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

REMARKS OF JOHN E. ROBSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE INSTITUTE FOR RAPID TRANSIT'S URBAN TRANSPORTATION CONFERENCE AT THE PARK PLAZA HOTEL IN TORONTO, CANADA, JUNE 12, 1968, 4:30 P.M.

It is a great pleasure to be here today. It was very kind of you to invite me here to speak to our future creditors.

Since the Urban Mass Transportation Program does not formally shift to the Department of Transportation until July 1, I feel a little like the prospective father expounding the joys of family life. But this gives me a privilege rarely enjoyed by a public official -- which is to tell his constituency how things could or should be without having to take the blame for the way things are. No doubt this is the last time I will be able to address you in that enviable state.

It is appropriate, I think, that responsibility for the Urban Mass Transportation Program comes to us in the month of July, the month which marks the Declaration of Independence for the United States and the proclamation of the principles of freedom which serve as the very basis for our national existence. These

principles are quite relevant to the subject of urban transportation.

For the foundation of freedom is the right to choose -- your politics, religion, ideas, job, and where and how you will live. All the elaborate machinery of our democracy is grounded on the idea that making choices is good for people -- that in the exercise of choice we develop according to our own bent to our fullest potential.

And it is choice which should govern the kinds of cities we live in and the kinds of life we can lead there: the goals of those cities, the quality of their environment, and the kinds of transportation and other services they can provide. It is free choice which should allow each city to develop according to its own bent and to its fullest potential.

So, constitutionally, we are free to choose. But practically -- insofar as our cities and urban transportation systems go -- I doubt that we have fully exercised that right.

For to choose means a conscious selection among possible alternatives.

I question whether we have always had the political will even to create real alternatives for our cities. And where there have been alternatives, the consequences of choosing one or another of them often have not been sufficiently illuminated for the people and their political leaders.

We have created urban areas where the only choice is between leaving and suffering. And many have voted with their feet.

It is said that the purchase of a new car is the exercise of a transportation choice. It is certainly a choice among different kinds of cars. But it is hardly a meaningful choice among different modes of transportation. For many living in metropolitan areas there are no real transportation alternatives to the car. And there is little confidence among those who deeply feel the need for a real transportation choice that their communities or political leaders will provide those alternatives.

I do not believe that the private automobile is the last outpost of individualism or self-expression. And the choice to build highways to accommodate the cars which have and will come is not so much a choice as a necessary reaction.

But choices can be made -- if we have the will to make them. There is a town down in Virginia where, sometime around 1900, the Norfolk and Western Railroad considered building its shops. The people in the town decided that they didn't want the people and the activity which the railroad would bring. They decided that they liked their town as it was. So the railroad moved to Roanoke, then about the same size. Today Roanoke is twice the size of its neighbor.

During the Second World War this same town achieved what was, by local standards, a distinction. It was "the only town of its size in Virginia which had neither war industry nor military installations." For many towns this would be a Congressman's nightmare, the despair of a Chamber of Commerce.

This town, however, knew what it wanted. The community had made the choice and, whether you agree or disagree with the choice which they made, it was theirs. And this is important. They rejected economic expansion and instead chose the course they believed would assure that their town would continue to be the way they liked it.

This is, of course, a rare incident. But it illustrates the thesis that choices can be made and that the main task ahead for those of us in transportation is to create a favorable environment for choice.

There are several levels and aspects of the choices I am talking about, each linked to and dependent upon the other.

At the bottom -- and I say this with a melancholy deliberateness -- is individual choice. A family agonizes over choosing a home -- making sure that it is in a "nice" neighborhood. But I doubt that that same family spends very much time making sure that the city it lives in is pursuing a path which insures that there will continue to be any "nice" neighborhoods.

The difference is that people know they are making a choice when they pick a place to live. But in many cases they do not know that they can help make choices to shape the city's future. Instead, people often assume that they and their communities are carried along by irresistible forces. In the transportation field, for example, we often are told that the demand for a given type of facility will be at a certain level twenty years from now, and the clear implication is that we had better start now to build that facility to meet the projected demand.

But the obvious fact is that the demand will depend on the decisions we make now -- including the decision whether or not to build that very facility.

The point is that projections are not yet reality, and trends are not irreversible. The very existence of an Urban Mass Transportation Administration is a commitment to that principle.

But prophesies can become self-fulfilling, and trends can gather great momentum. The first step in reversing them is the recognition that there are alternatives.

Across the Nation, commuters daily sit in traffic jams. Silently, or not so silently, they protest what is happening and ponder whether there is another way. In a Nation as rich and resourceful as ours, surely there are solutions to his problem. The commuter should know how much these solutions might cost. He should know how possible alternatives might affect his property taxes. He should know enough about the way the system works to identify the steps which he as an individual, as a member of the community, as a taxpayer, might take to make the alternatives not just possible but available.

Most important, he should have the means for evaluating the cost of not having an alternative in terms of pollution, accidents, environmental quality and urban values. He needs to know what the alternatives -- or the lack of alternatives -- might cost in terms of the preservation of neighborhood unity within urban diversity. He should be made aware of the possibilities which real alternatives might offer -- possibilities like access to training and jobs for ghetto dwellers, and access to community facilities for the aged, the handicapped, and the poor.

But who is asking our not-at-all-hypothetical commuter what alternatives he wants to pursue? Who is illuminating the implications of each alternative? Who is meeting the argument of the citizen who objects paying for a transit system which runs a few blocks from his home because he thinks it is too remote to do him any good? In many communities, I fear that no one is.

I am now talking about the second level of choice -- community choice. Certainly among people who have devoted any thought to the problem there is no serious debate that communities must have and articulate goals. But who is to set them, and whose goals are they to be? Perhaps most important, do we have the mechanisms to set these goals through planning processes -- or if you will, choice processes -- which involve the people and their political leaders, as well as all the special interests, so that goals, if not perfect, are at least realistic?

Lincoln told the story of a piano accompanist who remarked after a particularly excruciating concert with an enthusiastic but untutored female vocalist that he had heard them sing on the white keys, and he had heard them sing on the black keys, but this was the first time he had ever heard anyone sing in the cracks.

I think that in the setting of community goals and related transportation objectives we have often been singing in the cracks. The people and politicians are frequently not involved in the planning processes. The necessary relationships between all the contiguous communities and governmental agencies which must be involved in sensible planning are often inadequate. Yet it is clear we have long passed the point where the suburbs can say to the city -- as one passenger in a rowboat was heard to remark to another -- "Say old man, your end of the boat is sinking".

For suburbanites and city-dwellers are clearly in the same boat. Suburbanites are intimately affected by diseases of the city, as those of us in transportation know only too well. Suburban ears are assulted by airport noise; suburban skies are polluted by the same pollutants which have damaged city air; suburban countryside and cityscape alike are increasingly given over to meet the demands of imbalanced transportation systems.

What can we in the transportation community do to help people and cities work out their own destinies in an environment of free choice? Plainly, we must begin by acknowledging that the function of transportation is to serve other community goals. Do we occasionally find ourselves arguing for the preservation and enhancement of the central business district so that transit may be preserved -- instead of arguing for the preservation and enhancement of transit once the community has decided it wants a significant and viable central business district? If we do, we lose credibility as advocates of community choice.

Next, we can improve the quality and attractiveness of the alternatives we offer. Do transportation planners and operators really work for integration with other modes so that the benefits of each will be complementary, not competitive? A great deal of effort has been expended in the past on the promotion of one form of transportation over another. Too little effort has been devoted to a critical examination of the means for relating all modes to the total systemic needs of the community.

Finally, we can contribute significantly in bringing to public consciousness an awareness of the alternatives. What are transportation planners and operators and their labor groups doing about individual and community choice? Are we really making the alternatives known to the people -- and to the mayors, the city councils, business, labor, and the state legislatures?

I raise these questions not because I think the transportation community has been laggard but because the issues are so critical. Already the range of choices open to communities is in some respects narrower than it was a few years ago. Because of the reliance in many areas on the automobile as virtually the sole form of transportation available, land use patterns have accommodated to its demands. As reliance upon the automobile continues and increases in default of an alternative, the problems of creating that alternative become ever more difficult.

I remind you that already 28% of our city space is devoted to cars. In some cities, over half of the downtown area is used for driving and parking. Los Angeles already has 700 miles of freeway. It plans 622 miles more.

Choices are constantly being made by the city, state, and federal governments as to where their resources will be allocated. The urban areas are well represented in Congress and in the state legislatures; reapportionment should increase that representation. Reapportionment will, I think, ultimately be seen as one of the chief tools of advancing urban transportation causes -- if enough people who care about urban transportation make sure that their representatives are aware of the alternatives.

Choices are going to have to be made by my Department and its Urban Mass Transportation Administration. We think those choices should be made in accordance with criteria which assure to the extent possible, the investment of federal transportation resources in a way which will bring

-- maximum safety and efficiency

-- maximum integration and coordination with other elements of the transportation system

-- maximum services to identified community goals and environmental values, and

-- the development of creative and innovative approaches.

We cannot judge the entries, like a coupon contest, on clarity and neatness.

The Department of Transportation stands ready to work with you in searching for new ways of financing urban mass transportation needs. We know those needs exist and we will be receptive to your ideas in trying to satisfy them.

When President Johnson asked all Americans to join him in an attack on urban problems as a part of a program of building a Great Society, he said:

> "The solution to these problems does not rest on a massive program in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the national capital and the leaders of local communities."

And the President has labored long and hard to encourage that kind of cooperation.

I leave you with the thought that there is no richer opportunity to see freedom of choice flourish than in urban transportation. But it will not flourish unless the environment for choice is improved. That will require hard work, vision, and willingness to compromise. It means keeping our eyes both on the stars and on the ball. We in the Federal Government can help. But you must carry the brunt of the burden. I am confident it can be done. And, gentlemen, the choice is yours.

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

REMARKS OF JOHN E. ROBSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA, AUGUST 5, 1968

Perhaps those brought up abroad and encountering this country fresh can see it with special clarity. Certainly no one has revealed us to ourselves better than our visitors: De Tocqueville, Lord Bryce, Gunnar Myrdal -- the list is long and distinguished. In 1965, the English political journalist,Henry Fairlie, visited this country for the first time. What he found here is something we might have missed:

> "The Revolutionary impulse in the American political tradition [he later wrote], is again at work. It is the promise of political inventiveness which one feels so strongly in America today: A searching for new institutions and new political communities. The political genius of the American people is about to make a new and significant contribution to the world."

So Mr. Fairlie predicted. And in lawyers' language, there is, I believe, some substantial evidence in the public record to support his findings.

The once-clear boundary line between public and private activity, for example, has in this decade become blurred. Ours is the time of

COMSAT, of Job Corps Centers run for profit by private corporations, of hybrid public-private anti-poverty agencies operating locally with funds from Washington. While the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 requires the "maximum feasible participation" of private industry, the Economic Opportunity Act of the same year calls for the "maximum feasible participation" of the poor themselves.

Our interest this afternoon, of course, centers on urban development. Happily, during the last 15 years and especially in the last five, urban development has again and again illustrated Fairlie's thesis. Here the crucial themes have been urban planning and regionalism. And the crucial events have been the enactment of federal legislation sponsoring and stimulating each of these.

If 1954 and the Brown decision triggered the present revolution in civil rights, the modern era in urban planning dates back to the same year. Then Congress first volunteered to subsidize local planning, stipulating at the same time that federal aid for housing would go only to communities preparing a so-called "workable program" and "comprehensive plan". Later in the middle years of this decade, Congress multiplied the incentives for planning, and dramatically ushered in the metropolitan aspect. A cluster of innovating statutes promised federal aid for a variety of urban purposes. But the grant money was to flow only if the grant proposal had been reviewed by a regional planning unit, or harmonized with an inclusive regional plan.

I want to take a closer look at the root assumptions embodied in these enactments, for those assumptions are currently shaping our responses to urban problems.

One was Congress's historic judgment that urban problems were so momentous, and local resources so slight, that massive federal aid should be forthcoming.

The second was that ambitious full-scale planning, if not itself the answer to the urban question, was at least essential to the search for answers.

Next, that the metropolitan area, rather than the city itself, should be the stage on which urban problems are confronted.

Finally, that federal agencies, while they might review plans submitted to them, would leave the actual job of planning in local hands.

These propositions, now firmly embedded in our urban institutions, are strong evidence of the "revolutionary impulse" Mr. Fairlie detected at work. But as I now think back upon his conclusions I find myself wondering about their buoyant optimism. True, our recent political experimentation has been impressive. But shelves of our official reports document in chilling detail that we are up against a crisis in our cities the likes of which we have never known before. And there is some disquieting evidence that aspirations central to our present urban policies may not be wholly realistic.

Not realistic, first of all, in an intellectual sense. The kind of planning these programs augured was comprehensive geographically, embracing the entire metropolis. It is comprehensive in a subject-matter sense, often including architecture, land use, water resources, transportation and many other public concerns. And comprehensive in a time sense, intended to account for developments till near the end of this century. Yet our experience now suggests that such a planning enterprise may be simply beyond the state of the planning art.

With respect to the time factor alone, I am disturbed by Professor Banfield's dictum that given the incredible pace of social change in America, five years is the longest term anyone can sanely plan for. In any event, faced with the awesome planning responsibilities the laws assign them, some cities have responded by developing a planning process so unwieldy and slow that its early efforts may be obsolete before any useful product has been turned out. Others have farmed out the planning job to a few consulting firms, jeopardizing the virtues of localism and diversity Congress was hoping to promote. The point is that we may have bitten off too much -- that until the techniques and resources available to planners are considerably more powerful than at present, we might accomplish more by attempting less.

Unrealistic, too, in a political sense. Regional problem solving has been a hallmark of federal urban policy. Yet, for all the federal inducements in that direction, for all the conferences at which metro government has headed the agenda, its actual examples I can count on one hand: Clearly, something there is in American political life that

doesn't love a regional government. I suspect we at the Federal level have no choice but to adjust to this, and at least for the short run, learn to live with the limitations: that most comprehensive planning agencies, for the immediate future, will play an advisory role only. And that regional administrations will be limited for the most part to decisions in those few specific functions which most demand a regional approach. These limitations accepted, we can more usefully ponder the central questions: How can an advisory body advise most persuasively? How can a single-function agency best carry out its limited purposes?

Beyond realism, moreover, lie other matters troublesome to the federal idea of area-wide planning -- matters which go to the heart of the democratic process itself. I assume that democracy's inner precept is that citizens, directly or through their representatives, have the right to control those public decisions which determine the context and quality of their lives.

City and metropolitan planning, however, can be seen as resting on a different base. For running through the urban planning movement in this country is an elitist, technocratic theme, a theme which assumes that planning is merely the application of principled reasoning, technical skills and rudimentary civic good sense by those specially trained in the planning science. If this concept is valid, citizen approval is no more relevant to a good urban plan that it is to an accurate engineering formula, and citizen participation in the planning process is as inappropriate as in the laboratory.

I do not believe, though, that this simple view of planning has weathered the endurance test of time and experience. Most of us today would concede that every specific act of planning by its nature rests on some matrix of value choices. This seems true whether or not these choices are explicit, whether or not they are even conscious on the part of the planner. The relative merits of city and suburban residential arrangements, the right balance between humane aesthetics, industrial growth, and economic cost: these are questions which appeal to the human judgment and spirit, not the drawing board. This accepted, how can we give the <u>planner</u> both the first and the final say?

There is an obvious analogy to jurisprudence. The view long prevailed that legal cases are decided by a scientific process of mechanical logic. While it prevailed, widespread judicial intrusion in the affairs of state could not cogently be resisted. But finally, we recognized the role the judge's own values and attitudes play in constitutional decisions. Since then, the entire practice of judicial review has been keenly problematical. The way out -- if we have found the way out -- would seem to be in judges' exercising self-restraint, deferring more than before to the political process in questions of competing values and policies.

Similarly, planning must not be allowed to insulate itself from the democratic process. But self-restraint is not the answer here. We want our planners to be creative and bold. Indeed, how we arrange for planning to respond to the political process is a vexing question, and one which surely will challenge to the fullest that "political genius" in which Mr. Fairlie reposes such confidence.

One approach is for the city council or a politically appointed planning board simply to vote yes or no on the document drafted by the professional planning staff. But this won't do. For the choice would be between the projected order of a particular plan and the anarchy of a planless future. This, of course, is no choice at all. The advocacy of a particular plan by the professional staff may not result in the adequate illumination of alternatives for the decision-makers. One way out here would be by arranging for what Paul Davidoff calls "advocacy and pluralism in planning." That is, the framing and espousing of competing plans by competing planners, competing interest groups, and competing political parties. The risk in such an approach is of confusion and wasted time and resources; the risk in not adopting such an approach is the increased likelihood of accepting an ill-considered plan. "Pluralism and advocacy" always carry the risk of waste and inefficiency. We are willing to assume that risk in our political and judicial procedures presumably because we believe that in reaching certain kinds of decisions, there are values higher than efficiency.

However, even in the frame of plural planning, plan approval by the city or county council might not alone suffice. New state constitutions, or amendments, usually get submitted to the voters themselves. Like a constitution, a full-scale urban plan serves to fix the fundamental structure of an urban area for many years hence. It too might profit from some form of direct citizen assent.

This idea of citizen involvement is one with a great deal of resonance nowadays. For many believe that democratic principles are now undergoing something of a crisis here in America. Today the citizen is surrounded by vast impersonal instiutions -- of government, of business, even of education. These may seem unresponsive, indifferent, even hostile to his human needs as he perceives them. In a special plight are the poor. They lack effective lobbies in the larger structures. They have no political "clout".

Even at the local urban level, where it supposedly flourishes, democracy in operation seems vexed with troubles. Evidence abounds. I can evoke our memory of housewives blocking urban renewal bulldozers headed for their parks and homes. And more than once highway planners have followed the line of least political resistance in routing freeways through neighborhoods as alive and coherent as they are poor and black. Jane Jacobs talked to an East Harlem man angered by a sterile new public housing project, and what he said sums up much of what I mean:

> "Nobody cared what we wanted when they build this place. They threw our houses down and pushed us here and pushed our friends somewhere else. We don't have a place around here to get a cup of coffee or a newspaper even, or borrow fifty cents. Nobody cared what we need. But the big men come and look at the grass and say, 'Isn't it wonderful! Now the poor have everything! ' "

Many leaders of local government has special difficulty in understanding the urban Negro community, with its special history, culture, and problems. No task is more urgent than having local officials be persons whom Negro citizens can believe are on their side. Yet creating truly regional government here and now could have the side effect of subverting the cities' powers at the very moment when Negroes and the poor in the cities are becoming a significant political voice. I emphatically do not accuse those espousing regionalism of insensitivity to the plight of the Negroes or the poor. Still, regionalism would seem to rob these elements in the community of political strength. And this conflict, I think, contributes to regionalism being so perplexing a policy.

In response to the apparent crisis in democratic practice, public policy is moving in two allied directions. First, many are at least discussing the assignment of major tasks to small, viable units of government very close to the grass roots. Critics of the Federal government have long held there are real practical limits on the jobs which a distant government bureaucracy can carry out. But only recently have we become aware that this truth equally applies to the bureaucracy at City Hall. Arising from this new awareness are concrete proposals to break down city government into a federation of neighborhoods.

In the other policy development, we have begun to allow for immediate citizen involvement in the process of decision-making. The Federal Model Cities Program, for example, requires that affected residents be involved directly in planning and carrying out each city's project. The poverty program had set an earlier precedent in this respect. The idea of direct democracy has a rich pilgram and populist heritage in this country. And this year it has become a recurring theme of our presidential candidates.

With both of these developments I am in sympathy. Yet my enthusiasm knows its limits. As for decentralization, the degree it is possible depends on the nature and purposes of the program in question. Though many vigorously dispute the Bundy proposal in New York City, decentralizing education may work out well. But, there are many areas of public responsibility -- including transportation -- where broader needs rule out the delegation of final decision-making to neighborhoods or even cities.

As for citizen involvement, the key obstacle, of course, is practicality in the conduct of government. I do not dismiss that lightly. Beyond that, I suspect that some of the appeal of direct citizen involvement rests on the pleasant assumption that men are inherently fair-minded and progressive. The obvious wrongs in society, the assumption goes on, result only from the sway of flawed leaders and institutions. But the evidence is hardly encouraging. Rather, it confirms that individually and in groups citizens can be as blind to their own best interests, and as cold to the rights of others, as any bureaucracy.

Despite these misgivings, on balance it seems to me that citizens and neighborhoods should play a larger role in the planning process. Right now, the citizen has two chances to pass on an urban plan.

These come when he is asked to approve municipal bonds or re-elect the mayor and city council. I am not convinced this is enough. These procedures give the voter only a belated, clumsy, all-or-nothing option. And the bond iss e question, by posing the matter so nakedly in terms of cost, may evoke an unfortunately negative response.

But there is a remedy which stirs my hopes. It is to structure meaningful consultation between the planners and the people while the plan is in the works.

This consultation can proceed in formal hearings, conspicuously publicized. In the hearings citizens and citizen groups can present data, debate issues, and confront the planners, and each other. Our experience further suggests the hearing is most meaningful when it culminates months of other contacts between the planners and the community. Typical should be the planners' attendance at meetings of many neighborhood groups.

The payoff of all these efforts can, I think, be great. The planners will be alerted to occasional factors they otherwise would have missed. Planners can learn from citizens and neighborhoods what their values and preferences really are. And the citizens will come to better understand the planners' concern for regional development, for relevant costs and feasible alternatives. The direct encounters should dramatize and make vivid all the human and environmental elements at stake. Finally, broad citizen acceptance of the final plan will surely be fostered. Without this no plan can work.

Fortunately, I can report that slowly, by fits and starts, law and practice have begun to move in this direction. In Dallas, the Twin Cities, and Los Angeles, recent urban planning efforts have been nourished by lively, thorough negotiations between the planners and the people. The Court of Appeals in Washington recently halted the building of two freeways, a highway, and a bridge because required hearings had not been held. The Court called these hearings "A check and balance basic to our entire system of Government". My own Department is working on revisions of highway hearing procedures. These would open the door to more effective citizen involvement in decisions as to highway location and design.

These last two experiences, involving the courts and a Federal department, hint at promise for the next few years. Of course courts cannot build our highways, or tell us where they should be built. But

courts can insist that procedures be fashioned which give all of us our chance to have our say. This same assurance can also come from Federal agencies, through the guidelines governing its funding of local projects. Mr. Fairlie specifically cited Federal guidelines, by the way, in listing our new creative institutions.

At least when the planning issue is a narrow one -- where to build a given bridge -- other possibilities come into view. In these cases, courts, and guidelines, can insist that the planners' decisions be supported by something like substantial evidence, further, that they take into account all relevant factors, including those of the human environment. Courts and guidelines can also require that the planners publicly articulate their responses to citizens' arguments which run counter to the planning decisions.

We should not portray the procedures we have been discussing as utopian devices. They will, for example, consume time that could have otherwise been spent in getting on with the urgent business at hand. But inconvenience is a price this country has usually been willing to pay when the success of the democratic process hangs in the balance.

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

REMARKS BY JOHN E. ROBSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION AT THE OPENING OF "CARS OF AMERICA - TOMORROW" SHOW, ON THE MALL, WASHINGTON, D. C., 10:30 A.M., SEPTEMBER 7, 1968.

It is getting to the point where Americans spend almost as much time analyzing their cars as they do driving them. There's no telling how many tons of paper have been sacrificed to trying to describe the great love affair between man and his car.

And yet, with all that effort, I don't think anyone has been able to improve on a description that was written before Henry Ford discovered mass production and a full generation before we had an Interstate program.

You may recall the scene in The Wind and the Willows in which Kenneth Grahame describes Mr. Toad's reaction to the first automobile he ever saw. The car knocked Toad and his friends Rat and Mole galley-west, tore up their cart, left them flat in the road. Rat was furious and Mole was terrified but Mr. Toad just sat there "in a sort of trance, a happy smile on his face, his eyes still fixed on the dusty wake of their destroyer."

"Glorious, stirring sight," murmured Toad. "The poetry of motion. The real way to travel. The only way to travel. Here today - in next week tomorrow. Villages skipped, towns and cities jumped - always somebody else's horizon. And to think I never knew. All those wasted years that lie behind me. O, what a flowery track lies spread before me, henceforth! What dust-clouds shall spring up behind me as I speed on my reckless way."

Of course, Mr. Toad's affair with the car was more addiction than affection and I suspect if Dr. Haddon had been around then he would never have let him near the wheel.

But now - years later - the automobile still produces happy trances, and spreads flowery tracks before us.

For nearly everyone except poor Toad, the automobile has meant greater personal convenience than any people in history have previously enjoyed. Cars provide access to distant places of work, study and recreation. They make of life continuous - some critics say excessive - movement, change, and adventure.

Certainly, by generating so much motion, wordage as well as mileage, cars give employment to millions who would otherwise still be making wagons and horse collars.

However, anything as great as the automobile can't be all good.

- The auto has killed a million Americans since it was introduced and wounded millions of others - far more than all our wars combined.

- It has gravely congested our cities, bringing into question whether central cities and cars are ecologically compatible on the same turf.

- In various cities, it accounts for from 50 to 90% of atmospheric contaminants.

- It has lead to highway systems that do very well at moving vehicles back and forth, except during rush hour, but that split communities, spoil the countryside and squander urban space.

Once our sacred beast of burden, the auto has become, in some ways, a burdensome beast indeed, a sort of Gross National Problem.

A reaction was inevitable. During the last two or three years hundreds of new ideas have been launched to save the best that is in the auto while mitigating its liabilities. Some of the results of this healthy questioning attitude are exhibited here today.

I am impressed by this display. There must be dozens of solutions for each technical problem that now confronts us. There may even be solutions for which we will have to find problems.

But I'd say the odds are very good that quite a few of these techniques and processes will prove feasible; will be integrated into new transportation systems; and will thus play an important historic part in making the automobile fully responsive to the needs of a sophisticated, urban society.

Critics to the contrary, the auto is not obsolete. The ideal of a personalized mode of transportation is firmly implanted in the American mind and it is there to stay. The auto will survive and prosper, especially outside the urban core.

The problem now is to adapt this prince of machines into a true servant of all the people and the people's welfare. Regulated, civilized, and redesigned, the auto will be a continuing exemplar of the man-machine culture of the 20th century.

For me personally, the cells of my optimism have been recharged by this splendid exhibit. It is just possible that within 20 years the American motorist will be able to exclaim again as he did at the birth of the auto age, "on a clear day you can see forever."

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

REMARKS OF JOHN E. ROBSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN TRANSIT ASSOCIATION, CLEVELAND, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 16, 1968.

It is a pleasure to be here this morning with all of you -- our friends and partners in this exciting business of urban transportation.

I am here to bring you a very simple message. It is this: America's urban areas need fast, clean, and safe public transportation. They need it badly. They need it now. And we at the Department of Transportation, working together with the cities, the States and groups like ATA, are committed to doing everything in our power to see that they get it.

We are on the verge of a new era in urban transportation. The condition of transportation for our cities is an increasing cause of national concern. It is viewed with grave urgency by political, business and community leaders. And the national platforms of both major parties express their commitment to improved mass transportation.

People have come to realize that America is an urban society: In a few years, four out of every five of us will live in cities and their suburbs. And the quality of our lives will, to no small extent, be determined by the quality of our transportation. For the ability to move is one of the cornerstones of freedom.

-- For the businessman, it is freedom to prosper.

-- For the worker, it is freedom to find a job anywhere in the metropolitan area.

-- For the housewife, it is freedom to seek out the best goods and services at the best price.

-- For the poor, it is freedom to seek education, training and jobs.

-- For the elderly and the handicapped, it is freedom to live a decent, normal life.

Yet this precious gift of mobility is denied to millions of urban Americans, or is rationed out on unacceptable terms. Drivers sit in rush-hour traffic jams which mock our investment in 60-mile-an-hour freeways. Those who don't want to drive, and those who cannot -- the young, the old, the poor, the infirm -- must depend on public transportation. Too often it is the carrier of last resort. And I do not have to detail for you, the leaders of this industry, the inadequacies of public transportation in our cities.

As the quality of our mobility decreases, we lose some of our personal freedom. Our choices narrow, and we cannot take full advantage of the opportunities the city offers. As a result, the city becomes a less attractive place to live or work in, a less viable investment for the future.

And many others beside urban travellers share in the costs of urban congestion. Shippers' goods sit in traffic on their way to market, and the efficiencies of jet travel are dissipated on the ground.

America suffers from the failures of her urban transportation systems.

What has gone wrong?

How did we get where we are today? And how will we get to where we must be tomorrow?

I think we got where we are now because our methods of making public decisions about urban transportation have been inadequate.

Inadequate, first, because they did not sufficiently distinguish between urban and rural conditions. Solutions to transportation problems that were perfectly appropriate to the wide open spaces have often been imposed upon cities and suburbs -- where space is a precious commodity. Critics of urban highways point to the percentage of our city land already given over to roads and parking. The point is that any project which commandeers great hunks of urban land must be carefully scrutinized. We are beginning to correct our past errors. And Congress has recently given statutory recognition to the distinctions between urban and rural highways. At the very least, we can insist that future transportation decisions give full consideration to spatial impact.

Our urban transportation decision process has been inadequate too, because decision-making authority has commonly been fragmented among a crazy-quilt of commissions, agencies, authorities, boards, officials and political jurisdictions.

Highway commissions built roads, planning commissions made plans, zoning boards zoned -- often indifferent, and sometimes hostile, to the goals of the others. It is small wonder that many good ideas have perished in the maze.

But more fundamentally, our methods of making urban transportation decisions have been inadequate because they have frequently been based on what seems to me a false premise.

The traditional jumping-off place for making transportation decisions has been an estimate of the so-called "need" for additional transportation facilities. Elaborate formulas have been developed to forecast how many trips would "desire" to go from Point A to

Point B at some distant date. In the case of urban highways, the projected "desire trips" that emerge from these formulas seem always to justify the construction of additional facilities. And today we have urban transportation systems increasingly centered on the private automobile and decreasingly able to cope with the demands on those systems.

I have two basic questions of this approach. First, I question its effectiveness in solving urban transportation problems. And second, I question its underlying philosophy.

As to its effectiveness, the story is all to familiar. As cities and suburbs grew, and as affluence brought the car within the reach of more and more Americans, we discovered that our streets had become congested with automobile traffic. Projections of "needs" for transportation facilities were undertaken. Not surprisingly, a "need" for new construction was found. New roads were built. But the relief the new roads brought was short-lived. People moved their homes, stores and factories rearranged their travel patterns to take advantage of the new roads. But soon our streets and highways were congested again. New projections of "needs" were made and were said to require more highway construction. Again the highways were built. And again, in response, homes, businesses and travel patterns were changed. And today, however often the cycle has been repeated, we still have congestion in our urban areas and a clamor for more highways.

Henry Barnes, the ingenious and experienced Traffic Commissioner of New York City, resignedly made the point: "No matter how many steps you take to improve things", he recently said, "it seems you can never fully satisfy all traffic needs."

Mr. Barnes' remark suggests that the elimination of urban traffic congestion simply by the construction of additional roadway may be an impossible goal. Yet the orthodox tools for urban transportation decision-making -- based upon projections of what we have called "needs" -- seem to demonstrate a "need" for still more urban highways.

But I also question the philosophy of using projected traffic "needs" as the sole basis for making urban transportation decisions. The word "needs" itself is misleading. What we are really talking about are the projected desires of potential future travellers. To conclude that those projected private desires create an inexorable public mandate to satisfy them is to confuse wishes with necessity.

What is needed now -- and I mean needed -- is a new dimension in urban transportation decision-making -- one that weighs the projected desires of potential future travellers against other pressing needs and important values: The need for clean, fresh air. The need for parks and open spaces. The need for a real estate tax base. The need to preserve neighborhoods. The need to continue urban diversity. Indeed, the very need for a center city itself.

It is time for us to begin making transportation decisions on the basis of what the city itself wants to be. That means treating the projected desires of travellers as only one part of the equation. It means making our decisions on the basis of the total impact upon the city.

It means making our decisions so that the city, after construction of a new transportation facility, will be a better place than the city which would be produced by any other alternative.

And there are alternatives. One is improved mass transit, bus or rail, perhaps combined with expanded fringe parking. And techniques like computerized traffic control, bus preference, exclusive bus lanes, metering of entering vehicles, and many others can improve capacity on existing facilities without major new construction.

The automobile and the highway have contributed enormously to economic health and mobility in America. And private automobiles have and will continue to have an important role in our cities. But we have come to know that the private automobile can no longer be the dominant feature of the urban transportation landscape.

The cornerstone of a new dimension to transportation decision-making is the recognition that cities are not the pawn of irresistible forces. Projections are not yet reality. And cities can choose which desires they want to fulfill, and which they will subordinate to other values for the common good.

Bold, creative leadership can use transportation as the sinew to bind together the city of the future. Transportation cannot do the job alone. But together with imaginative approaches to land use control, public financing and the other tools of urban development, it can help our cities become what they choose to become -- instead of going where the acceptance of unconstrained projected "needs" takes them.

I sense a new determination by our people and their leaders to take their future into their own hands. There is no more important task for us in transportation than to get behind these efforts.

This is an enterprise in which we can join with the most powerful commercial interests and with our poorest citizens. For the downtown businessman, the suburban dweller and the man in the ghetto all have a stake in making our cities work.

There are some encouraging signs -- some glimmers of change in our institutions of local decision-making.

Cities are coming to recognize that the success or urban planning efforts depends upon the informed consent of the community. And techniques of public hearings and liaison with community groups are being refined and expanded.

At the same time, a number of State and local governments are following the Federal example by establishing departments of transportation or regional transportation authorities with jurisdiction over many modes. And new regional organizations are making it possible for transportation and other public decisions to be made on a coherent and integrated basis.

But beyond improved decision-making institutions, one thing that will be needed to revitalize urban transportation is more money.

Funding for public transportation has been meager. If we are to afford our cities a meaningful opportunity to decide their own futures, there must be enough funds available for public transportation to make it a real alternative, not an impossible dream.

States and localities are stepping forward to assume increasing financial burdens for mass transportation. New York and the Boston and San Francisco areas are exciting examples. But at current levels of funding -- local, State and Federal -- not enough money is available to meet the problems across the nation.

My Department intends to help remedy this. The Department of Transportation is now exploring all the possibilities for a legislative package to help provide funding needed to solve the urban transportation crisis. We want to have it ready for the next Congress. We will need your help.

I think this industry we are part of is a growth industry.

But like other growth industries, one key to the future of urban transportation is imaginative innovation. There must be technological innovation. And Federal funds will continue to share in these efforts.

But innovation in service may be just as important to the future of public transportation as new technology. And each of you must continue your search for new ways to serve the community better.

There are many exciting ideas for the urban transportation systems of the future. There are roles in those systems for rail technology and for bus technology. There are roles for publicly owned systems and privately owned systems. But we cannot afford to think of ourselves as simply being in the bus business or the rail transit business.

For the bus and rail systems you run today may not resemble the urban transportation systems you run tomorrow. Whatever those systems are, all of us must think of ourselves as being in

the transportation business. It is our job to move people. And in moving them we should not limit ourselves to the traditional solutions of the past.

But nothing is more important to a revitalization of urban transportation than a sense of confidence that the job can and will be done.

I have spent a great deal of time during the last few months talking to people all across this country -- businessmen, political leaders, journalists and the poor. I have never been more confident that the wave of the future in our cities is public transportation.

This is so because it must be so, if our cities are to prosper and, indeed, survive.

We here should not -- and America cannot -- sell public transportation short.

The challenge is there. It is formidable. But the resources will be there too. Because the challenge must be met. And as important as the material resources of money and technology are, the ability to meet the challenge will depend largely upon our resources of spirit -- boldness, inventiveness and hope. One of the greatest rewards of being at this ATA Convention is the confidence it gives me that those resources are here in abundance.

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

REMARKS OF JOHN E. ROBSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON INDUSTRIAL TRAFFIC OF THE DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION, AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE, ATLANTA, GEORGIA, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1968.

Mr. Donnelly, thank you. You gentlemen who are involved with industrial traffic and the Department of Transportation share many concerns, and I welcome this opportunity to discuss some of them with you.

The Department of Transportation -- it's just a year and a half old -- was created at the crest of a new wave of cooperation between business and government. Our nation has the only privately owned and operated transportation system in the world. None of us think it should be otherwise.

What, then, is the government's role? My Department believes that the mobility of people and goods can best be improved, not through extended government controls, but through extended cooperation with industry.

We see an urgent need for increased planning, so that the transportation system can expand efficiently to serve a growing economy. And as we double the size of that transportation system in the next

two decades -- which we must -- we will have to pay serious attention to its effect on man's environment.

Problems caused by hazardous materials are not new in our industrial society. There are even instances where something not ordinarily hazardous has caused a great deal of trouble when things went wrong.

Few people remember the Great Boston Molasses Flood. It happened in 1919. There was an explosion in a molasses warehouse, and an ocean of molasses swept -- or maybe oozed -- into the streets of Boston. Some places, it is said, were three feet deep in molasses -- one of the messiest industrial accidents in history. A very proper Bostonian, legend has it, got into trouble with his wife. He was late getting home because of the flood. And when his wife asked where he had been, he answered with what must be one of the greatest strayed husband excuses in history: "Why, dear, I was trapped in a flood of molasses."

Matters have become much more complicated since that simpler time. American chemical research develops about 25 new products each day. An enormous variety and quantity of explosives, exotic fuels, nuclear materials, flammables, poisons, corrosives, and other hazardous materials move about this country. Developing them takes great industrial sophistication. So does transporting them.

As you know, the basic law dealing with the transportation of hazardous materials is the Transportation of Explosives Act. Responsibility for administering it was transferred to the Department of Transportation on April 1, 1967. In the year and a half since, we have worked to provide uniform, workable regulations. Secretary Alan Boyd has given high priority to this task.

Individual administrations within the Department are responsible for their part of the regulations -- depending on whether hazardous materials are moving by rail, highway, air, or water. Yet, obviously, regulations have to be developed jointly.

So we have established the Office of Hazardous Materials, operating under the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology.

The Office of Hazardous Materials develops regulations, which are then proposed to the proper administrators for adoption. People in the Office of Hazardous Materials also provide technical assistance to the administrators and make sure that regulations are properly tested and evaluated.

We believe this basic effort should be carried further. "Coordination" can become a cliche in government, but in a program which involves so many different interests and purposes, it is crucial.

Our goal is a single set of carefully drawn national standards. As the initial step to coordinate the Department's regulatory program, we have set up a Hazardous Materials Regulations Board. The Board is made up of representatives of the four operating administrations, which regulate air, water, rail, and highway transportation. The Department's General Counsel serves as the board's legal advisor.

So much for organization. What do we hope to accomplish in the near future? As many of you know, we have given notice of our intention to revise the current hazardous materials regulations, aiming for changes that will give us something simple and effective to work with.

As we accomplish this, we will be especially concerned with four main areas: classification and labels, handling and stowing, placards and emergency procedures, and general packaging requirements.

You gentlemen know better than I how fast things change. There is a constant stream of new products, many of which require new handling systems. At the same time, there are new, improved packaging materials and operating techniques. There is a trend toward more bulk shipments. The needs of the aerospace and missile industries especially, change constantly. So must our regulations.

In the past, efforts to regulate hazardous materials were concerned mostly with the properties of materials themselves -- what are the chemical characteristics" -- and less with the types of hazards which arise from the conditions the materials are subjected to in moving them from one place to another. We intend to reverse this emphasis.

What happens to hazardous materials while they are in transit? Are they bumped, shaken, heated, cooled? And what effect does this have on them? We know a great deal, but we have a great deal more to learn about transportation environment.

What else? Techniques of transportation themselves change constantly. Carriers innovate, and seek to operate more efficiently and profitably. Our regulations must stay in step with these changes.

What are the responsibilities of shippers? Of course, they must package hazardous material properly and identify it clearly. Material and container must always be compatible -- "the right juice in the right can."

Proper documentation of shipments is an absolute necessity. If documentation is incomplete or wrong, proper action cannot be taken at the scene of an accident by fire and police officials. Of prime importance is a full, accurate description of the commodity on the shipping paper. For example, a recent shipment of Class B poisons which had leaked on food products was listed simply as "five gallon cans." This in no way alerted anyone to the seriousness of the accident or even warned of the danger of death or injury. Unfortunately, this was not an isolated incident. In the past six months there have been 77 reported accidents involving Class B poisons, many in circumstances where the shipping paper did not show the hazard.

The best safety tool available to shippers and carriers is the proper reporting of an accident. If the Department knows what the trouble is, it can take action to remedy the problem, or tell someone at the scene what he should do.

Currently we are developing regulations which would require reporting of accidents to the Department by all shippers and carriers.

Some materials escape regulation altogether. Should we have additional classifications? For example, certain cryogenic materials are not regulated. Neither are molten metals. Yet all, in the right, or I should say the wrong circumstances, these can be extremely hazardous.

Finally, we think it is extremely important to consolidate present separate sets of regulations, each written for a specific mode of transportation, into one set of regulations that covers all modes. Increasingly we find that shipments are intermodal, and regulations should simplify this process and its interchanges as much as possible.

There is no question in my mind or in yours, I am sure, that government regulation serves the public interest. Thankfully, we are past the time when government and business lived in a car-and-dog world of mutual antagonism.

As Secretary Boyd told the American Petroleum Institute last November:

> "The Federal government is well aware that corporations do, indeed, have an obligation to their stockholders. At the same time, private industry has come to realize that obligation is not necessarily in conflict with its obligation to society. Indeed, the social obligation has proved to be excellent economics in the long run."

In this sense, then, it is as important to you as it is to the public that there are adequate standards and safeguards when hazardous materials are transported. The record so far has been adequate, but we must seek perfection.

These standards cannot be written and imposed by the government acting on its own, even if the government wanted to -- which, of course, it does not.

Instead, we must work in close partnership with people such as you. We need your technical resources and experience. We need first-hand and continuous knowledge of your problems. To get these things, we must consult with you constantly. Equally important, we must have your considered comment on proposed regulations and the operation of regulations already in effect.

We are counting on you, and I assure you we will listen.

Thank you.

105.14

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

STATEMENT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY JOHN E. ROBSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFICIENCIES AND SUPPLEMENTALS, SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, ROOM 1224 NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1968, 9:30 A.M.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I appreciate this opportunity to present our case for the restoration of certain of the reductions recommended by the House Appropriations Committee in the Department's estimates as set forth in the 1969 Supplemental Appropriation Bill.

We have requested four supplementals. These are:

1. $4.2 million to cover the part year costs of a Civil Service Commission reclassification of air traffic controllers. This reclassification was urgently needed and the House Committee has recommended $4 million, $200 thousand under the budget estimate. The Federal Aviation Administration believes that the reduction can be absorbed and we are not appealing it.
2. $580,000 to pay an approved contractor's claim on work done to restore docks and other facilities of the Alaska Railroad at Seward, Alaska, destroyed in the 1964 earthquake. The

#D778 6-26-69

S. 2

ROBSJE681008

No. 279

House Committee recommended granting the full request since there is agreement that the amount is due the contractor.

3. $500,000 to provide the initial funding of the recently enacted Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968. The House Committee has recommended $250 thousand, just half of our request. We ask that your Committee approve the full amount of our request. I will discuss our need for the restoration in more detail later in my statement.

4. Language to transfer to the Salaries and expenses account $665,000 of funds already available for Urban Mass Transportation grants. The House Committee has recommended $300,000, less than half of what we requested. The Committee in its report stated that it had allowed 20 positions, compared to our request of 45 and also specifically denied positions to set up small field offices. We have concluded that the field staffing can be deferred, but the remainder of the original request is urgently required for the management of the program. We are, therefore, appealing for an amount of $585 thousand to be transferred. This is $285 thousand over the House Committee's recommendation but $80 thousand under our original request.

That, Mr. Chairman, summarizes the situation and our appeal. I will now very briefly explain why we seek some restorations for the Gas Pipeline program and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

With respect to the Gas Pipeline Safety program, the Department originally estimated that the cost of staff and research programs to develop the Federal safety standards would be $2,000,000, about half to be spent on study contracts and consultants during FY 1969. As finally approved, the Act authorized appropriations of $500,000 during FY 1969, the amount of our supplemental request. The House Committee recommended $250,000. This sum will cover little more than the cost of assembling the basic information for the Federal safety standards.

We have projected $150,000 for contracts and consultants to collect and analyse the information necessary for developing the Federal safety standards. The Act requires that we publish these standards by August 12, 1970. To meet that date, we must:

1. determine the location, size, age, and ownership of the pipelines in use;

2. determine the operating practices of the hundreds of pipeline owners;

3. analyze the operating experience and accident record of the pipeline system to determine where the safety problems lie, and

4. develop a scheme of safety regulation.

The inventory and analysis will have to be done by contract, because the Department does not have the manpower to do the job and will not have the time to develop the staff. This contract work will have to be done under this initial appropriation because of the tight schedule set by law.

An appropriation of $500,000 for FY 1969 would permit only a small field staff and State liaison program. Any lesser sum would require reduction or elimination of these activities, since they are of lower priority than the development of the Federal safety standards. The field staff should be established as soon as possible to investigate accidents, establish contact with industry, and prepare for enforcement of the regulations. The State liaison program is essential to the success of the Federal-State cooperation contemplated by the Act.

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration's request for a transfer of $665,000 from the Urban Mass Transportation Grants appropriation to Salaries and Expenses was reduced by the House Committee to $300,000. The Department asks that $285,000 be restored. The House Committee report specified that 20 positions were approved compared to our request for 45. We are now appealing for funds to support only 37 jobs. We are not appealing for the eight field positions which were denied in the House report.

These requests are made, first, because Reorganization Plan Number Two of 1968, in establishing the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, approved an entirely new organization in the Department of Transportation. This Administration, like others in the Department, is authorized and expected to provide or fund for both its direct operations and its administrative support. Moreover, the UMTA assistance program has been growing rapidly, and because of the uncertainty as to where it should be administered it has never been adequately staffed. There is a backlog of inquiries from local public agencies and of unreviewed applications which urgently need action. Nearly $500 million of Federal funds are now committed in on-going projects which require supervision.

In short, the Administration faces a workload which, in the last year, has grown from 50 percent to 100 percent in several areas, and the 1970 program, already appropriated at a level of $175,000,000 provides for a substantial further expansion in program activity. The effective management and oversight needed for the efficient and successful operation of the program can simply not be accomplished with the currently available staff of 39 people.

Of particular importance is the development of the research program to improve transportation technology called for by the Urban Mass Transportation Act. Such a program is the key to the future of urban mass transportation. With an aggressive, imaginative program of

research the Federal Government can stimulate cities to take the initiative in meeting their needs.

In summary, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration requires the 37 additional positions requested to function as an operating administration within the Department of Transportation; to meet the pressing workload increases which the agency faces; and to develop a program which will provide the long-run Federal leadership which will stimulate local and State initiative. Unless these additional positions are filled in 1969 the objectives for the program on which the reorganization plan was based will go unrealized for another year.

Finally, I want to stress that we are asking for no new appropriation. We are seeking only the transfer of a small amount of program money already appropriated. We are convinced that this modest investment in more effective program supervision will yield substantial benefits by insuring that our mass transporation appropriations are productively and effectively spent.

That completes my statement, Mr. Chairman, I and my colleagues here would be happy to answer any questions.

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

REMARKS OF JOHN E. ROBSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT MEETING OF THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, D. C. CHAPTER, WASHINGTON, D. C., OCTOBER 15, 1968

Thank you very much, Admiral Morrison. It is a pleasure and an honor to be here today. I cannot tell you the pleasure it gives a former private first class to have all this brass as a captive audience.

It is also a great pleasure to be here just following the Academy's football victory last weekend. They tell me that these events in recent years have been about as frequent as total eclipses of the sun.

I am reminded of my days in college when the great Tennessee mountain raconteur, Herman Hickman, was head football coach. After an excruciating string of lost games Herman was asked by the press how his relations were with the alumni. "Well, drawled Herman, "I believe I've been able to keep them sullen but not mutinous."

Times are changing for our educational institutions. There was the day when one chose between going to a co-educational college

or an educational one. And, of course, there is the story about the rich woman who owned what she considered a very intelligent horse. She wrote the President of the University of Norwich and asked that a degree be conferred on the horse, adding that if this were done she would contribute a million dollars to the college endowment. After lengthy debate, the President and trustees of the University of Norwich weakened and agreed to go ahead with it. At the graduation ceremony the horse was decked out in cap and gown like the rest of the senior class. In handing the degree to the horse, the President of the University was constrained to observe that it was the first time in the history of the University that a degree was conferred on a whole horse.

But as I said, our educational institutions have changed and it is change that I would like to talk to you about today.

If a generalization is possible about this year 1968, it probably should be that nothing will come out of the year the same as it went in. The generalization seems to apply no matter where you look -- from the St. Louis Cardinals, to the state of the theatre, to the Catholic Church, to the operation of the democratic process. It's a baffling, frustrating, but always exciting year. Those who are perceptive have learned a great deal from it. Those inclined to wring their hands have wrung them often. The optimists among us are probably less optimistic this year, and the pessimists more pessimistic. I prefer to react in terms of Dickens -- "It was the best of times and the worst of times."

Perhaps we all need a breathing spell.

For almost two centuries, we have trusted the operation of our democratic system in a free society, and it has served us well. I believe we can go on trusting it, and it will go on serving us. Our current frustration and nervousness tend to blind us to what a remarkable society we are.

Last week, I was in Everett, Washington, just north of Seattle. There, in a plant so huge it almost seems entitled to issue currency, declare war and join the U. N., the Boeing Company is building gargantuan jet airplanes that will carry 490 passengers long distances

at high speeds. It is an awesome display of technology and industrial achievement. Even a few years ago, it would have been impossible.

Yet I did not come away from my encounter with the Boeing 747 feeling I had witnessed a technological coup d'etat. It was predictable, almost inevitable, that we would design and build such an airplane. And it is predictable, almost inevitable, that we will design and build its successors. The technology in our society has an open end. It literally can do anything we want it to do. We are becoming technologically blase -- to the point where, when we have sent three astronauts whirling around the earth, we here at hearthside U.S.A. worry about the two who have colds, and whether the dehydrated beef stew on Apollo Seven is tasty.

I don't mind living at the wide end of the cornucopia. Neither, I am sure, do you. We have come to accept abundance, and the technology that produces it, as our ancestors once accepted the tide's ebb and flow. Abundance, and the opportunity for abundance, are to us inevitable. We admit we must learn to smooth off the rough edges -- which currently means spreading the opportunities around a bit more so that everyone has a fair share.

But generally we have come to cast our life style as if it were a traditional western. The hero -- us, collectively -- always leads the posse, shoots the villain and gets the girl.

Is it really that ordered, pleasant and inevitable? Of course it isn't. Paraphrasing a candidate in another year, in our hearts we know it isn't. Even lotus blossoms, as a steady diet, can leave a sour taste.

People worry much less about quantity in American life. If you take the trouble to observe waistlines, suburban shopping centers on Saturdays, and houses built around crammed closets and refrigerators whose doors have shelves filled with food, you'll know we have plenty of enough in America, or enough of plenty -- whichever you prefer.

So here we sit, prosperous and powerful. Here we sit, eating steak, smelling good, looking posh -- but chewing our fingernails and eating our hearts out at the same time. Why?

I am not Plato, or Arnold Toynbee. But I would like to suggest why. Unfortunately, answering the question points to a tedious and difficult solution.

The answer can be put pompously -- something along the lines of what profiteth a man if he gain the whole world yet lose his own soul. Or it can be put much more simply. Do we still have the capacity to choose what we want to be and then work to become it?

All the elaborate machinery of our democracy is grounded on the idea that making choices is good for people -- that in the exercise of choice we develop according to our own bent, to our fullest human potential.

Yet increasingly, the opportunity to choose seems to elude us. Traditionally, we have believed that individuals have the right to decide how they will live their lives, and that there will be as little restraint as possible on their decisions. Further, we have believed that as citizens, we have the right to control directly, or through our representatives, the public decisions which determine the content and quality of our lives.

Yet many of us believe that these basic, democratic principles are undergoing something of a crisis. Today, individuals are surrounded by vast, impersonal institutions -- of government, of business, even of education. Too often, these institutions, however well conceived or intentioned, seem unresponsive, indifferent -- even hostile to our human needs as we perceive them.

Naturally, this situation leaves us restless and frustrated.

The political disarray we have experienced this year, sometimes bordering on the incoherent, is one reaction. Excluding violence and irresponsible anti-establishmentism, this is the way we compete for power -- a not unexpected process in a democratic society. In fact it is so expectable that the Constitution spells out how it shall be done. But the current intensity of challenge to and debate over our institutions and processes underscores the dimensions of our national unease.

We are past the point, in our urbanized, industrial society of a return to rugged agrarian individualism. But I think our institutions are beginning to respond to the threat of a wholly depersonalized society -- the threat most often identified as the cause for the crisis in democratic practice.

First, there is much discussion and the beginning of action to assign major tasks of government to small, viable units as close as possible to the grass roots. Hopefully, diminishing the size of the institution responsible for certain decisions will increase the importance of the role of the individual in those decisions. For a long time now, critics of the Federal Government -- and not just ultra-conservative critics -- have argued that there are real, practical limits on the tasks a distant government bureaucracy can effectively carry out.

Recently, we have begun to realize that "distant" in the governmental sense does not always mean many miles away. The bureaucracy in a state capital or in City Hall can often be as distant from the concerns and problems of its citizens as the bureaucracy in Washington. So there are proposals to break down even city government into federations of neighborhoods.

Second, a parallel policy development provides for and encourages immediate citizen involvement in the process of decision-making. The poverty program set an early precedent. Currently, the Model Cities Program requires that residents who are affected be directly involved in planning and carrying out each project. And both statute and regulations governing programs administered by my Department, notably the Federal Highway Program, make provision for the expression of citizen views in public hearings.

I sympathize with both these developments. But my enthusiasm for them has its limits.

As for decentralization, the degree to which it is possible depends upon the nature and purpose of the program. Although the evidence is not all in, decentralizing the operation of schools may work out well. But other areas of public responsibility -- such as transportation -- have a much broader base: so broad that neighborhoods, cities, even states, cannot make final decisions.

As for citizen involvement, the key obstacle is practicality in the conduct of government. Many of government's tasks are so technical and so complex that they cannot be effectively carried out if everyone concerned becomes directly and personally involved. A well-informed citizen and a well-intentioned citizen is not necessarily an expert citizen. And some things, like it or not, have to be left to the experts.

Beyond that, I suspect that some of the appeal of direct citizen involvement rests on the pleasant assumption that men are inherently fair-minded and progressive. The obvious wrongs in society, this assumption continues, result only from the sway of flawed leaders and flawed institutions. But the evidence hardly bears out the assumption. Instead, it confirms that individually and in groups, citizens can be as blind to their own best interests and as cold to the rights of others as any bureaucracy.

To quote Mark Twain, "If you have all the fools in town on your side, that's a big enough majority in any town." But I expect to see continued experimentation and changes in our governmental processes and institutions -- designed to meet the common aspiration of each of us to stand on our own two feet and have a choice in what we want to become and an opportunity to get there.

There is, it seems to me, little purpose in fighting the press of change simply because that isn't the way we have always done it. We are in new times and new times demand changes in our old institutions.

Churchill said it better, "If we open up a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future."

I do not for a moment suggest that changes in our institutions and our governmental processes comes easily. It doesn't. It comes hard. But from the confidence in our ability to respond successfully the the challenge of difference springs a basic strength in our democracy; and we shall only lose sight of our goals when we lower our heads to see the obstacles.

10821

1150

106.14

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

REMARKS OF JOHN E. ROBSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE 80TH CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, NOVEMBER 14, 1968

As I reflect on the relationship between the States and the Federal Government, I am brought to the conclusion that it requires something of an historical perspective. It may be presumptuous of one who represents a Department less than two years old to hold forth on the subject of State/Federal relationships to a group of men associated with state agencies dating back as far as the year 1804. Indeed, 1804 is one year before the idea of a Federal Department of Transportation was first advanced to President Thomas Jefferson.

The underpinning of the Federal concept grew out of issues we are still wrestling with today. In the early 19th century, a strong central government was viewed with suspicion. The 10th Amendment to the Constitution underscores that suspicion by reserving to the States all powers not specifically delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government. But aside from political philosophy, it seems to me that most problems of those days could be very capably identified and dealt

6-27-69

#1096

3-2

#00319

Robs JE 68 1114

3/5/69

with on the State and local level. We were decades away from the commerical complexities of the turn of the century, from a national transportation system, and from national distribution of goods and services. We were even further distant from the McLuhan era of total and instant communication. And I think, too, that there was considerable disagreement as to what the problems were.

While it may not be appropriate for some of us, in light of the events of last week, to make judgments on the degree of suspicion which the Federal Government is held in, it is clear that we are living today in a much different environment for State/Federal relations. For one thing, I believe there is considerable national agreement on what the problems are. The great center of the American populace, and both major political parties, are not very far apart in identifying the problems. There is, however, considerable debate over what the solutions to our problems should be.

In our very complicated society there is a fair concensus that more and more of our problems can be categorized as national in scale. I don't think this view emerges just from the alleged failure of the states to respond to problems. For in a predominantly urbanized nation, where the former travel and communication barriers of weeks and months have shrunk to minutes and hours, the problems are national in a physical sense. But the mere classification of problems as national does not come to grips with the issue of the limitations on a national government in managing the solutions to national problems, and insuring that these solutions take into account local and regional tastes and considerations. I assure you that the Department of Transportation is keenly aware of the difficulties a distant bureaucracy faces in dealing with the local and regional aspects of a problem.

For example, my Department is responsible for administering the Federal-aid Highway Program which was conceived of as a national network of interstate highways supplemented by various local road systems. Surely a major interstate transportation network must be handled with a national overview. Indeed, the consequences within our national transportation system are often felt a great distance from where the particular decision is implemented. But in the final analysis, when a segment of the network of our national highway system is built,

it is built in a specific place, in a specific city, in a specific neighborhood. And here the character and dimensions of the national transportation system have an impact on the lives of people who are a long way from Washington and from the national transportation planners.

It is interesting to observe the current demand by all bands of the political spectrum for the return of Federal problem management (not necessarily with attendant financial responsibility) to the State and local level. We see proposals for revenue sharing with the States; the poverty program attempts to give local management responsibilities down to the neighborhood level; and we are witnessing today a fierce battle in New York City over what geographic unit will govern local school policy. I think these developments are significant to the analysis of the problem we are here to discuss today.

Concurrent with the trend to bring the management of problem solving closer to the people, we see a growing and widespread concern about the relationships and responsibilities between commercial enterprises and the individual. Government is becoming much more involved in protection of the individual, not only in the physical sense, but in the protection also of the less quantitative aspects of our environment such as its aesthetic qualities. We are in, it seems to me, an era of consumerism never before seen. Much of this is reflected in recent Federal legislation dealing with automobile safety, gas pipeline safety, laws to protect the quality of food and even legislation designed to deal with individual credit transactions. Whether or not you agree with all of this new legislation, it is fair to say that its enactment by Congress reflects the belief by a majority of the national legislators that this is what the majority of their constituents wanted.

If we are going to have a really viable State/Federal relationship in the future, it seems to me that all of us must strike a better balance in dealing with four trends: first, the trend to adopt a national legislative framework within which to solve national problems; second, an increasing recognition of the practical limitations on the national government in managing and implementing solutions to national problems; third, the clamor for greater reflection of local and regional sensibilities in both

the adoption and implementation of solutions to our problems; and, fourth, a growing tendency to impose upon all government a heavier responsibility in protecting people against various risks in our bountiful but complex commercial system.

I, for one, am optimistic that this balance can be achieved. There are recent examples where federal legislation encourages the States to play a very significant role. Immediately, the gas pipeline safety legislation comes to mind. It offers the opportunity to State agencies, assisted by Federal funds, not only to become the monitoring and enforcement agency, but to exercise creativity in that role. Similarly, an important role for the States and local communities is staked out in the Highway Safety Act of 1966. In addition, as many of you know, my Department has under consideration a proposal to expand the role of the States in motor carrier safety activities.

These are all steps in the right direction. They are not perfect, but they are significant moves in an attempt to strike a better balance in the role of the Federal and State establishments.

It seems to me, too, that there are untapped areas for cooperation between State and Federal agencies in which much more can be done. In the field of research, training, and data and information sharing, I would guess that much could be accomplished through the use of common facilities and expanded utilization of modern data retrieval techniques. I encourage NARUC to develop proposals for action in this area. I am reasonably confident that you will not find resistance at the Federal end.

Finally, let me say that the role which we and you will play in the future is going to depend in great measure upon how responsive we are to citizen concern for protection, whether it be in the economic or safety area. The key to preserving the proper State and Federal balance is public confidence in the ability and dedication of State and local government agencies. We can and should work together. And we can and should try to preserve this important balance in our regulatory system.

# # #