

53-DOT-70

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY U.S. SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JOHN A. VOLPE TO THE AMERICAN TRANSIT ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1970.

When I was Governor here not too long ago, I used to bring the official greetings of the Commonwealth to all the conventions that came to town, like Frank Sargent did here this morning. And in welcoming people, I used to like to talk about all the Massachusetts "firsts" -- the first subway, the first public school, the first railroad, and so forth.

Well today, I'd like to just point out that Massachusetts was the first state to send a Catholic to the White House, the first state to send a Negro to the U.S. Senate, and now -- if you help me get that public transportation bill through the House -- it'll go a long way toward making a Massachusetts Italian want to stay in the Cabinet!

I want to assure you that we are still burning the midnight oil on behalf of your bill and mine -- the landmark Public Transportation Act of 1970. We're almost "over the hump" with this one, and I'm sure you all agree with me that it's going to be a pretty great feeling when the President finally signs it into law.

My friends, the golden age of public transportation is just beginning. That's not a hope -- it's a promise -- and it's based upon an irresistible trend.

I'm glad the Commonwealth of Massachusetts -- my home state -- helped start this trend with the pace-setting Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Your former President, Edward A. Pellissier, described this bill as making Massachusetts the "new valhalla for the transit industry" and that is just what happened.

See other #57

①

Setting up a unified transit authority for a zone of the many municipalities in greater Boston and financing a transit restoration program with special taxes, this State not only anticipated the Federal Transit Bill of 1964 by a month but set in motion a new wave of progress which eventually reached Cleveland, northern New Jersey, San Francisco and elsewhere.

Yet all of us know that nowhere near enough has been done.

Conditions inside our cities have gone downhill fast. Commuting times are up, ghetto residents are reaching the point of outrage, traffic jams are common throughout the business day and not just at rush hours, and vehicle noise and exhaust emissions pose a serious threat to health.

We have come to recognize that we must move people, not cars. We know full well that no car -- not even a limousine -- ever brought one dime's worth of merchandise. So accessibility by car is not the same thing as mobility for people or prosperity for merchants.

Unless we can control and relieve traffic by skillful deployment of modern transit vehicles, all our urban problems will be magnified. A man cannot live long with jammed arteries, and neither can a city. No city can enjoy prosperity and civic peace without unimpeded systems for circulating people and the vital goods of commerce.

It is a cinch that building more freeways to accommodate more cars is not the whole answer -- they tend to reach capacity as fast as they are opened. Freeway after urban freeway was designed to meet traffic loads of 1990 and yet filled up by 1965. So it is obvious that highways alone can never do the job.

There is no question in my mind that the automobile's days in the center city are numbered. I'm not proposing that it be outlawed -- it is too vital to our mobility for that -- but I suspect that it will have to be regulated to a certain extent.

We have recently seen in Tokyo, New York City, and Washington, that keeping cars off certain streets at certain hours can greatly increase our mobility, cut noise and smog, and incidentally raise the profits of merchants along the way. Success breeds imitation, and I'm confident that other cities are bound to follow.

Perhaps it's readily obvious (I know it is to you) -- but once such measures are taken, the American city still must preserve its mobility, and the obvious answer is public transportation.

If we're going to regulate automobile traffic, we have to provide an alternative. And that alternative must be clean, fast, efficient and safe -- and it must attract patrons, not simply accommodate them. It's all too true that urban transit has a bad image. People think of creaking buses, screeching subway cars, dirty commuter trains. They think of obsolete routing, slow service, regular breakdowns, and standing in the rain for a bus that never comes.

Mayors all over the U.S. say that poor public transportation is a top problem on their lists -- and in some cases a crucial determinant of social peace in our troubled cities.

Al Karr, an enterprising reporter for the Wall Street Journal, took a poll recently to get the facts about declining service. Here are some of the quotes he came up with:

Mayor Sam Yorty of Los Angeles referred to the 1968 defeat of a transit bond issue and said, "Our need still exists and becomes more urgent as congestion mounts."

In Cleveland, Mayor Carl Stokes described transit needs as an "overwhelming problem".

Alderman Richard Curtin in Minneapolis declared that mass transit is the "one alternative" to massive freeway congestion at peak hours.

New York banker Donald Weeden stated that the deterioration of transit systems is a threat to the very "life blood of the urban economy."

The message doesn't vary. It's always the same. So in spite of the difficulties that lie ahead, public transportation must be made to work. It has to work or the cities are going to stagnate and die while suburbia sprawls in all directions, creating an even greater demand and necessity for private automobiles.

That is why the future of urban life in this country depends upon the Public Transportation Assistance Act of 1970. But I know I don't have to convince ATA members of that. You have been with us from the start.

I personally deeply appreciate the vigorous way in which ATA has rallied the transit industry behind this bill. You have also done priceless homework among those grass roots in the cities throughout the nation. I want to thank you, too, for supporting the very necessary compromise we made on funding, because otherwise there would be no chance for the bill this year. In short, your constant help has been crucial in all phases of this legislation.

We must be doing something right when a bill that everyone said a year ago had no chance breezes through the Senate by 84 to 4 and passes the House Banking and Currency Committee by 34 to 0.

The logic of the bill is really compelling. Not only governors, big-city mayors, transit people, bus makers, drivers' unions, chambers of commerce and young activists of both parties, but even the Triple-A, the auto makers and the oil companies are supporting this measure. Senator Russell Long said that you and I had put together -- and I quote -- "The damndest coalition I've ever seen." That's quite a compliment.

We are seeing some of the same forces at work on the House side. We are getting a lot of support from small and medium-sized towns where transit lines have collapsed already or are tottering on the edge of insolvency. For old people, for youngsters, for the handicapped, for the poor, the demise of buses is a personal disaster because they have no other way to get around.

I predict the bill will pass, and when that happens, urbanization in this country is going to take a new course. The renovation of the central city is bound to accelerate. Access to schools, housing, employment, welfare -- all will benefit.

And another point; one of great interest to all of you. Few people realize how tremendous the mass transit market really will be. "Railway Age" recently estimated that the Public Transportation Act will trigger expenditures on a scale not seen since the turn of the century. I don't know whether the figure will reach the \$20 billion in ten years that the editors forecast. A study prepared for UMTA shows capital needs over the next ten years at between \$28 and \$24 billion. But I do agree that the market will be a big and rapidly growing one, with bright possibilities for aggressive manufacturers and suppliers.

I intend to see to it that buses and trains share equally in this market. But because of the capital intensive nature of rails, it would not be surprising to see more than half of the money invested in this direction. The main thing to keep in mind is that success in public transit will generate money for all modes adequate to their needs. This is the classical action of a free market economy.

What will this new era of transit investment mean to the man in the traffic jam? What will the public really be able to count upon 10 years hence? Here is the general picture as we presently see it.

Fringe parking lots, where drivers may deposit their cars and take the bus or rapid rail into town, will become common. We will see the spread of reserved freeway lanes for buses, and bus drivers will be able to control traffic signals in their favor to expedite rush hour travel. I expect further that some form of refined demand-actuated bus systems will gradually make their appearance in the less congested urban and suburban neighborhoods. Rapid rail transit will become a common means of airport access. More communities -- such as Atlanta, Saint Louis, Los Angeles, Baltimore and Seattle -- will be relying upon commuter trains to get people downtown.

What's more, there is every prospect that the Tracked Air-Cushion Vehicle will play a prominent part in moving people through high density corridors where stops need be made only at 3 or 5 mile intervals or more. The first TACV will be placed between Los Angeles International Airport and the Sepulveda Dam Recreation area (we're aiming for late 1972) and will be pushed up to 175 miles-per-hour by a linear induction motor. Later models, to be tested at our recently dedicated proving ground in Pueblo, Colorado, will reach 300 miles-per-hour and bring a new era of high-speed, medium-distance commutation between the hubs of our emerging linear cities, supplementing our overburdened highways and airways.

And new technologies such as this will certainly lead to basic and profitable refinements of our inner city circulation systems. We are in an era that recognizes technical spinoffs, and we are certainly prepared to utilize the great amount of expertise at our command.

Public transportation, as I see it, is the great untapped resource for making the city conform to human needs. The average citizen today spends far too much of his valuable time trying to get where he has to go. Tomorrow it will be different. Travel will be a pleasure. The modes will be integrated.

Public transportation will be safe, clean, comfortable, stylish and efficient. We will have practical, alternative access to the commercial and cultural centers of urban life.

I want to make one thing clear. I am not anti-automobile. Freeways have a vital job to do in the countryside, and in certain well-planned urban locations.

No one who sees the big picture today is going to try to downgrade or dispense with such a great national asset as the interstate system.

What this country needs now -- and is going to get -- is a balanced system of transportation in which each mode does its job and where the consumer gets to exercise a little choice, instead of having one mode forced upon him.

By working together, we can speed that day. And in so doing, we will set an example for the world of how reasonable men can muster urban forms, save the environment, and make a better life for all mankind.

#####

(6x) all