federal policies must bear some of the blame for creating these problems as well as compounding some of your difficulties in dealing with them.

The Federal government, for example, has at one and the same time established programs to rebuild and restore our central cities and programs that have contributed to their decay and decline.

We are moving, in the field of transportation at least, toward more comprehensive and better coordinated Federal-aid programs. The authorization by Congress - just a few weeks ago - of the transfer to the Department of Transportation of the Urban Mass Transit Administration is a step in that direction.

But we do have a long way to go before we can say that our Federal programs are so structured and shaped that they respond as fully and as flexibly as they should to the needs of our urban areas.

Currently, for example, our transportation demonstration programs are designed to deal mainly with individual pieces of hardware rather than with systems and to serve very broad rather than very particular needs. And they have a way sometimes of being applicable everywhere in general and nowhere in particular.

We may well want to consider a radical revision of our whole approach to demonstration grants - a revision that would enable them to serve both more inclusive and more unique purposes, both more comprehensive and more concrete needs.

The approach I have in mind would, for the first time, permit cities - backed by Federal assistance and free from rigid program categorization - to define and attack their most urgent transportation problems as they interpret them at the local level.

Today, by contrast, city mayors are severely restricted in what they can do with Federal transportation aid. Billions of dollars are available for urban streets and freeways and a few million dollars are available for mass transit. Yet freeways and mass transit are only two ways of dealing with just a few urban transportation needs.

A city may well decide, for example, that it requires - not new highways or mass transit - but more fringe parking, or better airport access, or a new computerized traffic control system, or street grade separation, and so forth. But today no Federal money is available for any of these purposes. As a result, our city mayors all too often find themselves restricted to Federal transportation programs with little relevance to their most urgent transportation problems.

The approach I suggest would make grants available to meet urban transportation problems in almost any way - however novel - that bears a rational relationship to a city's overall transportation planning. It would, as I envision it, help our cities meet their immediate needs as well as improve their comprehensive transportation system planning.

This is but one way in which we - at the Federal level - can make our programs much more responsive to the real needs of our cities.

And those needs are urgent - in transportation, in education, in employment, in every aspect of urban life.

But, as I have said, while Federal efforts can aid immensely by responding to urban needs, they can only aid - they can only encourage.

For transportation decisions -- like those involving most of our pressing public problems - are essentially local political decisions - they must be made by the citizens of these local areas themselves and by the officials they have elected to run their governments.

I know that many of you strongly supported efforts to make local government workable. I urge you not to retire before the job has really begun.

I am absolutely convinced that, in transportation as in all other aspects of urban planning, businessmen and other laymen must get involved in the politics of planning - they must get involved in the substance as well as the selling.

Certainly we need the experts - but urban planning, like other things, is too important to leave entirely to the experts. And far too many businessmen seem satisfied to serve as sidewalk superintendents and suburban sharpshooters.

Nor is it enough to wait until you've got a package already wrapped up, and then go out and sell it - which businessmen have done, and done superbly, in a number of cities throughout the nation. By and large, the businessman has been reluctant to get involved in the earlier and messier stages of the planning process.

One reason, I suppose, is that he does not feel qualified.

Another is that businessmen tend to think of the decision-making process in a democracy as something different from the process in business.

If that were true, every new product would have gone on the market without a whimper from the sales department. Every store would have been expanded without a word of warning from the treasurer. And you could say of the board of directors room that there never was heard a disparaging word.

The fact is that the difference between the politics of the community and the politics of business is one of degree and of market. Elected officials deal not with one unified market or even several neatly identifiable markets but with a multitude of markets, all contending for a different share of the available product. And they must work - shape their programs and products - within the free-for-all of these contending pressures and often with resources utterly inadequate to the problems they face.

They need all the help they can get - and they need your help most of all.

#####

