

**REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION MORTIMER DOWNEY
SETTING THE INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION
RESEARCH FRAMEWORK
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 4, 1996**

Good morning. I'd like to begin my remarks today with a transportation example from nature: the Canadian goose.

Have you ever observed them flying in their V formation? Ever wondered why one wing of the V is usually longer than the other? After years of study, researchers have the answer: *the longer wing has more geese.*

I'm joking, of course, but geese instinctively know the value of *cooperation*. For instance, they regularly change leadership. Why? Because the leader fights head winds to make flying easier for the geese behind him. When he becomes exhausted, another goose takes over.

Scientists have discovered through wind tunnel tests that a flock of geese can fly 72 percent faster and farther by cooperating in this way.

The lesson is applicable for us because intermodalism -- a buzzword if ever there was one -- is nothing more -- and nothing less -- than *cooperation*.

It's easy to get caught up in process and forget what intermodalism is all about. It means cooperating to increase our transportation system's efficiency -- and its benefits for the American people.

Moreover, intermodalism's promise has been somewhat obscured by the questions surrounding it -- questions that, over the past five years, have gone from "*what?*" to "*why?*" to "*how?*" to "*when?*"

There has been tremendous progress on improving intermodal connections, both in the private sector and in military traffic.

Advances like double-stack trains and projects like the Stark County, Ohio intermodal project are becoming so common that they're taken for granted. Moreover, there has been a tendency to forget -- or to dismiss -- the progress we've seen.

Indeed, some people see that four years have gone by since the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act was passed and wonder why its full promise hasn't been realized.

Well, neither Rome nor the Interstate Highways nor the New York subways were built in a day -- and we aren't going to have full intermodal connectivity in a day -- or after four years.

Integrating our transportation systems -- with their physical and technological differences, geographic dispersion, different owners, different customers and different patterns of labor organization -- will take an ongoing effort that will stretch over many years.

But that effort -- no matter how complex or demanding -- is essential.

Let me start with the obvious: we continue to face growing travel demand -- inadequate capacity -- bottlenecks and poor connections between modes -- and aging, deteriorating infrastructure. We can't take any of that lightly.

DOT's recent report on the nation's surface transportation system didn't surprise anyone when it concluded that we should be investing \$57 billion annually in our surface transportation systems alone just to maintain current conditions.

Of course, simply maintaining current conditions won't give our economy the capacity it needs to grow.

That's why the report also concluded that an additional \$23 billion annually could be invested in projects whose quantifiable benefits, such as savings from congestion reduction, would outweigh their costs. So that's \$80 billion that we ought to be investing each and every year.

However, all levels of government now spend about \$40 billion annually on surface transportation infrastructure, which means that we have a \$40 billion-a-year gap.

Closing that deficit in today's environment of limited public funding -- especially when other public services have their own legitimate needs -- means going beyond the paradigms that have driven transportation policy for the past 40 years.

Let's face it: we cannot just build our way out of the congestion and the other problems we face. We don't have the money to do so -- not even at the Pentagon -- we don't want the impacts on our environment that doing so would bring -- and there are serious questions about the long-term effectiveness of such a strategy.

But that doesn't mean we should turn our backs on our legitimate needs and on the opportunity to support economic growth. Nor can we turn our backs on the national security needs our transportation system supports.

Our *existing* transportation facilities will continue to be the backbone of our mobility, and we're going to have to maintain, and even expand, the network of transit systems, roads, ports, and railroads that has been so critical to our nation's prosperity.

However, we can't close the infrastructure gap just through new construction. Strategies such as Intelligent Transportation Systems and other new technologies, innovative financing, and demand management will play key roles.

Intermodalism is another of those strategies. It essentially is nothing more than good management of our transportation system.

It will help us to enable system users -- the military, private shippers, government transportation agencies -- to use the best mode -- or combination of modes -- to meet their needs in moving people and goods and to reduce the burden on system segments, especially when it's cheaper than major new construction.

Doing that means ensuring clean, compatible connections between modes and providing genuine consumer choice.

Those choices are becoming more complex, with simple point-to-point options and modes being replaced by complex choices of routing in networks and options to locate economic activities anywhere on the globe.

And, although government -- especially at the federal level, which by definition must take a national perspective -- clearly has a critical role to play -- most of this has to be done through market mechanisms that build upon the transportation systems that have been built up over generations and that -- on the whole -- still work well.

This can't happen through top-down government directive: that's an approach that has failed around the world in recent years.

Instead, government's role in promoting intermodalism has to take several forms.

We should promote deregulation to end economic distortions and allow markets to take their natural shape to return authority to state and local decision-makers.

Acting first under President Carter and now under President Clinton, the federal government has essentially ended economic regulation in the trucking, rail, and air passenger and cargo sectors and closed the doors on the 107-year-old ICC.

That has given consumers more choices and billions of dollars in savings while enabling providers to enter new markets and introduce new efficiencies.

The federal government, with its resources and its national perspective, can help to develop the analytical tools and databases that can enable businesses to make sound choices.

For example, we've been working with Los Alamos National Labs on developing innovative performance and operations system models and other new analytical frameworks to help us better understand entire transportation systems.

The federal government also can empower state and local agencies to use federal funds more flexibly, and to make investment decisions that are right for them as linkages into the network.

\$2 billion in ISTEA funds already have been transferred to mass transit in this way, and that has relieved pressure on congested urban highway corridors.

ISTEA funds can be used not only for passenger services but for freight projects as well. For instance, ISTEA funds improved road connections to the Columbus Inland Port Intermodal Facility in Ohio, and financed bridges for what will become the Alameda Corridor.

As ISTEA mandates, government at all levels also can improve transportation planning processes to ensure that the best projects are chosen for federal funding -- projects that meet genuine needs.

At all levels of government and in the private sector we can work to ensure that the new technologies now being developed and deployed, such as Intelligent Transportation Systems and Global Positioning satellites, are by design intermodal, and that they make transfers between systems as seamless as possible.

These new technologies also can be developed to link into the information systems that allow military and private users to more effectively manage their operations, as some already do through "just-in-time" delivery systems that in reality are mobile logistics programs.

Government also can encourage transportation system optimization -- but do it in ways that don't involve command-and-control of civilian systems.

America's evolving transportation systems have some of the same attributes of the Internet -- decentralization, immense capacity, unique opportunities for creativity -- and we need to enable the development of systems to harness and integrate these systems' power without impeding it.

Now, all of these things make sense, and I'm sure that few would disagree with them -- *in principle*. However, I'm sure that there would be plenty of debate about the specifics.

That's why conferences such as this one are so valuable. They bring together representatives from transportation agencies, the military, and business to discuss how to better integrate and improve the transportation network of which we're all a part. These meetings can help to develop a common language and a shared understanding.

That such meetings and other activities are now common is a big step by itself. After all, how much interaction was there between different modes 10 or 15 years ago?

As someone who worked in intermodalism before intermodalism was cool -- to paraphrase a former presidential candidate -- I can tell you that there wasn't much contact among different users. So even talking among ourselves is in itself a big step.

Talk, of course, is only a step. It's results that count. So now I'd like to turn to how we're cooperating to achieve results through the topic of this conference: research.

We at the federal level can provide leadership. We've already done some of this through steps that I'd mentioned earlier, and we'll continue to build upon those.

We're also continuing the integration of activities that had been confined within modal "stovepipes." The creation of the Office of Intermodalism that Michael Huerta heads and the hiring of Noah Rifkin as a department-wide Director of Technology Deployment are steps in this direction, and anyone who has worked with them or their staffs can tell you that they've helped.

We've also ensured that the newly-created Bureau of Transportation Statistics is intermodal in its orientation, and that it's available to provide data to users from all modes and all sectors. BTS is already a key player in the development of vital information analysis tool-kits.

We have been devoting increasingly greater proportions of our research to intermodal topics and to programs that transcend modes.

Through this research we'll develop solutions to the nontechnological obstacles intermodalism faces: the institutional, financial, and educational barriers.

For instance, although ISTEA requires consultation among various interests during the development of metropolitan transportation plans and programs, many areas lack the mechanisms and structures for such consultation.

Who pays for intermodal projects is another issue. Given funding constraints, some are reluctant to contribute to projects that they don't see as wholly "theirs."

The Stark County, Ohio project I mentioned earlier actually shows how these barriers can be overcome through innovative financing that brings together public and private interests.

In other cases there are legal or regulatory barriers that discourage intermodalism -- such as the prohibition against using Airport Improvement Program grants or airport revenues for off-airport highway or rail links, even when those improvements would clearly benefit an airport.

Finally, there is a genuine lack of training in cross-modal or intermodal issues. We still train people to be highway engineers or transit planners, and then fail to provide them with the information and tools they need to assess and meet challenges in a world that increasingly demands intermodal solutions.

Given these deterrents, we believe that it's critical for DOT to shift some of our research resources into the "soft side" -- that is, to policy and institutional research.

Although we must continue our long-standing commitment to "hardware" research -- and we're doing that -- often in partnership with Defense -- in areas like ITS and GPS, where we've greatly expanded the federal commitment under President Clinton -- we have to do more in these other areas.

However, over the past few years we've heard from many of you that we should place less emphasis on conventional research and develop a broader research agenda that will help you to better understand how transportation shapes the economy, affects the environment, and influences the quality of life.

Moreover, transportation organizations at all levels are continually interacting with each other and need to increase their ability to do so effectively. Areas like public participation, awareness, and consensus-building, mechanisms to involve the private sector and other levels of government, technical tools, and policy alternatives are all vital and demand research.

We have a number of ongoing efforts that respond to these "soft-side" research needs. Let me go over some of them in each of the three areas I'd mentioned: institutional, informational, and educational.

We've taken steps on the institutional front. Many of you participated in the Irvine conference a few months ago that focused on building a joint research agenda for intermodal freight issues -- including such topics as joint military-commercial funding of ports and other freight facilities.

Our highway policy research now includes analyses of investment requirements and alternative funding strategies, better quantification of highways' economic importance, better travel-forecasting and data collection methods, and studies of the implications of alternative fuels and demand management.

Through FHWA, we're identifying barriers to local-level intermodal planning and operations.

We're also improving such analytical tools as geographic information systems to support national program evaluation and for information and data sharing with other levels of government and business.

On the informational side, we're acting to improve data availability on all aspects of transportation system performance and for the systems that collect and distribute these data. That's essential for effective intermodal planning and decision-making in both government and business.

As I mentioned earlier, the Bureau of Transportation Services has expanded its initiatives in this area. They've been producing and distributing data both to the public and private sectors.

They're now doing major surveys on domestic freight and passenger movement, and transborder freight flows, and are integrating data from a variety of other surveys and studies. This work -- bringing together commodity flows and passenger data -- can provide leaders with the information they need for investment decisions.

Finally, we're taking steps on the educational front. We know that new technologies, concepts, and institutional policies are changing the world in which we work -- that an intermodal

world demands a broad *and* deep knowledge of many areas -- and that keeping up isn't easy.

We're providing educational and training assistance through a variety of activities, including targeted third-party training, sponsorship of university programs, and continuous direct outreach.

Although we don't have a National Intermodal Transportation Institute, both the National Transit Institute and the National Highway Institute support intermodal programs that offer training and employee development in areas that cross traditional modal barriers.

The Rural Transit Assistance and Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Programs also provide extensive intermodal training and technical assistance.

Our university research programs currently contribute about \$60 million annually to these institutions through both the University Transportation Centers Program and the ISTEA-established University Research Institutes.

They not only develop the next generation of transportation professionals, but also spur the development of innovations through ongoing research targeted at intermodal needs.

Finally, we're undertaking extensive outreach on research issues through the Volpe Center in Cambridge and the Turner-Fairbank Center here in Washington. These centers also hold

technical forums and provide informational exchanges on a variety of issues.

All of these efforts contribute to an intermodal research agenda that not only will provide technological solutions, but also address the institutional, informational, and educational issues that can impede progress towards a seamless intermodal system.

This morning I've talked about our vision for intermodal research and development -- our guiding principles -- and our priorities and objectives.

I'd like to close by asking you to consider these closely in your deliberations today and tomorrow -- remembering that what we all have in common is far greater than our differences, and that -- through cooperation -- we can overcome the barriers we face.

Your viewpoints, your knowledge, and your experience is going to be extremely helpful as we reach judgments about federal transportation research and development, and we look forward to hearing your views. Thank you.

#####

**REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION MORTIMER DOWNEY
TRANSIT GENERAL MANAGERS MEETING ON ATTB
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 11, 1996**

Good afternoon. I'd like to welcome you all to this presentation on the Advanced Technology Transit Bus -- and I'm glad to see that none of you were frightened away when you heard the words "advanced technology" and "transit bus" joined together.

I know that there's always some hesitation in any industry when a federal agency becomes involved in technology development. Those of us with a few years of transit experience bear more than a few scars: we all remember the White Book and Transbus -- or at least *I* do -- but we learned some powerful lessons from that experience.

The most important lesson was that the federal government can't force technology on an industry ahead of its time. We can -- and should -- work with industry to develop and deploy new technologies, but it has to be done cooperatively. In the case of transit, it's critical that everyone affected -- operators, manufacturers, suppliers, the riding public -- be fully involved as we create a new bus for the 21st century.

We've already met with members of many of your technical staffs, and many of them serve on a peer review panel that's

monitoring this project's development. Today's meeting -- the first at such a high level -- is an expansion of this process.

Of course, after our experiences in the 1970s, it's reasonable to ask why we're even bothering to go once more unto the breach. The simple answer is that the federal government has multiple goals at stake, and this project is an excellent way of fulfilling them.

We want to enable transit to help meet vital national goals -- greater energy efficiency to reduce our dependence on petroleum, especially imported oil -- better air quality -- and improved mobility for all Americans, including the disabled.

Transit can help to achieve these goals, and we want to direct federal resources towards buying products that enable you to do so.

What we're doing with this bus is consistent with what we're doing in other areas that affect these goals, such as the Partnership for a New Generation Vehicle, our initiative with Detroit's Big Three.

And, if we are going to succeed in that initiative -- producing a vehicle with three times the fuel efficiency at today's levels of comfort and safety -- transit will need a new model if it is to be competitive.

We want to ensure that America has strong transit systems that can do their part in meeting urban America's mobility challenges.

That's why -- as you heard Secretary Peña announce this morning -- the President's 1997 budget will propose a 25 percent increase in operating assistance -- raising it to \$500 million a year, the level we supported last year and still believe is right for these circumstances.

And it's why we've increased capital funding and promoted funding transfers that let FTA obligate a total of \$6 billion last year -- the most ever for transit.

Our support can't just be financial, since there are limits to what we can do as we work to end the budget deficit. However, we *can* help you in other areas.

Many of you are under pressure to help cut noise and pollution in your cities and reduce wear-and-tear on pavement. You also need buses that are economical to operate and that keep your costs low in an era of tighter funding at all levels of government. We want to help manufacturers build buses that do all of these things and build here in America at a profit.

We also wanted you to benefit from a bus that incorporates the newest technologies and materials as an integral part of its basic design -- advances like intelligent transportation systems

and high-tech materials made available through dual-use programs with the Defense Department.

You can't get the most out of these advances through retrofitting or even by adding them onto today's bus designs. Integrating them into the vehicle from the ground up will get us the maximum possible benefit.

The final reason we're developing the ATTB is that we want to support America's bus industry -- making it competitive both at home and abroad. This industry produces thousands of good, high-paying jobs, and we want to ensure its stability.

We've met with manufacturers and suppliers as part of an effort to ensure their future prosperity -- in fact, some of you participated in a meeting last September and gave the transit agencies' perspective on these issues -- and we see this vehicle as one of the ways to ensure American bus builders' long-term success.

Those are our reasons for starting this project, and I think you'll agree that they're sound. Of course, the best reasons and the best of intentions won't matter if they don't result in a reliable bus that gets the job done. We won't have accomplished anything if we end up with a bus that you don't want to buy or that your riders don't want to use.

My time at the MTA and Gordon Linton's on the SEPTA board provide some appreciation of transit's needs, but we really

need to hear from you -- the people who manage these services day-to-day. Your involvement will ensure that we stay on course and make the most of this opportunity.

Now, I'd like to ask Gordon to offer FTA's views on this project and to give you some more detail. Gordon...?

#



TRANSPORTATION TRENDS

**REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION MORTIMER DOWNEY
AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 12, 1996**

Good morning. I'm glad to see so many of you here this morning. I suppose we're all flattered when people come to hear us -- although sometimes it's for the wrong reason.

When he was Vice President during the Carter Administration, Fritz Mondale once was surprised -- and thrilled -- to find a large crowd on hand when he flew out of Lewiston, Maine's airport.

Before he rose to address the crowd, he turned to one of his hosts and said, "I'm really very, very flattered. There must be about two thousand people here."

His host agreed and said, "Yup. This is the first time a Boeing 747's ever taken off from Lewiston, and everyone turned out to see if it'll take off okay." *That's* the sort of thing that keeps public officials humble.

My topic today isn't aviation, but transit -- and especially President Clinton's commitment to the transit industry and to the men and women who work in it. Over the years you've given voice to their concerns, and the President shares your commitment.

During the past three years he has fought for economic policies that have succeeded in improving the economic security and quality of life for American families.

Today, the once-dreaded Misery Index -- the combined rates of unemployment and inflation -- is at its lowest rate in 27 years -- and perhaps it's time we found it a new name.

(More)

*U.S. Department of Transportation
Office of the Secretary, Public Affairs
(202) 366-4570*

It begins with a balanced budget plan to do away with the deficit but still protect our obligations to our parents, to our children, and to our future through investments in Medicare, Medicaid, environmental protection, and education.

You've all read about the differences between the President and Congress, but what you don't hear about is how much there is in common.

The seven-year balanced budget plans proposed by the President and Congress now have in common about \$700 billion in savings -- more than enough to balance the budget, give a tax cut targeted to working families, and protect the priorities that the President has set out.

So at this point the issue isn't whether we can balance the budget, but whether we should sacrifice vital priorities just to satisfy a rigid ideological agenda, and give tax cuts to those who don't need them.

I think that would be wrong, and I believe that the American people do, too. *They want* clean air and water -- *they want* good schools for their children -- and *they want* a secure retirement for their parents. So *let's agree* on those savings we already have in common -- *pass* a balanced budget plan -- *and move on* to the other challenges we face.

We can -- *and we should* -- do more to strengthen our families and to provide economic security to people who work hard but *aren't* getting raises and *don't* have access to health care or stable pensions or lifetime education and training.

The *President's* balanced budget plan shows that we can move forward on *all* of these fronts. He wants Congress to pass health insurance reforms that require insurers to be fair. Fairness means covering people who have lost their insurance because they've changed or lost their jobs, and not discriminating against people who have pre-existing conditions.

He wants to ensure that American workers can take their pensions with them when they change their jobs, so they don't lose the retirement security they've worked so hard to earn.

He wants to increase education opportunity by offering new tax deductions for the cost of tuition and training -- new merit scholarships for top students -- more loans for college and jobs training -- and universal availability of the computers and new technologies that are essential to today's learning.

He wants to improve conditions for lower-paid workers through a 20 percent increase in the minimum wage, which -- in real terms -- is now at a 40-year low.

And he also wants to protect the increase we gained in the earned income tax credit -- a program that rewards work and that's improved the lives of 14 million working Americans.

(More)

We've given operators expanded flexibility in using capital funds for spare parts and bus overhauls so that they can make the most of their operating assistance to save service.

We're taking action to ensure the safety of transit workers and riders -- as Secretary Peña recently did with his emergency order to make commuter rail operations safer. And last month the Secretary met with the security chiefs of transit agencies from around the country as part of his effort to beefed up our intelligence operations to prevent the terrorist problems other nation's transit systems have faced.

We've stood with you -- and turned back -- assaults on the Davis-Bacon Act -- on the collective bargaining rights of Amtrak employees -- and on the 13(c) protections that are at the core of transit workers' rights.

What we've accomplished on 13(c) is especially noteworthy, because we didn't just continue to ensure workers' rights but also worked with you and with management to make the process more effective and to make sure it didn't disadvantage transit in the planning and funding processes.

We acted administratively to streamline 13(c) and cut red tape in order to speed up procurements and save transit agencies money -- all without placing workers at risk.

But in spite of this, there are still some advocates of repeal. The threat *hasn't* ended. This is a battle that we'll need to fight again this year.

The same is true of the fight for operating assistance. In a time when many want to zero it out completely, we've fought for it and we've managed to preserve it. Here, too, the threat still exists. Congress managed to cut operating assistance to \$400 million in this year's budget, a level they view as a way to zero it out. Transit needs -- and deserves -- more than that.

So I'm pleased to say that, in the budget he's submitting to Congress next week, the President will propose to increase operating assistance by 25 percent -- to \$500 million. It's a level that transit operators need in order to maintain their services, and it's a line that *we're* drawing. I promise you that we're going to fight hard for it.

Cutting operating aid and trying to repeal 13(c) aren't the only ways that transit skeptics are trying to hobble this industry. I mentioned how much ISTEA's flexibility has meant to transit -- \$800 million last year alone. Well, transit's adversaries want to end that flexibility.

They don't trust state and local officials to make the right choices for their communities -- to choose transportation projects on their merits rather than whether they happen to fall into some rigid category.

(More)

TALKING POINTS
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION MORTIMER DOWNEY
DOT/SBA REINVENTION CELEBRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 25, 1996

*(This will be an informal event at which you will stand -- without a podium
-- and address federal workers involved in the DOT/SBA MOU.)*

- * I'd like to welcome you to today's celebration of an agreement that will allow DOT to contract directly with 8(a) firms -- another common-sense government step brought on as a result of Vice President Gore's National Performance Review. It brings to small business procurements another reform to give federal workers the tools they need to do their jobs better.
- * Procurement has been one of the major areas targeted for reform by the Vice President because it's the key to our doing government's job well. The federal government is the nation's largest buyer of goods and services, and everyone's heard the purchasing horror stories -- the \$600 hammers, the nine pages of specifications for ashtrays.
- * These were the products of an outdated system that forced federal workers to rely on rigid rules and procedures -- excessive paperwork -- and multiple inspections and audits that cost more than they save.
- * That's never good, but it's especially burdensome for small businesses which may have narrow profit margins and can't afford the delays of a lengthy, inefficient process.

- * That could have caused otherwise competitive small businesses to be forced out of contention for some federal contracts.
- * By enabling employees of the FHWA, the Coast Guard, and our Transportation Administrative Services Center to contract directly with small businesses, and by streamlining the purchasing process, we'll ensure that these businesses will continue to be a source of economic growth while we do DOT's work more effectively
- * We're showing that efficient procurement doesn't have to mean less opportunity for these quality suppliers.
- * I want to thank our DOT staff -- in the FHWA, the Coast Guard, the TASC, and our Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization -- for their role in bringing about this agreement. It's just one of many innovative actions coming out of our department-wide procurement reform laboratory, and we're proud of all of them.
- * I also want to thank our partners in the SBA. We've cooperated with them on a variety of initiatives, from small business outreach to initiatives such as last year's ITOP computer procurement, and it's a partnership we want to continue to strengthen. Now, I'd like to ask Ginger Lew to offer remarks on behalf of the SBA...

#####

**TALKING POINTS
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION MORTIMER DOWNEY
METRORAIL 20TH ANNIVERSARY
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 29, 1996**

(Introduction to be made by WMATA Chairman Ellen Bozman)

Speakers, per latest draft (in order): Ms. Bozman, WMATA Vice Chair Jack Evans, the Reverend Walter Fauntroy, Senator Sarbanes, Congressmen Hoyer, Davis, and Wynn, you, Gordon Linton, Fairfax Board of Supervisors Chair Katherine Hanley, David Brickley of the Virginia House of Delegates, Montgomery County Executive Douglas Duncan, Prince George's County Executive Wayne Curry, Carlton Sickles of the WMATA Board, and the Reverend Jerry Moore.

- * On behalf of President Clinton and Secretary Peña, I want to wish Metrorail a very happy 20th birthday. Over these past 20 years Metro has grown up to become an indispensable part of this region's transportation system -- not just in the District, but in Maryland and Virginia as well.
- * Metro provides fast, economical mobility both for the transit-dependent and for riders by choice who appreciate its high quality of service, and -- as someone who takes Metro to work every day -- I can testify to that quality.
- * Metrorail also has shaped growth in ways that make environmental and economic sense, and served as the best line of defense against gridlock -- taking tens of thousands

of cars off the road every day. It's hard to imagine how we survived without it.

- * Transit is *the* best solution for this area's traffic problems, and that's why President Clinton is committed to providing the money needed to get Metrorail to the full 103 miles.
- * The President is also fighting for a 25 percent increase in federal operating assistance, which would help to stabilize fares and service levels here and elsewhere around the country -- making transit an even more attractive option.
- * We in the Department of Transportation are proud to have been your partners over the past two decades, and we look forward to continuing that partnership. Let me close by again congratulating Metrorail on its birthday -- and by following Franklin Roosevelt's advice to public speakers: be sincere, be brief, be seated.

#