

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

1300

1171

STATEMENT OF J. D. BRAMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR URBAN SYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENT, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, REGARDING THE MIAMI JET AIRPORT, TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1969.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

I am accompanied this morning by Mr. Chester Bowers, Director of the Airports Service of the Federal Aviation Administration, and Mr. Oscar Gray, Director of the Office of Environmental Impact of the Department of Transportation.

When I consented to join the Department of Transportation as Assistant Secretary for Urban Systems and Environment, I did so partly because of a firm conviction that our national transportation programs must be increasingly guided towards minimizing undesirable environmental consequences. As the longtime mayor of one of our greatest and most beautifully endowed cities in the Nation, I am well aware of the strong motivations which favor proceeding with public work improvements. At the same time, I am aware of, and sympathetic to, the views which oppose such improvements when they needlessly impact upon our environmental values in an adverse fashion.

The office I occupy was established by Secretary Volpe because of his own concern about these same impacts.

Among the many controversial projects inherited by the Secretary was the Miami Jetport.

Because of its location adjacent to one of the Nation's most unique national assets, the Everglades National Park, it presents both a public

71-03591 S

challenge as well as an opportunity for the Department to come to grips with all the environmental type problems that transportation will face nationwide in the years to come.

The opportunities and challenges must be shared in this case by both the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Interior. In this project, we have every potential environmental conflict that anyone can imagine. If not coped with, it threatens adverse consequences to a unique National Park, with countless species of plantlife and wildlife, water conservation programs, and just about every other type of environmental value that exists within our Nation. My point is that it presents, in one package, the opportunity to explore both the consequences and the possible cures for almost every type of ecological conflict that development of an airport, or a highway, or a mass transit system can encounter.

I do not believe that every conflict present in the Everglades can be resolved in a manner to totally satisfy all points of view. I firmly believe, however, that such conflicts must be minutely examined, and their corrective solutions identified wherever possible. The Everglades is but one location where transportation programs are on a collision course with environmental values. Others are emerging across our Nation, and we must learn how to cope with them. The Everglades presents that opportunity.

In a sense, our jetport problem in lower Florida is quite ironic. For several years, aviation has increasingly imposed upon the peace and

tranquility of our citizens. The widely recognized solution has been to locate airports further distant from populated areas, in great open expanses of undeveloped land. In almost any other area of our Nation, I believe we would be applauding the Dade County Port Authority for locating its airport in accordance with those recommendations.

The Department has supported the development of a limited airport in lower Florida, and that facility is under construction. Its sole initial purpose is to accommodate the pilot proficiency training which is now taxing Miami International, some 36 miles away. When the training airport's first runway is completed, about September first, it will divert approximately 150,000 annual aircraft operations away from Miami International and extend the useful capacity of that airport until about 1980. If such diversion does not occur, we forecast that Miami International will become dangerously saturated at least five years earlier.

Miami is, I am sure you gentlemen are aware, a somewhat unique terminal point within our national air transportation system. Its location dictates overnighiting of both crews and aircraft which, in turn, economically encourages several air carriers to concentrate their pilot proficiency training at that location as nighttime operations. This fact has further induced several carriers to establish extensive aircraft maintenance facilities at Miami. And, of course, the city is appreciative of the resulting economic benefits and understandably eager to accommodate the carriers' operational needs. My point is that I believe that the training jetport, which is being constructed on privately-owned land, would exist today even if Federal aid had not been made available.

The need for a supplemental training facility was first recognized in late 1966. In the interim until June 1968--the date when Dade County and Collier County united in agreement upon the present site--several alternative sites were considered. They included Freeport, Grand Bahama; St. Petersburg, Daytona Beach, West Palm Beach, Boca Raton, Immokalee, all in Florida; and at the insistence of FAA, Hunter AFB, Savannah, Georgia; Turner AFB, Albany, Georgia; and former military auxillary fields at Cleviston and Brooksville, Florida. After due consideration, the Department concurred with local authorities that only the present general area and Homestead AFB were worthy of continuing consideration. Ultimately, Homestead was ruled to be unsuitable due to noise exposure upon residential areas when the pertinent factor of nighttime operations was considered.

In addition to the present site, four other alternatives were considered within its general vicinity. The first was located within Water Conservation Area No. 3 and was abandoned at the request of the Central and South Florida Flood Control District. A second straddled the Dade-Monroe County Line--south and west of the first site. This was highly satisfactory from a flight viewpoint, but was abandoned due to objections raised by the National Park Service. The third was located entirely within Monroe County and was further removed from the Everglades National Park. It was abandoned because of the inability of the two counties to resolve jurisdictional problems. The fourth site considered is the airport's present location. A fifth was under consideration

entirely within Dade County, but it again encroached upon Water Conservation Area No. 3. It was abandoned when Collier and Dade Counties reached agreement upon Site No. 4.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone into the details of past site selections for a specific purpose. If a satisfactory training airport is to exist in the lower Florida area, we believe it must exist in its present location. I think it pertinent at this point to observe that I know of no strong feeling--within either the Department of the Interior or within the multitude of conservation and environmental groups concerned over the jetport's development--which does not acknowledge that a pure training facility can be developed and controlled in a manner which is compatible with its surrounding environment. In other words, as a limited facility, the jetport can be engineered to result in only a minimum and tolerable impact upon the area's environment. This brings me to the burning future question.

I earlier indicated that the supplemental training airport will extend the useful life of Miami International until about 1980. Beyond that time, there is little question that an additional major airport will be needed to serve the greater Miami area. The current question is whether or not the present training airport site will be suitable for expansion to a full-blown major facility. As a major facility, we know it would draw population to areas adjacent to and northwest of the airport property. We know it would require the development of an adequate ground access corridor--probably along the present Tamiami Trail. At long-range, it may require some form of rapid-transit connection to Miami proper.

These conditions present entirely new potential impacts upon the Everglades environment. However, we do not know either the degree of their impact nor the possible actions which can be taken to minimize their effect. Fortunately, time is on our side. To be available for use in 1980, expansion of the airport beyond a training character must commence about five years earlier. Accordingly, we have until about 1975 to determine whether or not such additional development is proper at the present site.

I have recently discussed this entire matter with Under Secretary Train of the Department of the Interior, and we are in full agreement that we lack--and need--a great deal of factual information before we can intelligently decide upon the airport's future. We also agree that positive and strong roles must be jointly played by both departments to ensure that all of the consequences are evaluated and that their corrective actions are promptly identified. To this end, we are nearing formation of a high level joint Task Force to define the needed leadership role of the Federal Government, and to identify the studies, resources and multiple involvements with local and state governments which are needed for a totally satisfactory action program. We believe this action will readily produce the information we need, within the available time period.

Mr. Chairman, there are obviously many facets of this problem which I have not touched upon. I have chosen in this brief statement to put before you those facts which I hope you will agree are essential to your full understanding of the public issues involved.

I assure you that the Department of Transportation is fully aware of those issues. We are equally aware of the awesome public responsibility placed upon Secretary Volpe by section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act to decide such matters. In this case, and in every like case to arise elsewhere in our Nation, we will be guided by the full intent and spirit of that responsibility.

Thank you Mr. Chairman. This concludes my prepared remarks. I am afraid my knowledge of this problem, after less than a month in office, may not be as detailed as my statement might indicate. However, I shall be pleased to attempt to answer any questions you may have.



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

1300

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

19-S-69

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR URBAN SYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENT, J. D. BRAMAN, BEFORE THE WESTERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE, AMERICAN TRANSIT ASSOCIATION, AT THE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HOTEL IN SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, ON JUNE 9, 1969 AT 10:30 A.M.

T. S. Elliot, poet and critic, once said that he foresaw the end of the world as happening not with a bang but with a whimper. There is a growing body of opinion that he may have been right and that the first stage of the final crisis is already upon us -- that the dying whimper of an environment burdened to the point of collapse may come before another fifty years has passed. I do not necessarily subscribe to this gloomy prediction but do believe that the time is here for all of us to face up to the monumental task ahead of us and get on with the job.

Ever since nomadic man first settled down and began scarring the soil with planting sticks, burning off the brush to win crop land, and chopping down trees to stoke his hearth fires, he has had some capacity to damage the environment. Only in the last few years, however, has mankind achieved the ability not merely to damage his environment locally but to destroy it globally. This does not refer to the devastating ability of weapons of war, but rather to the "beneficial tools of peace." We have

- more -

71-03592 S

117.2

termed this as progress or civilization and through technology designed to improve our standard of living, we have created a toboggan run down which we may be sliding to disaster -- a slide smoothed by this very same technological excellence. It is not my purpose here to dwell in great depth on the total question of environmental decay which is beginning to deeply concern thinking people at all levels in our society. The effect of insecticides, fertilizers, and other deteriorating influences on the soil, the water, the atmosphere and the health of the people, are indeed grave concerns and well merit the best thinking and research of which this country is capable. As indicated in the title of my new office, environment takes a very high place. This is because the various elements used in the field of transportation do have a very serious effect either for good or evil on the environment in which we live. The problems created by the emissions from all types of energy derived from fossil fuels is well known. I am sure every thinking person is concerned about the emissions from automobiles, trucks, and buses and, more recently from modern jet aircraft. Over the years, steamboats and trains have also made their contribution to polluting the air which we breathe. It is not my purpose today however, to dwell on this particular phase of the impact of transportation on environment, since this is the concern within the Department of Transportation of our Office of Research and Technology. I am quite sure that the tremendous ability of the world's technology will eventually come up with solutions to this serious problem. Transportation, however, has another destructive impact on the environment which is best exemplified by the concern presently being expressed in almost all of the urban regions of the Nation over the influence of major highways as they pass through and affect our cities. In fact, the time may have come when it will be absolutely necessary, even though distasteful, to call a halt to the construction of major highways in most of our cities until these regions themselves have had a chance to take advantage of the opportunities now open to them for genuine full-scale regional land and transportation planning. Certainly there should be no question that all construction as vital to the welfare of a metropolitan area as our major transportation facilities should result only from a well thought-out, accepted and serious regional plan. These plans obviously will vary greatly from region to region.

The logical answer in such cities as San Francisco, Seattle, New York, Pittsburgh, and many others, where topographical and geographical features make access to the Central City difficult, would not necessarily apply to such cities as Denver, Phoenix, Dallas, Houston, and others where these factors do not interfere with full access to the city from all points of the compass.

The plan, when developed, should look at both sides of the coin.

1. It should not interfere any more than necessary with the improvements, the housing developments and the living patterns of the region.
2. It should be designed to help shape the development or redevelopment of a metropolitan region large enough to encompass the growth forecast for many years into the future.

Transportation in urban areas should be more than a means by which people and goods are moved efficiently. Rather it should be used as a tool to shape and mould the community -- to enhance that which is good and help correct that which is bad.

The major achievement in ground transportation in the last decade has been the successful effort to link together the metropolitan centers of the 48 contiguous states by the Interstate Highway System. In my opinion, this program has been a tremendous success and is probably one of the crown jewels of the Eisenhower Administration. I would like to see a proper solution to the urban transportation problem stand out as one of the great successes of the Nixon Administration.

The imminent completion of the Interstate System now makes it mandatory that we refocus our attention on these urban areas where entirely different techniques are required. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the broad and smooth highways which work so well across the hills and dales, the prairies and mountains, of our broad land, do not function so well as they enter the congested precincts of our cities. On the plus side, when a new freeway is constructed, the benefits to the public are obvious. High speed access to the Central City, 70 miles per hour through areas which previously had been tortuously slow, distance measured in minutes rather than miles. What is not so obvious, or pleasant to contemplate however, are the social costs which may also result. The ribbons of high speed freeway can also result in disruption of the social fabric of the community. People, families, neighborhoods and community growth patterns, frequently become the victims of progress.

This does not have to be the case. Urban transportation should be planned as a complete system using a mix of all modes each properly related to the others.

Urban transportation systems planning should be guided by the following considerations:

1. An urban transportation system should be a tool for shaping the growth of the metropolitan area and should have as its primary purpose the improvement of the quality of the environment.
2. There should be locally evolved solutions that reflect a balance of transportation modes most appropriate for each particular area.
3. Preferential funding for any one mode should not be the basis upon which mode selection is made.
4. In order that transportation systems can be planned and programmed intelligently, assured long-term funding for all selected modes is essential.

The placement of all Federal transportation programs under the Department of Transportation should prove most helpful to urban areas. Coordination of transportation planning with other community goals, as required in the Federal Aid to Highways Act of 1962, is essential. Congress most recently reaffirmed this concept in Section 204 of the Model Cities Act of 1966. This interlocking of long-range objectives makes sense by any test. The problem of transportation in cities is the problem of meeting community goals. We must be certain that comprehensive plans covering highways, public transportation, and airports can be put into effect without distortions occasioned by inadequate financing for any one element of the total system.

The Interstate Highway System, surely one of the great achievements of modern technology, would never have been possible without an assured long-term funding basis. The same logic applies to other necessary modes of transportation which complement the highway system. The trust fund for highways must be continued if we are to complete the Interstate system, and I fully support that concept. However, an assured funding source for all elements of public transportation is equally essential. With the many varied demands for Federal funding, seeking annual appropriations for a continuing public transportation program is simply too uncertain. In fiscal 1968, the total appropriations for urban mass transit was \$125,000,000; while, during the same period, 4.4 billion dollars was available in the trust fund for highway construction.

To ensure improvement of public transportation, we advocate a separate public transportation trust fund, provided with its own revenue sources, or some similar assured revenue approach, as the surest way of achieving a balanced transportation system for our cities.

Metropolitan transportation needs require that any system combine modes so that each plays its appropriate role in implementing the regional plan. Highways, buses, and, in some cases, rail, all have their contribution to make and each should have equal access to Federal financial assistance.

The original Interstate system of 41,000 miles is nearing completion --- this magnificent program was funded with the Federal government providing 90 percent of the cost, and the local share being 10 percent. I believe that there should be no substantial additional mileage added. Prudence dictates that we must be thinking now what form the Federal highway support programs will take in the future when the Interstate system is completed. I believe all future funding should be on the basis of 2/3 federal and 1/3 local sharing. Roads could then be selected according to their real place in the mix of modes rather than the reason that dollars for this mode are cheaper and more available than for other modes.

In the post-Interstate program, the proceeds of the Highway Trust Fund should be largely devoted to the solution of the metropolitan problems.

To accomplish this, I suggest that allocations be realigned into three classifications.

1. State Primary - which would include any extension or improvement to the Interstate System in either urban or rural areas.
2. Urban streets and arterials collateral to and in support of the primary system.
3. Rural state and county secondary roads.

These three categories, would, I believe, result in a rational approach to future highway development in urban areas.

With the assured funding made possible by a public transportation trust fund in addition to a continuance of the present highway trust fund, the regions will then be assured of Federal support to actually bring into being the plan which they have devised. In many instances, particularly in the smaller communities, this will assure support to the local bus systems, whether publicly or privately owned, so that they may have the advantage of modern equipment, of specially planned express bus routes many times on exclusive right-of-way, and other technological improvements which will make possible the continuance of this vital element in the life of the majority of our communities. In other regions where buses cannot alone provide the public transportation needs, it will enable the planning of systems centered around some type of mass transportation, rail or otherwise.

In my own city of Seattle, we have planned a 47-mile subway and surface rail system to be served by a network of approximately 500 miles of express buses and local buses, which, when built, will enable any citizen to travel from a point very close to his place of residence rapidly, comfortably, and hopefully cheaply, to his place of employment. There has been some question as to the use of subways and rail systems based largely on the unfavorable impression of the older systems, such as New York, Boston, Chicago, etc. Certainly, there should be no criticism of these systems, since they have served a very vital purpose over a long period of time, and in fact without them the central portion of these cities could not have remained viable and perhaps could not have even survived.

The Department of Transportation is deeply interested in all of the new innovative ideas for advanced technology in mass transportation. There are some very exciting ideas (currently being studied) on the use of gravity, pneumatic air, air cushion, and other examples of new technology. I am confident that in the not too distant future, there will be some very exciting breakthroughs in this field. However, in the case of mass transportation, as in almost every other aspect of life in this fast advancing age, there comes a time when in a given situation, decision must be made to go ahead with a program based on the highest state of the art as it is currently known.

For those regions in need of mass transportation systems keyed to some central spine of rail or other type of vehicle, considerable assurance can be drawn from the experience of other cities throughout the world. Two very fine examples exist in our great and friendly nation to the north. These are in the cities of Toronto and Montreal where complete mass transportation systems have been developed since World War II. In the case of Toronto, a recent report by an eminent consulting engineer firm indicates that the opening of the first 4 5/10 mile stretch ignited a \$10 billion developmental explosion. They indicate that \$15 billion of physical value has been created in Toronto in the past 10 years and "of this

two-thirds is attributable to the existence of the Yonge Street Subway." The area involving the greatest increase in value is within walking distance of the subway line. This system has now been expanded to 14 miles with planned extensions increasing this to 21 miles. The report states "that if an urban transit system never earned a dime, it would pay for itself many times over to its beneficial impact on real estate values." They say the use of rapid transit as a land development tool has been amply demonstrated by the T-Bana in Stockholm.

Thus, an orderly cluster development pattern has emerged having the rapid transit stations as the focal point with sub-centers laid out like pearls on a string. In Montreal, the newest of the systems, Mayor Gene Drapeau has said "rail transit is much more than fast transportation. It is a great contributor to the economy of the community and the region." Montreal's 16 mile system, soon to be expanded, took only four years to build and has been in operation for two years. It now carries one-half million people a day, business executives as well as shop clerks. High-rise buildings with handsome commercial centers have risen out of the subway stations. A visitor over-looking the city from a high elevation can trace the route of the system by the major new buildings that jot up over the major station locations. Meanwhile, vehicular traffic now moves smoothly and without jams on the city's carefully planned freeway system. One of the new things to be learned from the Montreal system is that with proper design, with stations oriented to people and their needs, a subway system can become the socially acceptable way of traveling in the city.

This was strikingly illustrated on a visit to Montreal shortly after the system opened. This was on a stormy November night with about four inches of slush on the streets and very few people above the ground. The subway system is connected to brightly lighted shopping malls under adjacent private property; these were thronged with people moving about in a most exciting and acceptable atmosphere. It was interesting to note that at the station directly under the city's cultural center that people in evening clothes were moving to and from events in the halls above, having left their cars in the outlying environs of the city to travel on their fine new subway system of which they all seemed so proud.

In addition to the question of ground transportation in and about our metropolitan regions attention must also be given to the growing problem of airport congestion.

An important and integral part of any comprehensive regional transportation plan must be the provision of adequate ground connections to the major airport or airports. In this field, a number of highly exciting new or improved methods are now under study in the Department.

My subject today has been transportation in metropolitan America. This obviously is but one element of a many-faceted problem. Part of today's urban crisis is that in the past we have tended to deal with urban problems symptomatically. As a result, we have come up with a different program for each area of concern -- some of these efforts have actually worked against each other. Transportation should not be treated as a separate problem, but rather, should be regarded as an exciting opportunity to restructure and redevelop urban America.

This approach has the strong support of Secretary Volpe because he believes it to be a workable concept.

This concept requires that funding for urban transportation programs be done on an assured basis, and not be subject to the vagaries of annual appropriations.

Most of all, I cannot stress enough the prerequisite that the local communities of this Nation must commit themselves to new levels of devotion, to the search for new approaches, new answers and new levels of involvement.

When considering an urban problem, in the final analysis it is the people we are talking about.

Too often we become hypnotized by the scale of the monuments that we construct and lose sight of just exactly what is their purpose.

In all too many cases we have been far more conscious of the amount of dollars we are spending than the lives we are disrupting.

Our own federal programs -- such as in the field of housing assistance -- have created residential patterns which transportation planners must now try to redirect.

Conversely, our transportation planners have often constructed systems based only on engineering and economic measurements which have disturbed peoples' lives and damaged their environment. These values, while not easily measurable, must be given full weight along with the economics of a project, when decisions are made.

In short, we have all been guilty of looking at our government problems on the same basis that we look at our personal problems -- take care of that which is of immediate concern, and though aware that this does not solve the long-range problems, let the future take care of itself.

It is time to change that. It is time for this Nation to take on the new task. The Nixon administration is committed to doing so, but can do nothing without full support and similar commitment in every hometown in America.

The subject is transportation. Our problem is the community of tomorrow. The wisdom with which we make our decisions today will determine the nature of the communities and the environment in which our children and their children will live.

We are the custodians of tomorrow.

We must choose wisely.

Thank you.

####

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

117.3

STATEMENT OF J. D. BRAMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR URBAN SYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENT, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, REGARDING H.R. 6750 AND H.R. 12143, MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1969.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

I am J. D. Braman, Assistant Secretary for Urban Systems and Environment in the Department of Transportation. I am accompanied by Mr. Oscar Gray, Director of our Office of Environmental Impact.

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you and testify on H.R. 6750 and H.R. 12143 which would amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality.

The purpose of these bills is related to an area of activity which we consider to be a vital Department function. Secretary Volpe has made clear his conviction that transportation projects must be undertaken in terms of their relation to all of our human needs. We must be concerned with the effectiveness of the various modes of transportation, but we cannot afford to promote this effectiveness in ways which would jeopardize the environment in which we live. Because this conviction is of such extreme importance, Secretary Volpe has strengthened the Departmental structure by establishing the position of Assistant Secretary for Urban Systems and Environment, to which I have been appointed.

The mission of my Office is to coordinate the policies, programs and resources of the Department with public and private efforts to solve urban and environmental problems; to develop and test new procedures, techniques and methods by which transportation progress can be made more relevant to environmental and urban needs and goals; and generally to make the offices

71-03593 S

and administrators within the Department more receptive and responsive to the needs of the cities and more sensitive to the protection and enhancement of the environment.

We will also assist the Secretary so as to maximize the Department's potential contribution to the protection and enhancement of environmental values. This includes his implementation of Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, relating to the natural beauty of the countryside, public parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges and historic sites. Our advise and assistance will also relate to other social and environmental impacts of transportation facilities such as prevention of air and water pollution, noise, and other nuisances. We will be attentive also to the visual impact of transportation works, the preservation and enhancement of aesthetic values, and the encouragement of good design in transportation engineering.

Coordination of these efforts from the Office of the Secretary is new, so we have much to do in establishing the policies and processes necessary to carry out the Secretary's mandate. But the important first steps -- the establishment of an organization and the assignment of responsibility -- have been taken.

It is apparent that a broad recognition of the impact of our way of life on the environment in which we live is an all too recent phenomenon. Clear expressions of national concern about the effects of transportation technology and transportation development are, consequently, only beginning to be fully understood and decisively implemented.

While this Subcommittee is concerned with the question of environmental quality in its broad context, a detailed review of the statutory basis for assuring compatibility between transportation programs and environmental considerations might be of interest to you.

In the area of water pollution, the Department, through the Coast Guard, is involved in the enforcement of the Oil Pollution Act of 1924 and in administering and enforcing the Oil Pollution Act of 1961. Currently, of course, Congress is considering comprehensive legislation which may substantially broaden the Department's responsibilities in the area of water pollution.

With the enactment last year of Public Law 90-411, the Federal Government took an important step in the direction of eliminating unnecessary aircraft noise by requiring the establishment of noise standards for aircraft.

In a somewhat more specialized requirement relating to the Federal-aid highway program, the law has for some time required that highway location decisions in urban areas be preceded by hearings by which the affected citizens might make their views known. To assure that this obligation is effectively discharged, the Federal Highway Administration in the Department has recently published a policy and procedure memorandum which clearly sets forth required procedures and provides that, for any project covered by the statute, two public hearings will have to precede final route decisions. One hearing would be devoted to general corridor selection and the second would deal with the design details of the project.

In this connection, I might also mention the 1965 highway beautification legislation. This established a program for controlling billboards and junkyards alongside Federal-aid highways, with Federal funds authorized to facilitate orderly removal. The Department has successfully concluded agreements with 21 States governing mutual responsibilities in achieving the goals of the statute.

In addition to these statutory requirements of general applicability, the laws establishing various transportation programs administered by the Department contain specific requirements to assure compatibility with comprehensive development plans. Thus, highway plans and programs are to be "formulated with due consideration to their probable effect on the future development of urban areas of more than fifty thousand population." (23 U.S.C. 134)

Prior to the Secretary's approval of an airport development project, Section 9(d)(1) of the Federal Airport Act requires a finding that the project is "reasonably consistent with plans . . . for the development of the area in which the airport is located."

And Section 3(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act requires, as a condition to project approval, that the project be "essential to a program . . . for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area."

In enacting these laws, the Congress has spoken clearly and decisively on the need to consider the interaction between our transportation system and the environment in which it functions.

Clearly, there is no lack of authority or obscurity in the objective of developing urban transportation systems to meet the broader goals of urban planning. This is not to say that there are no problems. We need to know much more about the planning process itself, and we need to know more about the ways in which public facilities such as transportation affect urban development and how they can be used to achieve the desired environmental effects. While much remains to be done, the need is clear and progress is being made.

In addition to our efforts within the Department of Transportation, we have made considerable progress in improving coordination with other Government agencies who have an interest in our programs. The Department has entered into an agreement with the Department of Housing and Urban Development designed to provide for the coordination of planning by the two departments. We have also established particularly close working relationships with the Departments of Interior and of Health, Education, and Welfare to facilitate joint consideration of problems of mutual concern. In addition, we participate in a number of significant inter-agency groups and serve on other public bodies, such as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Marine Sciences Council, and the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, through which we are kept currently abreast of developments relevant to environmental policy on a broad front.

As you can see, we in the Department of Transportation have an immediate concern for preservation of our environment. We are well aware of the national importance which this topic has gained during the past year.

President Nixon, as you know, on May 29 of this year, committed his Administration to the development and coordination of a national policy in this area. By Executive Order No. 11472, the President established the Environmental Quality Council, which is composed of various Cabinet members and is assisted by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality. The Council will attempt to examine the full range of variables which affect our environment today as well as prepare us for such problems which may be anticipated for the future.

In announcing the new body, the President stated that he expects this group "to review existing policies and programs and to suggest ways of improving them. Its members must project the impact of new technologies and encourage scientific developments which will help us protect our resources."

It is evident that the Administration is extremely concerned with coordinating all facets of environmental control and developing a national policy which the various departments may follow in implementation of their programs.

The legislation presently before you, H.R. 6750 and H.R. 12143, would also establish a Council on Environmental Quality. The group of Presidential advisors proposed in these bills would provide a staff of professionals from various disciplines. This Council would serve the function of advising the President on long-term national needs, the interrelationship of relevant Departmental programs, and the priorities by which we can understand and cope with the forces which are adversely affecting our national environment.

The problem addressed by these bills is an exceedingly complex one which this Administration recognizes. Many agencies and diverse programs are involved. This fact suggests the need for a coordinating mechanism in the Executive Office of the President. We believe the argument for maintaining organizational flexibility is a strong one and that the administrative approach already adopted by the President is preferable to a statutory body such as that proposed in the legislation. However, we recognize that such a body could be helpful to the President's new Council and, if the Congress believes that the establishment of a statutory body would be beneficial, we would not oppose that action.

Thank you Mr. Chairman. That concludes my prepared remarks. We will be happy to try to answer any questions the Committee members may have.



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

117.5

52-S-69

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, J. D. BRAMAN, AT THE 10TH BIENNIAL SEMINAR OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, HOUSTON, TEXAS, SEPTEMBER 4, 1969

To those of us in the transportation field, the title of my talk today is a little embarrassing because it hints at the relationship between eating a banana and then slipping on the peel. Certainly, here in America, we enjoy the best transportation system in the world. But that system has created urban problems -- and they are very severe ones -- which must be solved.

Anyone ever caught in a traffic jam has earned a Bachelor's Degree in transportation theory. And if he happened to be located behind a bus and near an airport, he probably qualified for a Master's Degree as well. In any case, most of us are familiar with these rather graphic examples of today's transportation crises. I'd like to speak to some of the solutions we in the Department of Transportation are considering.

I am in the unique position of having served as Mayor in a metropolitan city just prior to joining President Nixon's team at the Department of Transportation. As a result, I am aware of the problems which face today's urban dweller and today's urban decision maker. In my new role, I am happy to be able to help in focusing the Federal effort on solving those problems.

Population in America's urban centers has increased by a number of distinct stages, in most of which transportation played a significant role. From the beginning of the history of our Nation, communities generally started at some point where the transportation of that day was convenient. This may have been a seacoast landing -- or it may have been a convenient place along an inland waterway for boatmen to come ashore and establish their base for trading and other activities -- or the location of a railroad station -- or a frontier trading post.

71-03594 S

Later, the development of communities generally centered along some type of road. Where two or more families located in an area, the county generally constructed a road to serve them. If land use was attractive in the area, other people settled along this road and, by stages, it had to be improved and developed until, in many instances, these primitive, narrow-purpose thoroughfares became the arteries and freeways of today. Unfortunately, this resulted in most of our major cities reaching this initial development without any planning program whatsoever.

In spite of this, however, the city of a century ago was the center of many activities, manufacturing, retailing, family living, recreation and public education. At the same time that succeeding waves of immigrants arrived in this country, most of them coming to fill low skilled jobs, population pressures forced expansion. Those who could afford a longer journey to work climbed on the trolley or inter-urban railroad and moved out of the center city.

America's expanding economy provided an increase in the variety of jobs, in the division of labor, in the specialization of skills, and in the professionalization of occupations. And, with the coming of the automobile, people gained not only a status symbol to match their new economic independence, but also a mobility that meant freedom from the bounds of the city. And, as some moved to the suburbs in a search for relief from the repression of city life, the urban core became a trap for those who had no choice -- the poverty stricken and the culturally deprived.

So it is easy to see transportation's role in creating today's urban problems: congestion, pollution, slums -- an inadequate tax base, and, finally, irrelevancy. And that last factor may be the most significant.

People who no longer lived in the cities, no longer cared about the cities.

The supreme irony is that too many people are now experiencing a new awareness of the cultural and intellectual assets of the inner city. Unfortunately, and too often they can't take advantage of these assets because of their own stymied mobility.

Since the central cores of major cities still provide the majority of the employment and cultural opportunities, as well as the high values upon which a heavy percentage of the cities' tax income is based, it is extremely important that they not be abandoned. The nagging problem this brings to the planner is how to reverse this flow logically to the suburbs and bring back into the community some of those people of means and substance, who

have removed to the suburbs taking with them their personal influence in the city, their money, and the tax base their residency in the city would create.

One approach to this is the redevelopment of properly situated areas, hopefully as near the central retail and entertainment core of the city as possible, into attractive, multiple-residence communities. Certainly, if the trend to abandon the central city as a place of residence is not checked, it is easy to foresee that these vast, teeming, congested areas will further deteriorate to the point where they become nothing but centers of hopelessness, despair, frustration and anger which, like a cancer, spread throughout the fabric of the community and could, if not checked, ultimately destroy our way of life. This need not come about but to reverse the trend will require bold thinking and drastic action.

Even then the prospects for quick relief aren't too good, especially when you consider that, by the year 2000, at least 90 per cent of all Americans will live in cities. And most of them will be driving automobiles -- 150 million of them.

Even with birth control measures, U.S. population will grow to 325 million by the year 2000. That is an increase equal to the entire total urban population today. It is a growth that will be jammed in and around our existing urban areas.

Someone has suggested that planned parenthood should include limiting each family to one car. That might not be a bad idea, especially since most people already consider their car as "just one of the family."

But the problem is not simply a matter of absorption. Existing urban areas are already congested to the point of suffocation.

They cannot properly serve even present needs. As our urban areas grow, they must be transformed. This is the scale of the urban revolution which confronts us.

While most modern city dwellers are better off than their Victorian forebears, it could be argued that modern evils and inconveniences are more brutal. For these turn precisely on questions involving the mobility and choice which we consider as a first priority in a city and in a way of life.

Obviously, mobility and choice are interdependent. The city offers a variety of choices only if citizens have access to them.

We see peak densities on the journey to and from work and on weekends nearly equal densities jam the escape routes to the sea or mountains.

Less familiar to most of us than the problems of congestion and pollution but every bit as important in determining the fabric of urban life are the much more subtle considerations about the effect of transportation upon life in the ghetto. I would like to share with you some of our thinking on this problem.

The obstacles to physical mobility imposed by the structure of the modern city affect all its citizens, not just the suburbanite. Even deeper and more damaging is the immobility of smaller groups -- the poor who remain or arrive in the core area when the more affluent have moved on.

When racial differences are added to those of poverty, these residents are literally trapped in ghettos, deprived of access to better jobs and better lives.

A poverty from which there is no escape perpetuates poverty -- and lack of hope. It should be no surprise that violence erupts from such despair.

But the social starvation of the ghetto is not the only one which grows out of immobility. Many suburbs have the same quality -- one-class, one-income, one-age group and, during weekdays, for the most part, one-sex.

This uniformity belies the urban promise of variety and choice.

Transportation, or the lack of it, is too rarely recognized as the cause of the frustration that is bred by ignorance and exclusion.

If tomorrow's millions of new citizens are simply crammed into today's mold, we face the certainty of a further decline in urban life. We shall see even more sprawl at the edges, violence and decay at the core, frustration along the roadways. Choice and mobility will be distorted and lessened by the pressures of uncoordinated growth.

Basically the problem is one of meeting community goals. We must decide how we want to live and plan our transportation systems to meet that desire. This requires coordination and comprehensive planning. I believe urban transportation systems planning should be guided by four basic considerations:

1. A system should be a tool for shaping the growth of the metropolitan area and should have as its primary purpose the improvement of the quality of the environment.
2. There should be locally evolved solutions that reflect a balance of transportation modes most appropriate for each particular area.
3. Preferential funding for any one mode should not be the basis upon which mode selection is made.
4. In order that transportation systems can be planned and programmed intelligently, it is essential to have assured long-term funding for all selected modes.

The Department of Transportation has submitted to the Congress a proposal for helping cities build a balanced transportation system known as the Public Transportation Assistance Act of 1969.

Capsulized, this program promises to provide \$10 billion in grants and loans for the 12-year period from 1971 through 1982.

Initially, we are seeking funding for the first five years of the program in successive annual amounts of \$300 million, \$400 million, \$600 million, \$800 million and \$1 billion.

With a five year appropriation authorization coupled with "contract authority" the legislation seeks to permit the obligation of funds on a programmed basis over that period.

These funds would be available to cities of all sizes. They would cover up to two-thirds of the cost of such undertakings as the improvement of existing mass transit systems, the purchase of buses, and the installation of modern electronics and communications equipment.

New systems could be developed aimed at alleviating congestion in downtown business districts.

Experimental systems could also be generated to aid carless central city residents.

Assistance would be made available under the program to private transit operators to help them purchase equipment and improve service, where an application for such aid is approved by the State or appropriate local public agency.

It is our intention that this program -- coupled with the present highway program -- would allow cities to plan on a comprehensive basis.

Part of today's urban crisis has evolved because we have tended to deal with urban problems symptomatically. As a result, we have come up with a different program for each area of concern, some of which have actually worked against each other.

The basic and key ingredient of any practical transportation plan is the necessity that it be locally developed and that it be based on a long-range land use plan. Each region must determine how it wants to develop to absorb the inevitable population growth. This should include bold and imaginative redevelopment plans as well as those for growth outside of the current pattern. The individual topographical and geographical characteristics, the present distribution of homes and jobs, travel desire patterns and, even more importantly, the way the community should develop in the future, must be carefully considered and reflected. A plan which meets the needs of a San Francisco, Seattle, or Pittsburgh would not be the answer to plains cities such as Denver, Phoenix, or Houston.

Once such a plan is evolved, a good transportation system, utilizing all modes, highways, mass transit, and buses, can become the most potent tool available to bring it into being.

Houston is fortunate not to share with other American cities those topographical and geographical features which make access to the central city difficult. But you must be careful not to erect man-made obstacles as difficult to deal with as San Francisco's hills.

Your planning for the population densities of the future must begin now to, pardon the pun, avoid the rush. We in the Department of Transportation hope to give you all the help we can.

Thank you.

#



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

117.6

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, J. D. BRAMAN, AT THE MEETING OF THE INDUSTRIAL DESIGNERS SOCIETY OF AMERICA, AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON OCTOBER 6, 1969

The problems which beset American's metropolitan regions are profound. What the solutions to these problems are can be debated, but some of the causes are inherent in a break down of the transportation network in urban areas. Today, I should like to share with you some thoughts I have on the scope of the problem and a possible approach to dealing with it.

These thoughts emphasize the central role that development of a comprehensive transportation system must play in resolving our urban crisis. Some of the principles which must guide our efforts to that end are -- the need for a balanced system serving the requirements of all groups, adequate assured financing for all modes, the importance of local planning and local decision-making and, perhaps most important, the enhancement of the quality of the environment.

71-03595 5

Before proceeding with my discussions of the fundamentals for planning urban transportation systems, I would like to touch briefly upon the environmental concerns of my office.

T. S. Eliot, poet and critic, once said that he foresaw the end of the world as happening, not with a bang, but with a whimper. There is a growing body of opinion that he may have been right and that the first stage of the final crisis is already upon us -- that the dying whimper of an environment burdened to the point of collapse may come before another 50 years have passed. I do not necessarily subscribe to this gloomy prediction, but do believe that the time is here for all of us to face up to the monumental task ahead of us and get on with the job.

Ever since nomadic man first settled down and began scarring the soil with planting sticks, burning off the brush to win crop land, and chopping down trees to stoke his hearth fires, he has had some capacity to damage the environment. Only in the last few years, however, has mankind achieved the ability not merely to damage his environment locally, but to destroy it globally. This does not refer to the devastating ability of weapons of war, but rather to the "beneficial tools of peace". We have termed this as progress or civilization and, through technology designed to improve our standard of living, we have created a toboggan-run down which we may be sliding to disaster -- a slide smoothed by this very same technological excellence. It is not my purpose here to dwell in great depth on the total question of environmental decay which is beginning to concern deeply thinking people of all levels in our society. The effect of insecticides, fertilizers, and other deteriorating influences on the soil, the water, the atmosphere, and the health of the people, are indeed grave concerns and well merit the best thinking and research of which this country is capable. As indicated in the title of my new office, environment takes a very high place. This is because the various elements used in the field of transportation do have a very serious effect either for good or evil on the environment in which we live. The problems created by the emissions from all types of energy derived from fossil fuels is well known. I am sure every thinking person is concerned about the emissions from automobiles, trucks,

and busses and, more recently, from modern jet aircraft. Over the years, steamboats and trains have also made their contribution to polluting the air which we breathe. It is not my purpose today, however, to dwell on this particular phase of the impact of transportation on environment, since this is the concern with the Department of Transportation of our Office of Research and Technology. I am quite sure that the tremendous ability of the world's technology will eventually come up with solutions to this serious problem.

Transportation, however, has another destructive impact on the environment which is best exemplified by the concern presently being expressed in almost all of the urban regions of the Nation over the influence of major highways as they pass through and affect our cities. In fact, the time may have come when it will be absolutely necessary, even though distasteful, to call a halt to the construction of major highways in most of our cities until these regions themselves have had a chance to take advantage of the opportunities now open to them for genuine, full-scale regional land and transportation planning.

Until recently, I was the Chief Executive of one of our large cities -- Seattle -- and one of my main concerns was the local application of these principles. In my new capacity, my concern is no less, but it has now broadened to encompass all of our urban areas and, with respect to the environmental impact, the entire Nation. Nor is this an isolated position -- I serve as one member of a team, headed by Secretary Volpe, all members of which are committed to the same goals.

Perhaps the best evidence of this commitment is Secretary Volpe's creation within the Department of Transportation of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. For the first time, the formal structure of the Department reflects the important role which environmental and urban matters must play in its operations.

As I am sure you know, the Department's operating programs are handled by constituent units within the Department known as Administrations -- the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, etc. Previous to the creation of the Department of Transportation,

these Administrations were scattered in other Departments or existed as independent agencies. They were brought together within the Department of Transportation for two basic reasons:

-- To provide within the Federal structure a single spokesman for transportation's needs and problems at a level -- Cabinet level -- commensurate with transportation's importance in our society.

-- To facilitate coordination between the Administrations and their programs in order to make sure, among other things, that they are all headed toward common goals.

Nowhere is the need for transportation coordination greater than in our urban areas. Here is where the major deficiencies show up; where the major controversies arise; and where the sharpest competition for funds and for land develops. Furthermore, the urban transportation problem is not confined to internal systems; many transportation facilities essentially located in rural areas exist primarily to serve urban communities. There would be little justification for the Metroliner if it were not for the major cities at either end, as well as along its route.

So, the principal mission of the Office of Environment and Urban Systems, which I head, will be to coordinate the policies, programs, and resources of the Department of Transportation with public and private efforts to solve urban and environmental problems. In addition, we have these other functions:

1. To make sure that the Department's research and development program fully reflects urban and environmental needs;
2. To act as spokesman within the Department and within the Federal Government for the overall transportation needs of urban areas. We will, for example, be working closely with President Nixon's Urban Affairs Council and the various subcommittees thereof;
3. To serve as a focal point within the Department for the resolution of questions concerning the various modes within urban areas;

4. To serve as a central point within the Department for discharging its responsibilities related to the environmental impact of transportation.

As you can see, this is a broad and challenging mandate. I approach it with confidence, however, in the knowledge that I have the wholehearted support of Secretary Volpe in undertaking what needs to be done.

Among other things, I would hope that we can achieve some major improvements in the field of urban transportation planning.

The basic and key ingredient in any practical regional transportation plan is the necessity that it be locally developed. The individual topographical and geographical characteristics, the present distribution of homes and jobs, travel desire patterns, and even more importantly, the way the community should develop in the future, must be carefully considered and reflected. A plan which meets the needs of a Pittsburgh, San Francisco, or Seattle would not be the answer to plains cities such as Denver, Phoenix, or Houston.

The Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 makes mandatory a combined land use and transportation plan if a region is to qualify for Federal transportation, as well as many other forms of aid.

In the hope of stimulating thought, I would like to suggest the following as basic ingredients in a good regional plan:

(1) An urban transportation system should be a tool for shaping the growth of the metropolitan area and should have as one of its primary purposes the shaping of the environment.

(2) There should be locally evolved solutions that reflect a mix of transportation modes most appropriate to that particular area.

(3) Preferential funding should not be the basis upon which mode selection is made. At present, local decision-makers are faced with rather abundant 10¢ dollars under the 90/10 formula of the Interstate System and 34¢ virtually non-existent dollars for public mass transportation.

(4) In order that transportation systems can be planned and programmed intelligently, assured long-term funding, for all modes selected, is essential.

To assure Federal support to this type of planning and to make sure plans come alive and become realities, an assured long-range and dependable source of funds for the mass transit modes must be provided.

The Department of Transportation has submitted to the Congress a proposal, known as the Public Transportation Assistance Act of 1969, which will help cities build a balanced transportation system. This program promises to provide \$10 billions in grants and loans for the 12-year period from 1971 through 1982.

These funds would be available to cities of all sizes. They would cover up to two-thirds of the cost of such undertakings as the improvement of existing mass transit systems, the purchase of buses, and the provision of more modern and efficient electronics and communication systems.

With the continuance of the Federal Highway Trust Fund after completion of the Interstate System, and with the proceeds then devoted to urban needs, and with the provision of a companion public transportation financing program, communities can plan complete, integrated systems with assurance.

The development of a public transportation financing plan has been a major plank in Secretary Volpe's program. He has spoken to this need on many occasions in the short period he has been in office and is fully aware of the urgent importance of adequate, assured, long-range financing.

In this connection, I would like to note one point which is sometimes overlooked. When we talk of the need for mass transportation, many people tend to think only of new subways or new rail rapid transit

programs. These are, of course, the big glamorous projects that attract attention -- and also cost the most. They are needed in our very large urban areas, and we must see that they are provided.

But most of our urban areas are not all that large. There are in the U.S. more than 230 metropolitan areas over 50,000 population -- those legitimately needing rail rapid transit must be 10 per cent or less. In most metropolitan areas, we must rely upon less elaborate and less costly systems; in terms of present technology, this means busses.

Even in the largest cities where rail rapid transit is warranted, busses are still an essential supplement. The essence of rail rapid transit is high speed and this, in turn, means stations some distance apart. Only small portions of such urban areas will be within easy walking distances of these stations. Rapid transit systems will not be effective unless there is a good bus system for pick-up and distribution purposes.

So, when we talk about adequate Federal Support for mass transportation, we are referring to all forms of mass transportation, including particularly busses. I think it is incumbent on all of us to make this clear.

Too often in the past, we have tended to view our urban transportation problems in terms of a solution involving only one mode. At times, there has been sharp competition between the proponents of single-modal approaches. In the District of Columbia, for example, this competition has on occasion approached open warfare. To some extent, these attitudes may be a heritage from the time, prior to the creation of the Department of Transportation, when each program was separately administered.

One of our principal objectives will be to encourage the realization of the interdependence of all modes in the development of a comprehensive transportation system. New urban highways must be designed and built so as to minimize, to the greatest extent possible, disruption to existing development. But we are not going to solve this problem by refusing to continue to build roads and highways. An adequate highway system is necessary to the economic vitality of our cities -- as well as to the convenience and well-being of our citizens.

Furthermore, our most common form of urban mass transportation, the bus, is totally dependent upon highways and can be no better than our highway system. Perhaps some time in the future, our technology will produce an alternative system which has the bus's economy, flexibility, and ability to serve moderate, low-density areas but which is not tied down to the highway. That day is not in sight and, until it arrives, we will still need good highways for mass transportation, as well as for private vehicles.

But good mass transportation needs much more than good highways. If we do no more than provide the highways, we simply increase our dependence upon the private automobile, and this will not work. As Secretary Volpe has said, the automobile "suffers from the liability that the more we expand our highways, the more crowded those highways become". He has even raised the prospect that, if we continue as we are going, we may have to bar the central business districts of our large cities to the private automobile.

The more ardent highway proponents will have to realize that we must devote our attention and our resources to alternatives to the private automobile -- and this means mass transportation in large doses. Any other approach leads to more congestion and ultimate stagnation.

Urban transportation is thus an interrelated series of problems which must be tackled and solved through a systems approach using all modes. There is no single solution. The sooner we all realize this and act accordingly, the sooner we will come up with sound and workable answers.

In conclusion, the Department of Transportation stands ready to assist all local jurisdictions in finding solutions to their transportation problems.

I must repeat that we believe the initiative in developing regional land use and transportation plans must be taken by local authorities. Together with the cognizant units in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, this Department stands ready to advise and assist in the preparation of such plans, to assure that they will qualify under existing Federal programs designed to support local efforts financially.

My subject here today is transportation, but the real problem is the metropolitan community of tomorrow. The wisdom with which we make our decisions will heavily influence the nature of the communities in which our children and their children will live. We are the custodians of tomorrow's patterns of living.

We must choose wisely.



**DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION**

Copy # 2
NEWS

109.22

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

96-S-69

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, J. D. BRAMAN, AT THE 55TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, SHERATON HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA, OCTOBER 29, 1969

"TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT"

I welcome the opportunity to be here with you today. Your organization is one which is prestigious and has great influence, not only in your individual states but at the Federal level as well. Alf Johnson, my friend, is one of the ablest men in public life today.

In October of 1967 I had this same opportunity to visit with you at your meeting which was then being held in Salt Lake City. At that time, I suggested that your organization had a positive role to play beyond that of simply building highways. I am pleased to say that our positions are much closer today than they were then.

AASHO, like myself and all of the citizens of this Country, is changing with the times, and this is consistent with the leadership that this organization has given in its areas of responsibility. I think, however, there are still areas which should be reviewed and perhaps recast in light of events which are occurring around this Nation.

Dug 71-03107 S

I believe it is important to indicate at this point that to disagree is not to question the integrity or dedication of those with whom you disagree. Men of principle should be able to compare views and hold the respect of each other. I assure you that in pointing out areas where I feel we can do a better job, I do so with the knowledge that you people in AASHO have done a fantastic job in creating the interstate system in the United States. This has to be the greatest public works project in the history of the world. You have been the means by which we have been able to connect and inter-relate all of the metropolitan areas of the United States. Now that we are in the final planning stages of this magnificent system, I believe new techniques must be evolved so that we can bring to a satisfactory conclusion what has, in large part, already been done.

In saying this to you, I am reminded of a message from Alice In Wonderland.

Alice is talking with the cat:

"Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go?"

"That depends a good deal on where you want to get" said the cat.

"I don't care so long as I get somewhere," Alice said.

"Oh, you're sure to do that," replied the cat, "if you only walk long enough."

My experience of 15 years participating in the administration of local government has given me a philosophy which says: Know where you want to go as a city before you set out to get there, and use all the tools available to progress toward those goals.

Transportation is one of the most important tools available to help a city meet its social and physical development goals.

Gentlemen, a balanced transportation system will not solve the problems of metropolitan America, but in my view until all citizens have full access to their community we are not going to solve the social problems which beset this Nation.

One of the problems with our cities today is that we regard the social problems as being someone else's responsibility, and we criticize him for his failure to do his job. In fact, the test should be the other way around. We should all regard ourselves as having a vital stake in a strong and prosperous country with equal opportunity for all of our citizens. In this connection, as we go about our individual and collective roles in this society, we should see how we are contributing by our efforts to a stronger America.

Let us reflect for a moment on just how transportation can play a productive role in urban development. In this connection, I would like to make the following four points:

1. Transportation should be subordinate to the over-all goals and objectives of an urban area. It should be the means by which the community attempts to accomplish its development plan. If the objectives are not readily apparent, then the transportation planning process should be the vehicle which helps to stimulate the community into the formulation of such development goals prior to any substantial commitments being made for a particular component of a transportation network.

From my personal experience, I know that it is difficult to develop local goals which have broad community support. I believe, however, that both Federal and State transportation officials must be increasingly sensitive to the planning processes to see that it insures the proper result.

2. Balanced transportation requires balanced funding. The Department of Transportation, under the leadership of Secretary Volpe, has made a major step in this direction and of this I will say more later.

The problem to date has been in large part the fact that the availability of funding has distorted the best mix of systems and modes. Ideally, every Federal dollar should bring with it the opportunity for broad consideration of alternatives on the basis of local values. No Federal transportation dollar should be so expensive or so cheap that it propels local decisions toward one mode or the other. As I put my ear to the ground, from across the country I hear more and more calls for flexibility and variety in urban transportation systems, and, above all, I hear demands for new ideas.

3. We need better mechanisms to relate planning to implementation. The problems that exist in highway construction today are quite different than those with which you have had to contend in the past. For the impact in connecting metropolitan areas is not as personal as the restructuring of life styles occasioned by the penetration of the interstate system into the urban centers of this country. Let us call this intermediate planning, that systems design work which follows what we call comprehensive planning but which precedes detailed design and construction planning for each project. Once general land-use guidelines are set, there is a tendency to go to detailed planning, at which point we lose the flexibility which intermediate planning would give us in determining:

- the mix of transportation systems
- **the** special needs of the pedestrian and of the handicapped
- human engineering criteria in general
- environmental implications of alternative systems
- possibilities of multi-movement corridors

The day of the single-purpose project is fast disappearing. The day of the multi-purpose, multi-disciplinary approach to transportation planning and construction is here.

4. Metropolitan America should evolve its own development goals and these decisions should be respected by the State and Federal officials.

There is a well-intentioned inclination to intercede in the local planning process by those who are not actually a part of it in the hope of bringing about early resolution of disagreements. The system is such that, in my opinion, we have to permit local debate and controversy before an acceptable solution can be reached. I think it is clear from looking around at current controversies regarding urban transportation systems -- mostly highways -- that in the maze of Federal and State transportation assistance programs individual cities and their leaders too often find that their role and their influence in determining the city's future growth and development pattern is diminished. I think it is incumbent upon Governors and upon those high level officials like you who represent them, to administer each transportation program so as to allow each local government to control its own progress, insofar as this is feasible.

It is apparent from looking at your agenda that a good deal of work went into it. I commend you on the broad scope of your interests, particularly your attention to ecological and environmental concerns in transportation planning and development. As engineers, many of you know that the science of environmental planning has a long way to go to catch up with the science of engineering. Environmental planning criteria simply do not exist, partially, at least, because we have not until recent years focused on what the economists call the externalities of transportation systems. If you were to ask me in which single direction your highly developed talents could be expanded in the national interest in the coming years, I think I would suggest that they go in the direction of evaluating for decision-makers, what I shall call the "external performance of a system". While we have developed clear performance criteria for transportation systems, themselves, it seems to me we have not defined with the same clarity the way each system performs in its external impact.

What is its community impact, both good and bad, and can it be predicted?

What ecological impact occurs under varying circumstances, and can it be predicted?

Until these and related questions are answered more or less satisfactorily, major new commitments of resources and land for new urban transportation systems -- whether highways, mass transit, or others -- should not be made.

I should like to commend AASHO on its achievements in the past. At the same time, I should like to challenge AASHO to meet the needs of the new and different perspective on transportation which is offered by the establishment of our new department. As the States develop their own departments of transportation, no doubt your role will change too. As the most influential State transportation group, AASHO could lead the state transportation community to a new organizational structure, one which will meet the future demands on transportation and on transportation officials.

I know that AASHO can do this and I am confident that AASHO will.

I will not dwell on the purpose and structure of the Federal Department of Transportation. I know that you are well aware of our existence and of our general involvement in all kinds of transportation problem-solving. I am going to be rather candid with you today about the particular role of my Office, the Office of Environment and Urban Systems, in the Department of Transportation. I will not spell out the bureaucratic language which describes our official role but I should like to tell you about the intent of that language and its implications for you and for urban transportation in general.

Our office is a new resource for the Secretary of Transportation. It is a positive response to the growing national concern for balance between human engineering, and environmental values as transportation systems are being conceived and built across the Nation. Under this general mandate, our major task is to make sure that transportation systems outside urban complexes add to, and are compatible with, this Nation's great natural environment. At the same time, we want to make sure that transportation systems in urban areas help to resolve land-use problems rather than complicating them. We are building a series of case studies of a variety of local problems upon which this office plans to develop environmental criteria for planning and project approvals.

Recommendations along these lines will be made to the Secretary this year. And, for the time being, we are busy looking into problem areas and gathering together a professional staff which is capable of dealing with some of the complex problems like those which you people see every day.

The Secretary is committed to developing methods for the resolution of differences involving transportation systems while at the same time preserving our natural heritage. Our office is the first one of its kind in the Department at the Secretarial level to be given such a job. The primary mission of my office will be to provide a bridge between purely transportation objectives and the broader and more fundamental social, economic and environmental goals of the Nation and of its individual communities. As you know, that bridge is often the focal point for intense competition and

controversy. I will not shy away from hard choices where the Secretary must make the ultimate decision.

This office is a major Department coordinator in the sense that many transportation problems for which we are responsible involve not only several Department programs, but also involve programs, like Model Cities, which are the responsibility of other Departments.

This office acts as a major Department educator, since we bear the responsibility for introducing new environmental considerations into the planning process. We plan to conduct research into unexplored ground and we are looking for talented professionals well versed in ecology, urban planning, social science, public administration, engineering, and the law.

This office acts as a listener, in the sense that we have established reliable communication lines to most states and urban areas and therefore can listen and act as a sensing device for the Secretary.

The Office which I head is a resource which I hope the AASHO will avail themselves of. We believe that the resource and capacity that we are acquiring can be of great help in avoiding the painful confrontations which have become all too commonplace.

The office is also an advisor, since we make recommendations to the Secretary daily on a variety of transportation matters and since we have significant official responsibilities which involve us in related policy matters. For example, we are the Department's focal point for coordination with Model Cities programs and the Secretary's staff support for the President's Urban Affairs Council and also Environmental Quality Council. We have a major responsibility for coordinating Section 4(f) of the 1966 Transportation Act for the Department to help insure the preservation of parklands and open space.

I would like to mention in passing one of our projects with which you may not yet be familiar but which will require your cooperation. The Department of Transportation has established an Urban Corridor Demonstration Program. This program is designed to encourage improvements in 10 or 12 major urban corridors by using funds and technical assistance from both the Federal Highway Administration and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. We are quite hopeful that the Administration's request for \$16 million, to be equally financed by each Administration, will shortly receive Congressional approval.

Secretary Volpe has made it clear that he intends to forge a truly unified Department of Transportation. This type of cross-modal cooperation is exactly what the Secretary intends to accomplish. The inter-relationship of modes must be recognized as a fact of life.

In this connection, the Federal Highway Administration has circulated a policy statement to its field offices which might have already come to your attention. Very briefly, this program, which involves both highway and transit funds, encourages and promotes innovations such as pricing and transit fare experiments, better public transit marketing, better traffic controls, special bus lanes, intersection improvements, pedestrian separations, and special distribution-collection systems using mini-buses. It is also encouraging steps such as promoting staggered work hours as a device for reducing traffic congestion. We believe it is significant that this program brings together two of our Administrations in a concerted attack on peak-hour congestion, a major urban transportation problem.

I need not tell AASHO of the importance of national transportation policy and of Federal financial assistance in carrying out that national policy. The development of AASHO as a major resource for highway planning and development was made possible by the commitment of far-sighted men who know that long-term financing had to be assured if the Nation was to resolve the critical need for better roads and highways which confronted it during the 1950's. AASHO can take much of the credit for a job well done.

I have taken personal interest in another major commitment of national resources to transportation, the Public Transportation Assistance Act of 1969. This legislation contemplates \$10 billion being spent in the next 12 years on those elements of public transportation which would complement the on-going highway program. This proposed legislation deserves your enthusiastic support. We are attempting to come to grips with the most vexing problem that faces the highway engineer -- that is peak-hour relief.

We in the Department of Transportation want the highway system to work but this cannot happen until we are able to in some way diminish the strangulating congestion that confronts the automobile driver on a daily basis.

What has worked so well for highway should now be given an opportunity to work for other elements of the transportation system, that is adequate funding on a committed basis.

As times move forward, I would suggest to you that AASHO would be well advised to reevaluate its position on the scope of the Federal-aid Highway Program. Taking into account what the Public Transportation Act of 1969 is, what the resources of the individual States are, AASHO should ask itself whether the time has come to consider a broadening and restructuring of the highway program to make it more responsive to highway problems, and more flexible in meeting the totality of highway costs.

Gentlemen, I came here to talk about transportation and community development. What I am really talking about is how our children and their children will live. The decisions that we make will have more effect on those that have not been born yet than they will on us. We are not planning for tomorrow but for the next hundred years. We are the custodians of our Nation's future growth patterns - we must choose wisely.

Thank you.

#



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

109.25

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

118-S-69

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, J. D. BRAMAN, AT THE CENTER CITY TRANSPORTATION SEMINAR, FLAGSHIP RESTAURANT, WASHINGTON, D. C., NOVEMBER 25, 1969, 1:00 P.M.

First I wanted you to know what a pleasure it is for me to be here today. Certainly there is no greater transportation problem facing the major cities of our nation than that of how we can improve transportation within the core areas of these cities. In fact, you might say that most of our transportation problems and solutions hinge on the question of how best to serve these primary economic concentrations. The fact that so many of you are here is evidence of a broad recognition of this dilemma -- and it is a dilemma. I know from my many years of experience in Seattle that recognizing the problem and doing something about it are quite different things. I personally am convinced that only major changes and improvements to public transportation offer any long-range hope. In Seattle I was convinced that a modern rail transit system was the only answer. But you don't build such systems overnight. Ten years is probably a minimum realistic lead time for a modern rail transit system to be planned and constructed. In the meantime the same forces that today are influencing trip decisions both in terms of where people are going, and how they are going to get there, continue to operate. If the past is any guide, those decisions

-more-

71-031095

will be for increased use of the automobile and to an increased avoidance of the congested core area. That is the dilemma that we face. If we wait to do something we wait in face of a constantly declining use of existing public transportation with the resultant increase in congestion leading to abandonment by many people of the core areas as a place to do business. To rely on a long range solution is impractical both in terms of the time needed for implementation and the resources available to most cities. In fact, all cities may not need rail transit systems at all. However, all major cities are going to need substantial improvements to their public transportation systems. Of course there is always the option of doing nothing or pursuing a deliberate policy of decentralization, if that is what is felt best for the city. You can be sure that whatever transportation decisions are made to a considerable extent determine the economic health of your core area. It's your decision whether you think this historic area of your city is sufficiently important to the overall vigor of your community that you can permit it to atrophy or at best become one of several competing major activity centers.

One word about growth, because if you feel you aren't going to grow then there is really no great need for concern. It is estimated that the United States will grow in the next 30 years by 50 percent. This means we will add 100 million people to our current population of 200 million by the year 2000. It is further estimated that most of that growth will occur in our major urban centers and that they will be further impacted by the already existing trend of migration from rural to urban America.

I mention this because there is no city represented in this room that cannot expect to be a significantly larger urban metropolis as we close out this century. The shape of that growth within your urban region will to a great extent depend on the planning and the implementation of your planning during this next decade. The Department of Transportation has a number of programs which can assist you. The various programs of the Federal Highway Administration will be enormously important. If you aren't already thinking about it, the shape of the post Interstate program will be fundamental in helping you to meet your regional traffic problems. Beyond question the bulk of the daily trips will be by automobile and this need should be no more ignored than public transportation in planning for your future growth.

You may be interested in the program the National League of Cities is offering as a guide to the post-Interstate period. This program called the SJR system (State-Urban-Rural) calls for the redirection of Federal highway funds to urban areas. The State system would provide high quality roads for traffic between, around, and through the major metropolitan areas of the State. Essentially it would take the place of the present Primary System. The Urban Major Street and Highway

System would aid construction of traffic circulation systems within urban areas. The Rural System would be composed of major secondary roads not on the Interstate or State Primary Systems and located outside the urban areas.

In the direction of urban mass transportation, the Administration has forwarded to the Congress the Public Transportation Assistance Act of 1969. Most of you are already familiar with this \$10 billion, 12 year program. The signs are very hopeful that this program as amended by Senator Williams will be approved by the Congress. If so we will finally have a tool to insure that public transportation investment will achieve a parity with the various highway programs. I've long been an advocate of balanced transportation. This program offers to make that a reality rather than a slogan.

These are the long-range solutions about which I have spoken. However, we are here today to discuss another program which can be implemented much sooner and that I think is of major importance. The Center City Transportation Program brings a special emphasis to the core area of your city -- that area of your city which is particularly dependent on public transportation and particularly vulnerable to the lack of it. As I pointed out earlier in this talk there is a dilemma between what we must do and what we can do about public transportation in our cities. I see the idea of the Center City Transportation Program as one bridge across that dilemma. The use of this approach can provide several benefits. (1) It can start you doing something about improving public transportation -- and not necessarily in the traditional sense -- it could be any of a variety of programs; (2) it can provide a key portion of a long-range solution even if it does not provide such solutions in itself and (3) it can buy you some time in which to plan and implement a community-wide and regionally oriented long-range approach to an acceptable public transportation system, whether that is to extend, modify or modernize your existing bus system; build a modern rail transit system linked to buses; or to opt for some entirely new approach.

The one thing we cannot do any longer is just to sit back and let things take care of themselves. The message is coming through that public transportation, as presently existent in most cities, cannot compete with a carefully planned and well-financed program to serve the private automobile. The highway program is of great benefit to the motoring public, even if we can see the seeds growing of an ultimate failure to meet peak-hour travel needs. Such evidence is small consolation to the public or private public-transportation system that's about to fail, or to those persons who for one reason or another are dependent on that system for transportation. Public transportation has to compete and there is no better or more likely place in your community for it to compete successfully than for travel destined to and within your center city area. One word of caution here -- such an effort should

not become a substitute for other programs which will serve the deprived areas of your community nor should it be permitted to compete with any long-range plans you may already have. Hopefully, through careful planning, it can reenforce such efforts.

Some of you are, I'm sure, wondering why since the Center City Transportation Program is to be guided and masterminded by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration is the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems giving us the hard sell. To that end I would like to tell you a little about our office.

As I am sure you know, the Department's operating programs are handled by constituent units within the Department known as Administrations -- the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, etc. Previous to the creation of the Department of Transportation, these Administrations were scattered in other Departments or existed as independent agencies. They were brought together within the Department of Transportation for two basic reasons:

- To provide within the Federal structure a single spokesman for transportation's needs and problems at a level -- Cabinet level -- commensurate with transportation's importance in our society.
- To facilitate coordination between the Administrations and their programs in order to make sure, among other things, that they are all headed toward common goals.

Nowhere is the need for transportation coordination greater than in our urban areas. Here is where the major deficiencies show up; where the major controversies arise; and where the sharpest competition for funds and for land develops. Furthermore, the urban transportation problem is not confined to internal systems; many transportation facilities essentially located in rural areas exist primarily to serve urban communities. There would be little justification for the Metro-liner if it were not for the major cities at either end, as well as along its route.

So, the principal mission of the Office of Environment and Urban Systems, which I head, will be to coordinate the policies, programs and resources of the Department of Transportation with public and private efforts to solve urban and environmental problems. In addition, we have these other functions:

1. To make sure that the Department's research and development program fully reflects urban and environmental needs;
2. To act as spokesman within the Department and within the Federal Government for the overall transportation needs of urban areas. We will, for example, be working closely with President Nixon's Urban Affairs Council and the various subcommittees thereof;

3. To serve as a focal point within the Department for the resolution of questions concerning the various modes within urban areas;
4. To serve as a central point within the Department for discharging its responsibilities related to the environmental impact of transportation.

As you can see, this is a broad and challenging mandate. I approach it with confidence, however, in the knowledge that I have the wholehearted support of Secretary Volpe in undertaking what needs to be done.

One more word on my office and then if you'd like I'd be glad to try to answer your questions. You will note the prominent position in the title of the word environment. We don't interpret that word to mean bus decore although we are concerned about that too. Environment means to me such things as the quality of the air we breathe, and the water we drink, the appearance of our cities and towns, the productivity of our rural lands and the preservation of historic and natural resources, and above all, the preservation of the limited and priceless open spaces in our cities. So I'm concerned that the transportation investments of this Department not only add in themselves to an enjoyable and productive environment but that they be seen as tools which used wisely can help us to build a better America for people to live in and not just a better America to travel in.

#####



12246

**DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION**

450

NEWS

10927

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

122-S-69

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, J. D. BRAMAN, AT A MEETING OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER 4, 1969.

I am happy to be here today among my friends at the meeting of the National League of Cities. It has been just one year since we last met in New Orleans, but I feel that I could have written the TV commercial "Changing, Changing, Things are changing" about myself and about the League during the year which has passed.

The League has moved forward in a number of directions. I congratulate you on joining forces with the Conference of Mayors in order to serve better the interests of cities and city officials in Washington.

I like to feel that my move to Washington has also been a step toward better serving the interests of not just one city but of many cities and many city officials by giving them another voice in decision-making at the Federal level.

71-031105

I commend the League on its activities during the past year.

You have moved forward to support successfully Federal water pollution control legislation, shortly to be funded at a level which we wouldn't have dreamed possible a few years ago. And the League has moved, and moved effectively, as Mayor D'Alesandro has told us, to support and promote what is potentially the most comprehensive and best funded public transportation package in our Nation's history.

The League has also supported meaningful airport airways legislation now close to adoption by the Congress.

All of these are matters which were of considerable interest to me a year ago when it was my pleasure to be Mayor of Seattle and Chairman of your Transportation Committee. They continue to be of great interest today when it is my pleasure to be serving as a member of President Nixon's Administration and as Secretary Volpe's Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. That role is not only new to me; it is also new to the Department and represents what is basically a new way of thinking about transportation and what it means in the lives of all Americans.

Secretary Volpe told the House Appropriations Committee recently that he considered the establishment of the Office of Environment and Urban Systems to be a significant step, one which was taken, he said, because "so many of our national problems these days are centered in our urban areas, where about 80 percent of our people live, and so many of our other problems revolve around the way we treat the world in which we live."

My office has been called the conscience of the Department. As we see it, the role of the conscience entails the use of a broad and generous path rather than a straight and narrow one. As we see it, the role of the conscience also includes acting on behalf of those who by some narrower definition of Departmental activities might not be represented -- the people, the public interest.

Last year, the League's Transportation Committee stated: "All programs to improve urban transportation must give full consideration to their impact on other aspects of urban life."

The Department of Transportation shares that goal--shares it fully. And my office is there to underscore the Department's concern.

Let me tell you what the Office of Environment and Urban Systems is doing to make that goal a reality in today's and tomorrow's urban life. Let me also tell you what we are doing to expand and

extend that goal even further, to consider as our objective assurance that efforts to improve any transportation program must give full consideration to its impact on other aspects of life, not just in urban and metropolitan areas but in small towns and in the countryside as well, across the Nation.

I have just learned a new Washington buzz word. You know, I am sure, how these words and expressions come and go. We no longer talk about "program interface," although we try to see that it happens. "Conceptualization" of programs happens every day, but it is no longer the style to work the expression into every conversation. What we talk about today in Washington is "technological assessment." For those of you who don't keep up with buzz words, this translates into an effort to evaluate all technological developments beyond what they do technically or technologically in order to determine their broad economic and social impacts as well.

Transportation, and especially urban transportation, is, by definition, a technological development -- if it works. And we are trying to see that any technological development in transportation gives full weight to all the social and economic factors which might become involved. And so, technological assessment turns out to be our job.

We are trying to see that a balance is established between social, human, and environmental values on one hand and efficiency, engineering, and financial values on the other. We are trying to see that balanced transportation systems are established--especially in urban areas--which are fully suited to the widest range of local needs. And we are trying to guarantee that such systems are not distorted in their creation by the easy availability of Federal funds for one mode of transportation as opposed to the other choices which are available.

This is part of our role of serving as the conscience of the Department of Transportation. Believe me, it isn't easy. In a department such as ours, we find that each of the operating elements has a license by statute. Above all, each has its own source of financing, its long-established policies, procedures and relationships within the industry which it represents and within its own interest groups. This means, in each case, that each has a more or less powerful constituency to advance its own interests.

Each member of each constituency is there to promote his own form of transportation over all others and, in some cases, over any other consideration. And each of the operating administrations within the Department is equally dedicated to the promotion of

the mode of transportation which it serves, is sensitive about its prerogatives, and tends to reject anything which might be considered an intrusion upon its function and its freedom to act.

Here we move slowly, and we try to move sensitively. We try to promote understanding and teamwork and overall cooperation, but always within the context of our primary assignment -- that of maintaining a balance where frequently none had existed in the past. And we are there to promote--as the Department was created to promote--the establishment of a transportation system.

The key words are "balance" and "values", both of which are well-served, I feel, by effective public transportation. Because I believe that public transportation is essential to the efficient functioning of cities and urban areas, I should like to comment upon some of the values which it serves.

During a recent demonstration in Washington, a young militant was quoted as telling her friends not to throw rocks at the buses because, as she said, "Only poor people ride buses." I question her activity. I also question her statement. But I also question our sense of urban values if what she said is true. If she is right, our cities have been wrong. They have failed to recognize why it is in their own best interests to support and promote public transportation but at the same time seek better public transportation than we have today.

What she says isn't true in New York, where people ride buses because they work and private transportation doesn't. What she says isn't true on the Shirley Highway from suburban Virginia into Washington where the Bureau of Public Roads has reserved lanes for use by buses. These have shortened commuting time for hundreds of riders on public transportation and, at the same time, I'm afraid, have frustrated those who see the buses fly past as private automobiles inch along in parallel lanes. But, in too many cities, her statement may be harder to refute, and this should not be the case.

Better public transportation means better job access for the rich as well as for the poor. The Urban Mass Transportation Administration in the Department has shown this by conducting a number of successful demonstrations which have led to the establishment of new service designed to link the inner city with suburban job centers of many cities.

Better public transportation means better land use and a better return on each transportation dollar which is invested. If the tax base is figured in square feet, accessible industry and business return much more to the city than an accessible parking

lot for private automobiles. Better public transportation means a healthy urban economy, urban progress, urban vitality.

Better public transportation means a choice--a transportation alternative for everyone in the community. It means something quite different from being the only option available to those who have no alternative to inadequate public transportation service. Better public transportation serves the entire community. Inadequate public transportation serves just those who are too poor to choose something else, or those who are too old or too young to choose something else, or those who have physical handicaps which preclude their choosing something else.

Better public transportation, however, serves more than social and human values.

It serves environmental values when it reduces the number of automobiles on a street or highway and substitutes for them a public transportation system which pollutes less, which is quieter, which is cleaner.

It serves environmental values when it works so well that it reduces the need for additional highways across the urban or rural landscape, by virtue of the efficiency of its operation.

But better public transportation serves still more than these. It makes sense. It makes sense financially because it makes it possible to take full advantage of those resources which have already been invested in the transportation system, in the streets, and in the highways and expressways. It makes it possible to reduce the inefficient demand for additional facilities if they, too, will serve at less than optimum efficiency and provide less than optimum benefits and service.

We may find that it will take more than one year for the Congress to take action on proposals to increase Federal aid to public transportation. If it does, we shall spend more than one year promoting these proposals. We believe that the need is urgent, and we believe that the Department's programs are sound. And we are prepared to spend whatever time it takes in seeing that an effective program is adopted.

Another transportation area which is, or should be, of considerable interest to the cities is the question of the direction which the Federal highway program will take after 1972, when the interstate system is scheduled for completion.

The League has come up with some very interesting ideas in this area, and your views will, of course, figure prominently in discussions about the direction which the program should take. For example, your proposal to make the use of the highway trust fund more flexible and to concentrate the highway program on urban areas is receiving wide support. Your proposal for the SUR plan under which the trust fund would be split into three areas--State, urban, rural--is one which might resolve some of the problems which exist in the administration of the program today.

NLC would bring together under the State program today's interstate and primary systems, both inside and outside urban areas. It would establish an urban system to include all urban routes not covered by the State system, as well as all streets and highways which are now eligible for the TOPICS program.

TOPICS, as you know, is the Department's acronym for a program of Traffic Operations to Improve Capacity and Safety. TOPICS has not been used so widely as it should have been in the past. TOPICS promises significant improvements in the efficiency of urban streets and highways for both public and private vehicles.

Finally, under the SUR program, there would be a rural system administering all rural highway connections. Under the SUR plan, there are still a number of details to be worked out, including the almost all-important question of financing. But it is possible that it might go on a two-thirds/one-third basis, rather than 50/50 or 90/10, as is the situation today. This question and others will, of course, be resolved as we go along.

But we believe that it is important that highway programs be consistent with other transportation programs so that transportation choices are not distorted by the availability of greater Federal ratios of funds for one program than for another.

One suggestion which has been made and which will also be considered is the possibility of removing all classifications on Federal aid to highways. If this were done, grant recipients could spend available funds on any transportation-related problem. As I am sure you understand, this is not a universally popular idea. But as we move toward thinking of transportation as a system, both inside and outside the Department, we may be able to overcome some of the opposition to it which exists today.

Secretary Volpe has been emphatic in his instructions to those of us inside the Department about the need for promoting transportation--not highways, not subways, not air travel, not rail travel, but transportation--which is effective and efficient, transportation which recognizes the impact it is having on the physical environment and social environment in which it operates.

Past practices will not always be future practices. Political mechanisms which worked reasonably well to provide transportation solutions in the past may need to become more refined and more sophisticated if they are to provide transportation solutions to the problems of the future.

I commend the League for what it has done to anticipate the need for new political mechanisms and new techniques for transportation problem-solving in the future. I urge you to continue your efforts in this direction and to increase your involvement in these matters which are of such deep interest and concern to all who care about the future of our cities. With this strong resolution, we can make a major contribution toward better cities and a better urban environment for tomorrow.

Thank you.

#



**DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION**

107-109
NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

109.28

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, J. D. BRAMAN, AT A MEETING OF LEADERSHIP ATLANTA OF THE ATLANTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ATLANTA, GEORGIA, DECEMBER 8, 1969

I am delighted to join you in Atlanta and share with you my thinking on the problems and challenges of urban transportation today. Having served with Mayor-Elect Massell on the Transportation Committee of the National League of Cities for three years, I congratulate you on your choice of a man who understands the complex transportation issues confronting U. S. Cities.

My own participation in local government in Seattle over the last 15 years has left me with a clear commitment to the value of transportation as one of the most important tools available to help cities meet their social and physical development goals. If we are to avoid the facetious, but often believable prediction that, "the world will end in a giant traffic jam," then it is imperative we take action now to plan and construct balanced transportation networks.

71-03115

During the last decade we have witnessed a major achievement in ground transportation in this country -- the successful effort to link together the metropolitan centers of the 48 contiguous states through the interstate highway system. In my opinion this program has been an outstanding success and will go down as a tremendous achievement by the Eisenhower Administration which inaugurated the interstate system. Now, I would like to see a proper solution to the urban transportation problem stand out as one of the great successes of the Nixon Administration.

The imminent completion of the interstate system makes it mandatory that we refocus our attention on these urban areas where entirely different techniques are required. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the broad and smooth highways which work so well across the hills and dales, the prairies and mountains of our broad land do not function so well as they enter the congested precincts of our cities. On the plus side, when a new freeway is constructed, the benefits to the public are obvious - high speed access to the central city, 70 miles per hour through areas which previously had been tortuously slow, distance measured in minutes rather than miles. What is not so obvious or pleasant to contemplate, however, are the social costs which may also result. The ribbons of high speed freeway can also result in disruption of the social fabric of the community. People, families, neighborhoods and community growth patterns frequently become the victims of progress.

This does not have to be the case. Urban transportation should be planned as a complete system using a mix of all modes each properly related to the other s.

In the past decade there has been a marked change in national attitudes and priorities in transportation. While there is a continuing demand for improved transportation systems, at the same time the public is becoming more aware and concerned about the sometimes detrimental effects new systems can have on the environment. Transportation has, on past occasions, been guilty of creating or compounding some of our environmental problems.

I am sure that every thinking person is concerned about emissions from automobiles, trucks, and buses, and more recently from modern jet aircraft. It is not my purpose today, however, to dwell on this particular aspect of the impact of transportation on the environment, since within the Department of Transportation, this is the concern of our Office of Research and Technology. I am quite certain that our tremendous technological capability will eventually come up with solutions to this serious problem.

Transportation, however, has another destructive impact on the environment which is best exemplified by the concern presently being expressed in almost all of the urban areas of the Nation over the influence of major highways as they pass through and affect our cities. In fact, the time may have come when it will be absolutely necessary, even though distasteful, to call a halt to the construction of major highways in most of our cities until these regions themselves have had a chance to take advantage of the opportunities now open to them for genuine full-scale regional land and transportation planning.

Because of the importance of transportation in influencing the entire growth of an urban area, the options considered and selected in the process of planning transportation systems are crucial. Such critical decisions should be made by the elected officials of a community because those choices are not engineering choices, they are policy choices; they should not be loaded choices, they should be relatively free choices, standing on their own merit. By this I mean that the planning process -- which is essentially the drawing together of a wide range of interests to mold a city -- should be allowed to occur with a minimum of outside influence. External pressure -- the influence of Federal and State Government should be limited in order to ensure each individual community an open environment in which to plan for transportation and to determine the mix of modes and systems which will best serve its particular needs.

Of course, this is not to suggest that financial assistance is not necessary -- quite the contrary. Federal support is critical for all

modes of transportation, as you here in Atlanta, like my own city of Seattle, know full well.

Let us reflect for a moment on the role of transportation in metropolitan development. Nowhere is the need for transportation coordination greater than in our urban areas. Here is where the major deficiencies show up and where the sharpest competition for funds and for land occurs. In this connection, I would like to make three points:

1. Transportation should be subordinate to the overall goals and objectives of an urban area. The basic and key ingredient in any practical regional transportation plan is the necessity that it be locally developed and that it serve as a mechanism for reaching community objectives. Topographical and geographical characteristics, the distribution of homes and jobs, travel desire patterns, and most importantly, the way the community should develop in the future must be carefully considered. If the objectives are not readily apparent, then the transportation planning process should be a medium for stimulating communities to join in formulating such goals before making a commitment to any particular transportation component.
2. Balanced transportation requires balanced funding. Too often in the past we have tended to view our urban transportation problems in terms of a solution involving only one mode. Preferential funding should not be the basis upon which mode selection is made. No Federal transportation dollar should be so expensive or so cheap that it propels local decisions toward one mode or another. In order that transportation systems can be programmed intelligently, guaranteed long-term funding for all modes selected is essential. Under the leadership of Secretary Volpe, the Department of Transportation has made a major step in this direction -- the Public Transportation Assistance Act of 1969. I will return to this important development in a few moments.
3. We need better ways to relate planning to implementation. What I am referring to here is intermediate planning, defined as the step following what we call comprehensive planning, but preceding detailed

design and construction of a project. Too often, once general land use guidelines have been set the next step is detailed planning, at which point elected officials and other policymakers often lose flexibility in determining:

- the mix of transportation modes ;
- special needs of the pedestrian, the handicapped, the poor;
- environmental implications, such as noise, air pollution; and
- potential for new ideas and experiments.

I think that it is clear to all of us that the day of the single-purpose project is fast disappearing and the day of the multi-purpose, multi-disciplinary approach to transportation planning and construction is here. It is apparent from looking at the "Leadership Atlanta" agenda that your city is deeply concerned with a great variety of interrelated urban problems. I hope that my office -- which is a new resource for the Secretary of Transportation -- will be of assistance to you and your counterparts in major cities and smaller towns throughout the Nation as solutions are sought to the transportation component of such problems.

To be completely candid with you, my office, as the newest member of the Department of Transportation team, is just beginning to have an impact in the many areas of our responsibility. We see our primary mission as one of providing a bridge between purely transportation objectives and the broader and more fundamental social, economic and environmental goals of both individual communities and the Nation.

In one sense my office is a major departmental coordinator because the many transportation problems for which we are responsible involve not only several Department of Transportation programs, but also involve programs which are the responsibility of other Federal agencies.

In another respect, the office acts as a listener, working closely with local governments and civic and business groups to check the impact of Federal transportation policies in individual communities.

Since we have the responsibility for introducing new environmental considerations into the planning process we also act as a Department educator. We plan to conduct research into unexplored ground and we are looking for talented professionals well versed in ecology, urban planning, social science, engineering and the law. We shall be attempting to find answers to questions such as:

- What is the community impact of a transportation system, both good and bad, and can it be predicted?
- What ecological impact occurs under varying circumstances, and can it be predicted?

My office is also an advisor, since we make recommendations to the Secretary daily on a variety of transportation matters. For example, we are the Department's focal point for coordination with model cities programs and we serve as the Secretary's staff support for the President's Urban Affairs Council and Environmental Quality Council. We also have a major responsibility for coordinating Section 4(f) of the 1966 Transportation Act for the Department to help ensure the preservation of parklands, open space, and historic sites.

As you can see, this is a broad and challenging mandate. I approach it with confidence, however, in the knowledge that I have the support of Secretary Volpe in undertaking what needs to be done. In this connection, as I mentioned earlier, the Department of Transportation has submitted to the Congress a proposal for helping cities undertake long-range projects to build balanced transportation systems -- the Public Transportation Assistance Act of 1969.

This legislation has been revised and significantly strengthened since its initial presentation by a budgetary mechanism known as "contract authority." Contract authority will permit obligation of funds through the execution of contracts based on authorization alone. The only appropriations required will be those necessary to liquidate what will then be legal obligations of the Federal Government.

Capsulized, this Public Transportation Assistance program seeks to reverse the decline of public transit through establishment of a

Federal Government commitment to a \$10 billion financial and program over the next 12 years. Out of this \$10 billion, \$3.1 billion would be authorized for the initial five years of the program and this total would be available for obligation from the first year on.

This Act would expand our capability of capital grants, research, and technical assistance to improve public transportation. These funds would be available to cities of all sizes and would cover up to two-thirds of the cost of such undertaking as the improvement of existing mass transit systems, the purchase of buses, and the installation of modern electronics and communications equipment. Public transportation program should contribute significantly to relieving congestion -- and, incidentally, to reducing some of the noise and pollution caused by ever-increasing reliance on the privately-own automobile.

The Public Transportation Assistance program is not, of course, an isolated effort but is part of a total commitment by the Department to solving urban transportation problems. The so-called TOPICS program of the Federal Highway Administration -- a Traffic Operations Program for Increasing Capacity and Safety of streets in areas of 50,000 or more population was designed in part to complement the mass transit program. The traffic engineering techniques that can be undertaken include improved signal systems, pavement marking; turning lanes at intersections, installation of reversible lanes and control systems, upgrading of highway lighting, construction of pedestrian or highway grade separations at complex intersections, as well as many other improvements which will achieve the objectives of the program.

Such improvements in street and highway systems, together with fringe parking facilities, can substantially affect the efficiency of the chief form of public transportation existing in most cities, namely, bus transportation.

To encourage the use of these programs in conjunction with the programs of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, the Department is planning a special effort to be launched in this fiscal year and to be known as the Urban Corridor Demonstration Program. It will involve 10 or 12 cities to be selected on the basis of the extent to which they

utilize these programs imaginatively in a concerted attempt to reduce peak-hour congestion in urban corridors.

We are hopeful that this study will complement the Center Cities Program which we already have underway in the Urban Mass Transportation Administration and in which your city is deeply involved. Phase I of this project has been completed in Dallas, Denver, Pittsburgh and Seattle, as well as in Atlanta, and I am optimistic that this program, as it proceeds, will lay the basis for improved public transportation in these cities and in other metropolitan areas.

Turning to air transportation, I want to discuss briefly airport planning and some new initiatives in this field. In the past, airport planning has been supported to the tune of \$3 million by the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program. This, however, is only a drop in the bucket relative to other resources available. Accordingly, in the area of airport development, as in the public transportation field, this Administration has submitted a program which, when funded, will be a dramatic step forward in designing and constructing balanced transportation systems.

In brief, the Aviation Facilities Expansion Act of 1969 is a 10-year \$5 billion program for expansion and improvement of the U. S. airport and airway system to be financed in major part by new taxes on airway users. Of particular interest is the authorization of grants for airport system planning to areawide planning agencies and to any public agency for planning with respect to a specific airport. I am pleased to note that this grant program -- an estimated \$10 million a year for five years -- requires planning recipients to provide the opportunity for public hearings on proposed airport location to consider the economic, social, and environmental effects of the airport location and its consistency with local urban planning goals.

In the past, airport access planning has too frequently been unrelated to other functional systems such as housing, highways, and transit. Traditionally, the airport sponsor or a special purpose public authority has been responsible, but too often there has been little coordination

with areawide comprehensive planning. I am optimistic that new Aviation Facilities Expansion Act will encourage concerned citizens such as yourselves, as well as State and local government officials, to relate airports and airport access to other developments and other transportation activities in your regions.

I also am hopeful that you will look at airport access as a chance to try new systems. The Department of Transportation has not yet centralized its consideration of airport access problems, but help is available from both the Urban Mass Transportation Administration and the Federal Railroad Administration. We shall focus better and more systematically on airport access in the future.

In all these programs, one of our principal objectives is to encourage the realization of the interdependence of all modes in the development of a comprehensive transportation system. In designing and building our urban highways, we should minimize disruption to existing development. However, we are not going to solve this problem by refusing to continue to build roads and highways. An adequate highway network is necessary to the economic totality of our cities -- as well as to the convenience and well-being of our citizens. Furthermore, our most common form of urban mass transportation, the bus, is totally dependent on highways.

But good mass transportation needs much more than good highways. It requires only elementary mathematics to realize that the staggering increase of about three and one-half million vehicles a year cannot continue indefinitely. If it does, we shall shortly reach the point in our cities when there is no more room to drive. It is for this reason that I hope the Atlanta community, especially those in influential and leadership positions such as yourselves, will not allow one setback in the attempt to bring modern rapid rail transit to the city to delay or deter future efforts. If Atlanta is to maintain its vitality and its attraction for people as a fine community in which to live in the 1980's and beyond, it is essential for the citizens to commit the necessary resources for an efficient and effective rapid rail system.

In conclusion, the Department of Transportation stands ready to assist all local jurisdictions in finding solutions to their transportation problems. We will work closely with your metropolitan government officials, confident that together we can begin to meet the urban transportation challenge.

My subject has been urban transportation, but the real problem is the metropolitan community of tomorrow. The wisdom with which we make our decisions will heavily influence the nature of the communities in which our children and their children live. We are the custodians of our Nation's future patterns of living. We must choose wisely.

####



DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

109.30

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, J. D. BRAMAN, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AT THE SEMINAR ON "OUR ENVIRONMENT", SPONSORED BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES E. BENNETT, HOTEL GEORGE WASHINGTON, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1969

TRANSPORTATION, PROGRESS, AND THE ENVIRONMENT

I welcome the opportunity to be with you today at the invitation of Congressman Bennett. His past activities in sponsoring protective legislation, as well as this series of seminars, are evidence that he is very much aware of the growing concern for our Nation's environmental quality.

There can be little doubt that these concerns are well justified.

T. S. Eliot, poet and critic, once said that he foresaw the end of the world as happening, not with a bang, but with a whimper. There is a growing body of opinion that he may have been right and that the first stage of the final crisis is already upon us -- that the dying whimper of an environment burdened to the point of collapse may come before another 50 years have passed.

71-03112 S

I do not necessarily subscribe to this gloomy prediction, but do believe that the time is here for all of us to face up to the monumental task ahead of us and get on with the job.

Ever since nomadic man first settled down and began scarring the soil with planting sticks, burning off the brush to win cropland, and chopping down trees to stoke his hearth fires, he has had some capacity to damage the environment. Only in the last few years, however, has mankind achieved the ability not merely to damage his environment locally, but to destroy it globally. This does not refer to the devastating ability of weapons of war, but rather to the "beneficial tools of peace".

We have termed this as progress or civilization and, through technology designed to improve our standard of living, we have created a tobaggan-run down which we may be sliding to disaster -- a slide smoothed by this very same technological excellence.

It is not my purpose here to dwell in great depth on the total question of environmental decay, which is beginning to concern deeply thinking people at all levels in our society. The effect of insecticides, fertilizers and other deteriorating influences on the soil, the water, the atmosphere, and the health of the people, are indeed grave concerns and well merit the best thinking and research of which this country is capable.

As indicated in the title of my new office, environment takes a very high place. This is because the various elements used in the field of transportation do have a very serious effect either for good or evil on the environment in which we live.

It is not often that I have the chance to discuss transportation in the company of real environmental professionals like those on your agenda today. Not often enough is the subject of transportation placed in the context of environmental management. Too often transportation is considered an end in itself, rather than a tool to be used to improve the quality of life.

Today, I would like to give you some thoughts on transportation and the environment, then describe briefly what we are doing in the

Department, and finally, outline some ideas on which we think the Federal Government should be doing to promote a more enlightened environmental policy.

I think it would be useful at this point to describe the meaning of "environment" as I see it. Our environment is the total of all surrounding things and influences to which we, as humans, are sensitive. The natural resources which make up the environment are the things and processes available for us to use, not only to sustain life itself, but whose proper use provides the means for such life to be full and satisfying. Ecology is the science concerned with interactions between life and elements of the environment. It is the process of looking at systems, in our case at transportation systems, both as they exist and as they are planned, and to be concerned for the consequences of actions to change or build new systems. A simple case in point is the process of building a bridge over a natural stream, rather than filling in the stream, to provide for a road. I recommend to you, if you are not acquainted with it, Professor Ian McHarg's new book, "Design with Nature", as a leading exposition of what may be called ecological planning. We are trying to promote this "ecological mentality" in the Department, particularly as we can apply it to the planning process. Part of the reason for so many urban highway and other system disputes has been the lack of enough attention to environmental and social factors early in the planning process, as well as during design and construction. We want these considerations to become a formal and required part of the planning process. Only then will our new systems properly reflect the growing concern over our environment. This means that, among other things, the impact of the facility on the land through which it passes, particularly the already too scarce public open spaces, must have been considered. As Professor McHarg would say, we are after the "least social cost" solutions, rather than simply considering the lowest cost measured in dollars alone.

I believe my office of Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems, with its role devoted, in large part, to environmental concerns, sets an interesting precedent in Washington, not only for transportation, but for the Federal structure as a whole. The office which I head was established by Secretary Volpe to give the highest priority to environmental factors in planning, promoting and

building transportation systems. This development stems from an awakening on the part of concerned people to an understanding that transportation is always a major land user, always a shaper of the physical environment, sometimes a polluter as well as a major factor in economic growth, and that we had better begin to give environmental concerns a higher priority. Of course, the presence of a new role in the Federal bureaucracy does not do much in itself. What we want to do is to see that, as the Department considers and decides national transportation issues, economic efficiency is balanced with social and environmental costs and benefits, and that the user's benefits are always compared to the total social costs of the system.

To bring the issue a little closer to home, take the Miami Jetport as an example of competing forces -- one of them transportation -- acting on a land use issue. As you undoubtedly know, the position of all elements of the Federal Government has been that the Everglades National Park shall not and will not be damaged.

However, here is a situation where two valid and demanding public programs come into direct conflict. The Department of Transportation finds itself responsible for assisting in the provision of adequate and, above all, safe facilities for air travel in an area experiencing phenomenal growth, while at the same time, fully recognizing the necessity of protecting a unique national asset, the Everglades. Ironically, were it not a fact that virtually all land between Lake Okeechobee and the Everglades has some contributing influence on the Everglades, all knowledgeable people would be applauding the Dade County Port Authority for their foresight in attempting to solve the demanding need for better and more safer air facilities.

I am pointing up this case not because anyone will turn up as the victor or loser in the process, but simply to show that the Department of Transportation and its Federal Aviation Administration will cooperate with other Federal departments as well as with State and local governments to produce a sensible approach to promoting essential transportation facilities, in this case, airport development. You have, in this great State of Florida, the kind of high quality environment along with a high potential for economic growth that will undoubtedly lead to other confrontations of competing uses of land, as technology and growth

pressures challenge us to come up with new ways to preserve land. The kind of analysis and consideration going into the Miami Jetport issue should be part of all such problem-solving.

We are living in paradoxical times. As our technological capabilities raise our economic standard of living, they also lower our environmental quality indicators, the air we breathe, the land we use, the overall physical conditions surrounding both the urban and rural dweller. For instance, in the field of transportation technology, the private auto and highway system -- and we have the greatest highway system in the world -- has developed to levels of efficiency and performance beyond our expectations. But this development has been a major factor in unplanned growth, isolation of non-auto owners, increase in air pollution, and other uncomfortable pressures of urban life. While the private auto provides millions with personal mobility, millions of persons have no automobiles and cannot use our great highway system. While it is clear that the costs to date of providing this highly developed private automobile/highway service has been well worth it, I think now it may well be time to consider other priorities, namely public transportation. Of this, I will speak later.

Congress has not been silent on the need for tempering transportation efficiency with environmental concerns. The 1969 Federal Aid Highway Act, for instance, contains an amendment to the basic 1956 highway law which broadens the required considerations for urban highway location from simply "economic" considerations to, and I quote, "social effects of such a location, its impact on the environment, and its consistency with the goals and objectives of such urban planning as has been promulgated by the community".

I have no doubt that the Federal Highway Administration recognizes the need for this approach, particularly as major highway construction centers more and more in congested urban areas. It is my observation, however, that this understanding is nowhere nearly as prevalent in State Highway Departments as in the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. All of these organizations, both Federal and state, are finding it difficult to move from their time-tried practices which are admittedly efficient by the standard of economic cost alone. They have not as yet fully reconciled themselves to the necessity of considering the non-quantitative social values, along with economic ones, in decision-making.

Another example of Congressional concern is in the basic legislation setting up our Department of Transportation in 1966. Section 4(f) of that law -- and I shall paraphrase to save time -- says that the Secretary shall not approve any transportation project which requires the use of any publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area or wildlife refuge, or any land from a historic site unless (1) there is no feasible alternative to the use of such land, and (2) such project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to these lands. The Secretary has asked my office to carry out that very important mandate and we are doing as well as we can. The problem immediately clear to you, I am sure, is that we need better criteria to support our judgments on the impact of various transportation systems on the environment. If I can draw an analogy at this point with the air pollution problem, control at the pollution source is the advisable route to take in transportation, but the source -- as is true in most air pollution problems -- also represents a valuable generator of economic and social activity. That is always our dilemma.

Another indication of Congressional concern is the 1965 Highway Beautification Law. As you may know, the Department is going through a re-evaluation of this program administered by the Federal Highway Administration. As you know, the objective of the program is to improve the quality of the environment by preserving and enhancing the highway corridor through the reasonable control of outdoor advertising and junkyards and to improve landscape outside the highway right-of-way. We are considering alternative ways to accomplish this without some of the friction which the 1965 Act has created. Of course, this program has shown us that no authorized program will be effective if Congress fails to follow authorization with money. The program has never been funded adequately.

We need new ways to deal with the inevitable confrontations of system and environment, economic progress and social cost. What has often been missing in transportation development is the consideration of alternatives which present varying impacts on the community and the environment. Let me be clear about this concept. It is apparent that we need to consider transportation systems which contribute to, rather than distract from, our environment. This is one reason why public transportation, particularly bus transit, offers some interesting possibilities for using our current highway system more efficiently. The higher the quality of mass transit we can provide the less new ground we need to use to accommodate the private automobile. The

less new ground we use for transportation, the more will be available for less consuming uses. While this is somewhat simplistic, it is the essence of the issue. I think that, above all, we must consider that in our urban areas, we must try some new ideas for improving traffic flow and efficiency.

This leads me to a current legislative program. The Administration has forwarded to the Congress the Public Transportation Assistance Act of 1969. Most of you are already familiar with this \$10 billion, 12-year program. The signs are very hopeful that this program as amended by Senator Williams will be approved by the Congress. If so, we will finally have a tool to insure that public transportation investment will achieve a parity with the various highway programs. I have long been an advocate of balanced transportation. This program offers to make that a reality, rather than a slogan. We are hoping for early passage of this legislation to provide the first real long-term commitment of Federal resources to public transportation.

Let us reflect for a moment on the role of transportation in metropolitan development, in other words, on the way land is used and the way people relate to each other as urban areas grow. I would like to make four points which relate directly to environmental management.

1. Transportation should be subordinate to the overall goals and objectives of an urban area. It should be one of the means for reaching community objectives. If the objectives are not readily apparent, then the transportation planning process should be a medium for stimulating communities to join in formulating goals before making a substantial commitment to any particular transportation component. Elected officials should be given real policy choices, not engineering choices. As one of the two former elected officials on the Federal transportation team (the other is, of course, my boss, John Volpe), I strongly urge that elected officials be given the facts on environmental impact as transportation systems are planned and built.
2. Balanced transportation requires balanced funding. The Department of Transportation, under the leadership of Secretary Volpe, has made

a major step in this direction -- the Public Transportation Assistance Act of 1969 -- about which I have just spoken.

In the past, the availability of funding has tended to distort planning and to limit the choice of the mixes of systems and modes. To compound this problem, the HUD 701 Program to support comprehensive planning appears to be drying up and no replacement has appeared on the scene. Ideally, every Federal dollar should bring an opportunity for the broad consideration of alternatives based on local values. No Federal transportation dollar should be so expensive or so cheap that it propels the decision toward one mode or another.

3. We need better ways to relate planning to implementation. Let us call this intermediate planning, defined as the steps following what we call comprehensive planning, but preceding detailed design and construction for a project. Too often, once general land use guidelines have been set, the next step is detailed planning, at which point elected officials and other policy makers often lose flexibility in determining:

- environmental and social factors and influences of various systems,
- the mix of transportation systems
- the special needs of the pedestrian, the handicapped, and the poor, and
- possibilities for new ideas and experiments.

The day of the single-purpose project is fast disappearing. The day of the multi-purpose, multi-disciplinary approach to transportation planning and construction is here.

4. The Federal Government must prepare and structure itself for the effective administration of complex environmental issues. What Secretary Volpe has done is to give environmental concerns a high priority and exposure in the Department of Transportation. This kind of farsightedness should be manifest in every Federal activity where the principal mission is physical development. It is with this

kind of office in every such agency that we can begin to build a community of environmental management and concern and, therefore, influence Federal policy in this area.

Now, I would like to be a little more specific as to the role of my office in the Department of Transportation. As I mentioned earlier, our office is a new resource for the Secretary of Transportation. It is a positive response to the growing national concern about human, engineering, and environmental values which we have been discussing. We are trying to assure that transportation systems help to resolve social and physical development problems, rather than complicating them. We see our primary mission as one of providing a bridge between purely transportation objectives and the broader and more fundamental social, economic, and environmental goals of both individual communities and the Nation. Our office becomes by definition a coordinator and evaluator of the major operating Administrations of the Department -- highways, rail, urban mass transportation, aviation, and the Coast Guard. We are, for instance, the focal point for the transportation components of the Model Cities programs.

Our office is also designed to be a focus for research in the environmental aspects of transportation system development. We have a clear mandate to improve the state of knowledge on the relationship between transportation and urban and environmental goals and problems. Further, we will be developing planning methods to assure that national urban and environmental policies are effectively implemented through Federal transportation programs. We have a real educational job, too, since what we learn must be communicated to those who plan and build transport systems, and those who are likely to be affected by them.

It has been good to speak with you today on the subject of transportation and the environment. As you can see, many of us in the Federal Government recognize the close relationship between mobility and our environment. Let us hope we can be more effective in applying what we know and what we learn to preserving and improving the environment upon which we and those who follow us must depend for a full and satisfying life.

####