



**DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION**



**NEWS**

**OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

14-DOT-70

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY J. D. BRAMAN,  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS,  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE ANNUAL  
MEETING FOR THE WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1970, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

I congratulate you on focusing a part of your attention on the search for environmental quality in the cities. Your concern for such matters represents a shift in direction for the Wildlife Management Institute and its traditional concern for the care of those open spaces which are so hard to come by in our Nation's increasingly urban environment. Those of us who are concerned with cities welcome your interest, and we seek your support. A little Wildlife Management may be just what many of our cities need!

I think it was Victor Hugo who first spoke about "the power of an idea whose time has come." I find myself unable to remember an occasion in the past when the people of this country -- the people of the world -- from the right and the left, the old and the young, in

cities and in the countryside, were so seized with concern over a single idea, a single concept as is the case today. The idea is, of course, the threat to our environment, the threat to air, to water, to space -- to our food supply.

We speak of environmental quality, a matter of deep concern to all of us who want life to be more than mere existence. But in recent months concern over the environment has increased to such a fever pitch that we find that the public is now demanding more than an environment in which people can live the good life. Many are now questioning accepted technologies which, if uncontrolled, may threaten life itself.

President Nixon told the National Governor's Conference last month that, with all the various priorities for a limited Federal budget this year, and I am quoting the President, "...we put as our first priority the environment. Because as important as all the other areas are, here is an area where, if we do not act now, it will be too late possibly ever to act again."

These problems are not limited to those of us who live in the United States. Early in February, 22 of the world's richest Nations which make up the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development came together in Europe to discuss what steps that Organization and the Nations it represents might take to restore the quality and the vitality of the world in which we live to a more desirable state. Many of those who took part in the deliberations of the OECD were somewhat gloomy about any prospects for restoring the environmental quality completely.

And, the problem is neither urban nor rural. It is both. The interrelationship and interdependence of the city upon its rural sources of supply is lesson number one in agricultural economics. President Nixon, in his message on the environment, spoke of those 19th century farmers who tilled a plot of land to exhaustion and then moved on to another. These men were not villains. The damage which they did was part of their reaction to what then seemed to be the unlimited bounty which was available to every American. Katherine Bates reflected their vision when she

characterized America as a land of spacious skies, bounteous fields and fruited plains. These views reflected the 19th century confidence that such plenty would be there for the asking for as long as Americans crossed the mountains in search of new natural riches and the greater prosperity to be found in the fields and the streams which lay beyond those mountains.

This is a situation which no longer exists. Americans of my generation have found it necessary to rethink their former notions that the land and the fruits of the land were inexhaustible. Americans of the generation now moving into adulthood and, we hope, responsibility, have taken up the environment as a cause and -- on this issue at least -- the generation gap seems to be joined as young and old work together to find answers and solutions to a variety of questions as to what we can do to improve the quality of our air, our water, our lives -- not just for ourselves but the generations yet to come.

Pogo may become the spokesman for the age with his apt comment, "we have met the enemy and he is us." I trust that Pogo's spirit of wry good humor will be the tone of the attack on the problem. I personally fear that Cassandra-like pronouncements tend to divide forces rather than to link them together in a common bond.

In the past, it has sometimes been necessary to create a crescendo of public concern before it was possible to create anything resembling a crescendo of public response and public action. In the case of the environmental near-crisis which confronts us, it seems to me that the Federal establishment -- the Executive and the Congress -- have assumed positions of real leadership in the effort to design action programs which are capable of responding to the public alarm, the public need, the public demand.

Let me tell you some of the steps the Federal Government has already taken.

We have adopted clean air legislation which sets standards of air quality and which has already made significant strides toward reducing industrial pollution, especially in our cities and

metropolitan areas. We have adopted clean water legislation which seeks to restore our rivers and streams to the quality which was once theirs before an increasingly urban America turned them into the polluted bodies of water which we know today -- from which we cannot drink, in which we cannot swim, and around which we do not like to breathe.

The Department of Transportation, which I represent, is the first Federal agency to have had set forth in its establishing legislation a requirement that its projects give consideration to their impact upon the environment. We have not gone far enough, but in the Department we have already taken steps to see that highways, rapid transit, rail and airport facilities are located in areas where they will not impair the quality of their physical surroundings. We are concerned with noise. We are concerned with air and water pollution from transportation sources. We are concerned with the quality of life.

As one of the first acts of his new Administration, President Nixon established an Environmental Quality Council, now the Cabinet Committee on the Environment, within the Executive Office of the President. Quasi-governmental agencies such as the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering and the National Research Council have brought their efforts together into an Environmental Studies Board. The President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty has now become the Presidential Committee on Environmental Quality.

Six months ago, 100 or more members of Congress had already introduced legislation on a variety of subjects relating to the environment into this session of Congress. This legislation has been referred to 19 different committees, with areas of responsibility ranging from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Since that time, increasing public interest in the quality of the environment has lead to more than a hundred additional pieces of legislation, all of which seek to restore, repair or preserve some aspect of the quality of the environment in which we live.

A most important piece of Federal legislation affecting the environment was signed into law by President Nixon on January 1. This legislation, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, has enormous significance in terms of the operation of Federal agencies such as mine and in terms of providing a Federal response to public concern in environmental matters. Let me read to you the purposes of this Act:

"To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation; and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality."

This Act sets forth a declaration of national environmental policy, and I should like to tell you what its objectives for the Nation are:

- to fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;
- to assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
- to attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;
- to preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;
- to achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and

- to enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

But, the Act goes beyond statements of policy and goals.

It calls on all agencies of the Federal Government to undertake specific actions in order to meet the demand of the American people for greater effort, at every level of Government, to reverse the degradation of our environment. Specifically, the Government is required to bring together in a systematic interdisciplinary approach to problems, the talents of natural and social scientists and of designers, in all planning and programs which may have an impact on the natural resources upon which we depend for life itself. Further, in order to overcome some of the shortcomings of past Federal planning procedures which made decisions on the basis of narrow cost-benefit analyses and in response to specific economic or technical concerns, the law requires that unquantified environmental amenities and values be given appropriate consideration in decision making.

To my way of thinking, this is a significant step and one which can have far-reaching implications in a society which is deeply concerned about the human quality as well as about the physical features of the world in which it lives.

For the first time, as a result of this legislation, Federal officials will be required to state in specific terms the impact of actions which they propose on the quality of the human environment which will be affected by those actions.

For the first time, Federal agencies are required by law to use ecological information in planning and developing those projects which have an impact on the availability of our treasured natural resources.

We in the Department of Transportation are pleased that our Department was in the vanguard of Federal agencies insofar as implementing this legislation was concerned. Secretary Volpe

has just announced that the Department and its Federal Aviation Administration will work with ecologists and planners in the New York area to determine the effects of proposals for extending Kennedy Airport and its area of operations into what is now Jamaica Bay.

As you may know, one of Secretary Volpe's first acts on becoming Secretary of Transportation was to establish the Office of Environment and Urban Systems as evidence of his own deep concern about the impact of transportation on the quality of the environment in which it operates. Too often transportation has been considered only as a means to move people and goods rather than as a useful tool to shape communities in which people may live in harmony with their surroundings.

We like to think that this concept is beginning to gain much acceptance.

However, with all the Federal legislation in the world, and with all the dedication of everyone who is involved, it is a difficult process. Planners and engineers who have been governed by a particular set of standards all their lives must rethink their own attitudes in order to include environmental considerations as major factors in determining the decision they must make.

Technology has made it possible to improve the American standard of living beyond anything that was thought possible 100 or even 70 years ago. Transportation technology has played an important part in bringing about that change. In the process, however, environmental quality has deteriorated to a point which would have been unthinkable 100 or even 70 years ago, and, again, transportation has contributed its part to that deterioration.

In highway planning, a step to correct this was taken in 1969 by means of amendments to the Federal Aid Highway Act. Up until that time "economic", and "engineering" considerations had dominated the decisions of highway planners. As of 1969, the law required that consideration be given to, and I quote: "social effects of such a location, its impact on the environment, and its consistency with goals and objectives of such urban planning as has been promulgated by the community."

The Federal Highway Administration is responding to this charge. It may take longer to make State Highway Departments similarly responsive.

Other transportation planning is being rethought in order to give greater consideration to environmental concerns that has been the case in the past.

We are trying to incorporate such considerations in the planning of Federal airports. We are trying to see that the rapid transit systems of the future also give consideration to their impact upon the urban environment in which they will operate. In all such planning, the goal must be to make transportation a contributor to the quality of the environment rather than an overriding element to which we must reconcile our demands and our values.

We believe that transportation programs, destruction of environmental quality in the past, can be contributors to such quality. We are trying to see that this is done. The problem is one of education. It is hard to convince every public official and every tax-payer that the cheapest way is not always the best way, even though those of us who are concerned about the quality of life are convinced that this is the case. Incorporating consideration for the environment into our thinking, into our planning, and, most important perhaps, into our budget process is not easy. I hope that you share my view that it must be done, but we must accept the fact that no matter what our determination, our objective will not be reached fully today nor tomorrow no matter how great our concern may be.

Within the Department of Transportation, I am one of two appointed officials who formerly held elective office -- I was Mayor of Seattle and Secretary Volpe was, of course, Governor of Massachusetts. We feel that this gives us a unique insight into Government other than Federal Government.

Secretary Volpe and I are deeply aware that all of our efforts on the Federal level can only serve to reinforce existing efforts on the State and municipal level. This is true of transportation service and it is true of urban and environmental quality.

Each city must establish its own goals and its city must be prepared to determine where and how it is willing to change its life style and its practices in order to meet its goals.

In Seattle, we had an example of this of which we are very proud. The people who lived around the shores of Puget Sound and Lake Washington set a goal for themselves - years ago. They wanted to turn back the course of civilization -- or the lack of civilization, if you like. They wanted to restore Lake Washington and the shores of Puget Sound to their former state as a community resource -- in the broadest sense, rather than their state as a community shame -- which they had become in 1958 after many years of being used as the city "waterfill area."

Reversing the course of man's inhumanity to nature was not easy. Ten years after the end of World War II, Seattle and its suburbs, like many other metropolitan areas, faced a series of urban and metropolitan problems which went beyond existing political and jurisdictional boundaries. In 1956 an areawide citizens' committee proposed the establishment of a metropolitan federation of local jurisdictions to deal with water pollution and other areawide problems, sewage and garbage, transportation, planning, parks, and water supply. After several efforts to win voter support, authority was granted by the voters for METRO to engage in an extensive water pollution control program.

Now all the physical facilities necessary for the rehabilitation and eventual restoration of the Lake have been completed. Today, effluents discharged into the Lake have reduced from 20 million gallons daily to zero. During the ten year period since the inception of METRO, both the population of the area and the area served by METRO have grown. While the clean-up of Lake Washington has moved forward, a parallel effort has stopped the flow of untreated sewage into Puget Sound's Elliott Bay. As a result, much of the bay front can now be redeveloped for parks, floating restaurants and other recreational purposes.

What I am saying is that the people of Seattle decided---and then they voted \$125 million in bond issues to make it possible to clean up the waters which make up 80 percent of Greater Seattle's boundaries. It could have happened anywhere. In some places traditional jealousies between jurisdictions make the clean-up of a neighborhood more complex than was the case of Seattle's Lake

Washington. In Seattle, we have the usual jurisdictional problems, namely 15 cities and sewer districts, councils, boards, commissioners and authorities, each with its own pride and identity, each with financial problems and with local funding demands to be met.

However, the clean-up of the water around Greater Seattle was a community goal, enunciated by the people and supported by the people. And therein like the secret of its success. Harper's Magazine called it "an uncommon solution that could stand as a model for other urban centers." U.S. News said that it provided "a lesson for the whole country."

I don't mean to labor my personal view. But I do mean to emphasize my personal experience with what can be done if we articulate environmental goals for the city or the region. The best, the most progressive, the most dynamic -- even the best funded Federal effort in the Nation's history to restore, to repair and to preserve the quality of the environment is difficult, if not impossible, if that effort does not reflect a local desire, a local objective, a local goal to preserve that quality.

A 19th century wag said, "Pigs is pigs." Perhaps that is because no one ever gave them a chance to voice an opinion on becoming something else. But cities vary greatly from one to another. And cities -- to remain good cities -- places where people want to be, where they find pleasure in being, where they reflect a desirable, an appealing, a positive life style, must set their own goals and then set about accomplishing them. Each is different, each city has its critics and its defenders, each has a distinctive character and quality.

You may prefer your skiing area to mine; your beach to someone else's -- each represents something positive in us, an environment in which it is possible to find, and satisfy ourselves. Cities have special qualities, too. Cities, too, are part of the environment. It is up to the people who live in them, who enjoy them, who relish whatever may be their special charm and quality to see that urban quality -- the city, is improved or enhanced and preserved -- in order to reflect and return to the citizenry what the most people feel is the greatest good -- not just for specific individuals who

live in them today -- but, as with any other resource, for the people who will live in them in the years and in the generations which are to come.



# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# NEWS

93

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

17-DOT-70

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, J. D. BRAMAN, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, DELIVERED AT THE DOWNTOWN ASSOCIATION BREAKFAST EVENT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL TEACH-IN AT BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 1970.

I welcome the opportunity to speak to you today -- Earth Day -- about the role of Transportation in preserving the quality of the environment -- and, thus, the quality of our lives.

I congratulate you -- the civic and professional leaders of Birmingham -- for joining the young people throughout the nation today participating in the Environmental Teach-In. When last fall Senator Gaylord Nelson and Congressman Paul McClosky called for a national Teach-In on the Environment, Hundreds of young people took the call for an Earth Day back to their college campuses -- and back to their communities. However, few cities have responded as has Birmingham where young and old, alike have joined to reaffirm life.

For this is what the Teach-In is all about: an affirmation of life. Each of us participating in the Teach-In is doing so to learn

what we can do to preserve a quality of life for ourselves and for our children.

Every 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.

This is why it is fitting that the activities of the Teach-In have been initiated by the young people of our nation. It is they who must carry the burden; it is they who must live in a world scarred by man's progress.

Pogo's somber declaration: "We have met the enemy; and he is us", has become the watch word of the Teach-In. This recognition by our young people of their responsibility to preserve environmental quality deserves our every support. This is why, when I learned what Dr. Marshall Brewer and the young students who organized GASP have done to alert the city of Birmingham to the ills of the environment, I was very pleased to join all of you today to tell you what we in the Federal government are doing to respond to the cry for environmental quality.

When Secretary Volpe -- at the beginning of his administration -- created the Office of Environment and Urban Systems he affirmed the priority he as Secretary of Transportation assigns to the preservation of environmental quality. This is because the various elements in the field of transportation do have a very serious effect either for good or for evil on the environment in which we live.

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 therefore, it becomes apparent 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 use 's benefits are always compared to the total social cost of the system.

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 about the collateral consequences of actions designed to change or build new systems. A simple case in point would be the decision to build a bridge over a natural stream, rather than to fill 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.

Of course, there are no simple answers to the question of using transportation to control land use planning and thus to preserve environmental quality. When a group of young students concerned with the environment were asked to visit our Department to discuss what they --

as young people -- considered our greater problems, several in the group said the greatest problem was the complexity of the problem. There are no simple solutions to environmental concerns.

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 these sources also represent valuable generators of economic and social activity. How to properly balance these two important considerations constitutes 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. 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, etc., 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, including 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. Perhaps you are already familiar with this \$10 billion, 12-year program. The signs are very hopeful that this program 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 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 re 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 trans-

portation 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 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 solve 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 to 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.

In recent months, as young people have articulated their concern with preserving the quality of life, our office has become the focal point for the Departmental involvement with Teach-In activities. The Department of Transportation is participating in the Teach-In by supplying speakers and information. Secretary Volpe and I, as well as staff people from all levels of the Department, are today addressing groups such as yours. However, we believe a Teach-In by its very name indicates an opportunity to learn. As we leave Washington today for Teach-In activities across the country, we go not only to speak but to listen! to reason together so that we may all work together for the preservation of the environment.

And, we consider today not a culmination of concern for the environment; but a beginning. Today is a day to affirm our concern with tomorrow's world; but it is today that we must work to preserve the environment. Our office has acquired a new constituency during preparations for the Teach-In -- a constituency of young and old concerned citizens. We trust this association will be a long and fruitful one. We welcome the chance to speak with you today; and we look forward to continue to hear from you tomorrow.



# 12731

**DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION**

**NEWS**

**OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

**WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590**

109.35

REMARKS FOR J. D. BRAMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, DELIVERED AT THE RAIL TRANSIT ASSOCIATION IN COOPERATION WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR RAPID TRANSIT, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, APRIL 23, 1970

It is always a pleasure to join my friends, the members of the American Transit Association, particularly at a time such as this when we may be close to the day when all of us can join together in having something to celebrate. I am speaking, of course, about the Administration's Urban Mass Transportation Act, which we are told is proceeding through the House toward a vote, after which it will be submitted to a conference committee. There we anticipate a reconciliation of the differences which exist in the Bills adopted by the two Houses of Congress.

I doubt that many of us could have been convinced a year ago that this legislation would have fared so well in such a short time. I realize that we are not yet there and, as someone who knows about such matters, I have never been one to count chickens too soon.

But the Senate approved the Bill by an 84-4 vote and I believe that we have found sympathetic ears in the House. I believe that the actions which members of Congress have already taken are a reflection of their awareness, an awareness which is increasing across the Nation, that the automobile is not now and will never be in the future, the only answer to the need of the American public for a transportation system.

My colleague, Carlos Villarreal and the Department's Congressional staff have done their work well. This is a busy time in Washington, and it is an especially busy time for those of us who are concerned about the quality of the environment in America today and about the quality of life in the Nation's cities.

I spent yesterday in Birmingham, Alabama, where I spoke to civic leaders and to students, all of whom had come together to express their concern about environmental quality in their city. The people of Birmingham, like the people of Boston and of New York, and of San Francisco, and of hundreds of smaller cities have stopped to take a long look and to reflect deeply about the environment which means the quality of life. Many of them are even more concerned about the quality of life which will be possible for the generations which are yet to come.

As you know, one of Secretary Volpe's first acts upon becoming Secretary of Transportation was the establishment of my Office, the Office of Environment and Urban Systems. He established this Office because of his own deep concern and because of his awareness of society's concern about the environment in which we live. He also established this Office to give recognition to the need for a better and more humane urban environment, one element of which is transportation. Secretary Volpe has given us some of the tools which we need to achieve the job which must be done. And we are supported to a degree by actions which President Nixon has already announced. In the future, we hope that our efforts will be made even more productive by extensive programs designed to improve the quality of the air which we breathe and the water which fills our streams, lakes, and shores, all designed to improve the physical quality of the world in which we live.

On January 1st, President Nixon signed far-reaching new legislation, the National Environmental Policy Act. This was his first official act of the day, of the year and of the decade. The President chose this particular legislation for the honor intentionally in order to dramatize the importance which he attaches to it and to his concern for improving environmental quality. He has called this the "decade of the environment." He has also said "That it is literally now or never."

We are fortunate that the Administration and the Congress are prepared to respond in such meaningful terms to what has been called the crisis of the 70's. We are fortunate that both public and private efforts are joined, are committed, to the search for new and better tools to reverse the tide of degradation which has too often in the past been the pattern of our daily lives. Better transportation, better public transportation, and better transportation planning are certainly among those tools.

Concern about the environment and awareness of the need to restore and renew it is not limited to us who live in the United States. Early in February, 22 of the world's richest Nations, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, came together in Europe to discuss what steps the Organization and the 22 Nations which are its members might take to restore the quality and the vitality of the physical world in which all of us live. Many of those who took part in these deliberations were gloomy about prospects about achieving any sort of success. I do not believe that Cassandra-like pronouncements make an effective contribution to the solution of problems, and I am convinced that environmental quality, like politics, is the art of the possible. I believe that transportation can make significant contributions toward assuring that possibility -- environmental quality -- becomes a reality.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 has enormous significance in terms of the operation of Federal agencies such as mine in terms of providing a Federal response to public concern in environmental matters. Let me read to you the purposes of this Act:

"To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the

understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation; and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality."

This Act sets forth a declaration of national environmental policy, and I should like to tell you what its objectives for the Nation are:

- to fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;
- to assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
- to attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;
- to preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;
- to achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and
- to enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

But, the Act goes beyond statements of policy and goals. It calls on all agencies of the Federal Government to undertake specific actions in order to meet the demand of the American people for greater effort, at every level of Government, to reverse the degradation of our environment. Specifically, the Government is required to bring together in a systematic interdisciplinary approach to problems, the talents of natural and social scientists and of designers, in all planning and programs which may have an impact on the natural resources upon which we depend for life itself. Further, in order to overcome some of the shortcomings of past Federal planning procedures which made decisions on the basis of narrow cost-benefit analyses and in response to specific economic or technical concerns, the law requires

that unquantified environmental amenities and values be given appropriate consideration in decision making.

To my way of thinking, this is a significant step and one which can have far-reaching implications in a society which is deeply concerned about the human quality as well as about the physical features of the world in which it lives.

For the first time, as a result of this legislation, Federal officials will be required to state in specific terms the impact of actions which they propose on the quality of the human environment which will be affected by those actions.

For the first time, Federal agencies are required by law to use ecological information in planning and developing those projects which have an impact on the use and preservation of our treasured natural resources.

We in the Department of Transportation are pleased that our Department was in the vanguard of Federal agencies insofar as implementing this legislation was concerned. However, with all the Federal legislation in the world, and with all the dedication of everyone who is involved, it is a difficult process. Planners and engineers who have been governed by a particular set of standards all their lives must rethink their own attitudes in order to include environmental considerations as major factors in the decisions they must make.

Technology has made it possible to improve the American standard of living beyond anything that was thought possible 100 or even 70 years ago. Transportation technology has played an important part in bringing about that change. In the process, however, environmental quality has deteriorated to a point which would have been unthinkable 100 or 70 years ago, and, again, transportation has contributed its part to that deterioration.

Too often transportation has been considered only as a means to move people and goods rather than as a useful tool to shape communities in which people may live in harmony with their surroundings.

We like to think that this concept is beginning to gain much acceptance.

In highway planning, a step to correct this was taken in 1969 by means of amendments to the Federal Aid Highway Act. Up until that time "economic" and "engineering" considerations had dominated the decisions of highway planners. As of 1969, the law requires that consideration be given to, and I quote: "social effects of such a location, its impact on the environment, and its consistency with goals and objectives of such urban planning as has been promulgated by the community."

The Federal Highway Administration is responding to this charge. It may take longer to make State Highway Departments similarly responsive.

Other transportation planning is being rethought in order to give greater consideration to environmental concerns than has been the case in the past. We are trying to incorporate such considerations in the planning of Federal airports.

We must ensure that the rapid transit systems of the future, the systems which will be funded by the new Transit Act, will give consideration to their impact upon the urban environment in which they will operate. In all such planning, the goal must be to make transportation a contributor to the quality of the environment rather than the overriding element to which we must reconcile all our other values. Effective public transportation can reduce air pollution, noise, and urban blight. It can reduce the demand for more and more highways. It can result in sensible, constructive land use and wise community development. This is not only true of transit facilities. We believe that all transportation programs, some times destructive of environmental quality in the past, can be contributors to such quality. We are trying to see that this is done. 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 demonstrates the Federal awareness that transportation is always a major land user, always a shaper of the physical environment and sometimes a polluter as well as a major factor in economic growth. 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. The problem is one of education. It is hard to convince every public official and every taxpayer that the cheapest way is not always the best way, even though those of us who are concerned about the quality of life are convinced that this is the case. Incorporating consideration for the environment into our thinking, into our planning, and, most important perhaps, into our budget process is not easy. I hope that you share my view that it must be done, but we must accept the fact that no matter what our determination, our objective will not be reached fully today nor tomorrow no matter how great our concern may be.

Secretary Volpe and I are deeply aware that all of our efforts on the Federal level can only serve to reinforce existing efforts on the State and municipal level. This is true of transportation service and it is true of urban and environmental quality.

Let us reflect for a moment on the role of transportation in the development of cities and the achievement of urban environmental quality. Transportation should be subordinate to the overall goals and objectives of an urban area, but it is important that it be considered as one of the means for reaching community objectives.

Both private citizens and public officials should be given real transportation alternatives, not just engineering choices. Both private citizens and public officials should be made fully aware of the environmental impact of any of a variety of transportation systems which are under consideration.

Next, balanced transportation requires balanced funding. Representatives of the transit industry, perhaps more than anyone else, have long been aware of the inequities of transportation funding in the past. We hope that the new Urban Mass Transportation Assistance legislation will give us the necessary tools for assuring such balance. We hope that the funds will be provided by this legislation and, that when they are, the distortions of transportation planning in the past can be avoided. Federal dollars should not distort decision making in transportation planning. Federal dollars should not make it possible to overlook the environmental impact of transportation programs by a dollars and cents rationale. Third, all of us must join in the search for better ways to relate transportation planning to the implications of such planning. Too often we move too quickly from the concept to detailed planning and lose the flexibility we should have if we are to make what is genuinely the best choice. An intermediate level of planning should make it possible to give full recognition to the environmental factors which are involved. Such intermediate planning should make it possible to give full recognition to social implications of what is proposed and to consider the special needs of particular groups such as the young, the old, the poor, the handicapped, and let's not forget, the pedestrian. Such intermediate planning should make possible greater flexibility in exploring innovative new techniques and new combinations of transportation facilities in order to achieve the best and the most compatible system by the broadest definition.

The Office of Environment and Urban Systems is charged with improving the state of knowledge on the relationship between transportation and the achievement of urban and environmental goals. We do not propose dictating systems or mix of systems to the public or to the city. Cities vary greatly. But cities -- to remain good cities -- places where people want to be, where they find pleasure in being, where they reflect a desirable, an appealing, a positive life style, must set their own goals and then set about accomplishing them. Each is different, each city has its critics

and its defenders, each has a distinctive character and quality. It is up to the people who live in them, who relish whatever may be their special charm and quality to see that urban quality -- the city, is improved or enhanced and preserved -- in order to reflect and return to the citizenry what the most people feel is the greatest good -- not just for specific individuals who live in them today -- but, as with any other resource, for the people who will live in them in the years and in the generations which are to come.

#####

94

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

STATEMENT OF J. D. BRAMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR URBAN SYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENT, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION OF THE HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE, ON H.R. 17436, FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1970

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the proposed National Environmental Data Bank Act (H.R. 17436).

H.R. 17436 amends the recently enacted National Environmental Policy Act to provide for the establishment of a National Environmental Data Bank. The Data Bank, which would be managed by a new National Environmental Data Bank Board, would serve as the central national depository of all information, knowledge, and data relating to the environment.

Under the bill, all Federal agencies would be required, in the conduct of programs of financial assistance and contracting to take action to ensure that all information on the environment resulting from such programs is available to the Data Bank. Those agencies would also be required to submit all legislative proposals and major operational proposals to the Data Bank Board for analysis and to obtain the recommendations of the Council on Environmental Quality before implementing the proposals or sending them to Congress.

We believe the time may come when a comprehensive environmental data system may prove useful to the proper management of resources and facilities in programs to restore and enhance the quality of our

environment. We believe, however, that the enactment of H.R. 17436 at this time would be a premature step. Because of the limited experience of the Government, as a whole, in the management of environmental programs and activities, we have some doubt as to whether we have accumulated, to date, sufficient skill and wisdom in this field to enable us to establish appropriate criteria for a new data system and to properly fit it into our present programs.

Less than six months have elapsed since the President signed the National Environmental Policy Act. We are just getting underway in our operations under that Act, and it would be profitable to obtain a greater measure of experience in connection with those operations before adopting new statutory requirements respecting environmental data management. With further experience in this area, I believe we will be in a much better position to identify our particular need for a new or expanded data system, and to determine how to put the system to its best use.

Another feature of H.R. 17436 with which we are concerned is the provision calling for the establishment of a Data Bank Board. We are doubtful of the wisdom or necessity of establishing a new Board for the purpose of centralizing the analysis, from an environmental viewpoint, of all Federal legislative and operational proposals. Again, I believe we should allow the Federal agencies additional time to gain experience under the existing statute. In time we can evaluate their performance and make a decision on this issue.

Now I would like to discuss briefly some of our activities and needs respecting the collection, storage, and dissemination of environmental data.

At the present time the various elements of the Department gather and disseminate a large amount of information relative to programs and activities in the field of transportation. Much of the information concerns such matters as aircraft and highway safety, and we are not directly concerned with such information in the environmental field. However, a great deal of the information we handle--while in many instances collected primarily for other programs--is pertinent to our efforts to enhance the environment and, perhaps, could be of greater value if we eventually established an environmental data bank. For example, facts on such matters as aircraft movements and vehicle registrations in themselves may be of limited use to us now in the environmental field. However, if they were combined through the use of computers with other information on such subjects as air and noise pollution, their importance in the conduct of problem-solving activities might be greatly enhanced.

We do not have in the Department or on a Government-wide basis, a data bank designed specifically for the storage of the environmental information available to us, but we can and do make use of automated reference systems that have been established principally for the storage of scientific and technical publications. For example, virtually all of the information collected by the Department in the form of studies or reports resulting from research and development,

including those on subjects in the environmental area, is forwarded to the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information in the Department of Commerce. The Clearinghouse is responsible for processing and disseminating the data to the public, government bodies at all levels, industry, and academic institutions.

Also, the Department, through the Federal Highway Administration, jointly supports a Highway Research Information Service which is operated by the Highway Research Board of the National Research Council. It is a computer based system which collects and disseminates data primarily on highways and highway vehicles. The Department has recently contracted with the Highway Research Board to begin to collect data on transportation noise abatement. An eleven man panel of experts will analyze this information to gain a better understanding of noise problems and research needs.

Another activity that may be of interest to the Committee is the Study of Environmental Quality Information Programs in the Federal Government (SEQUIP) organized by the Office of Science and Technology. The SEQUIP Committee has solicited information from Government agencies respecting the nature of their environmental quality information programs, and we understand it will prepare a report late this summer which will inventory these programs and make recommendations with respect to existing and new environmental information programs. The efforts of that Committee should be a valuable aid in determining the need for revising or expanding data facilities for environmental information.

In conclusion, we do have a great interest in the proper management of data on the environment as it affects the transportation area. We gather considerable information today which we realize could be put to better use in carrying out our programs, and we realize the limitations of some of the automated retrieval systems now available to us. We recognize we are in an embryonic stage as far as our efforts in this field are concerned and that a more sophisticated data management system may be a desirable goal. However, principally because we find ourselves in this rudimentary stage, and we do have so much more to learn before we can properly design and use such a system, we believe the establishment now of the data bank as proposed by H.R. 17436 would be inappropriate.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my prepared statement. Now I will be happy to answer any questions the Committee may have.



# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# NEWS

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

109.38

29-DOT-70

REMARKS BY J. D. BRAMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, DELIVERED AT THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS MEETING, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, JULY 13, 1970

Events may have come full circle when a non-engineer comes to talk to engineers and to keynote their deliberations on new concepts in transportation. I join you today to represent the Federal Government's role in developing the "new age in transportation".

Perhaps my presence in this role will become more understandable, if, as I hope, this conference goes far beyond its traditional consideration of engineering problems and its laudable efforts to increase professional competence. I hope your deliberations will additionally reflect your recognition of the new concepts in our society. For ours may well be a new age. We are deeply aware of the change which permeates the world in

which we live, change in society, change in technology. But many of us may not have stopped to consider the link between the two and the impact of one upon the other: society on technology, technology on society.

In Transportation, many of the wonders of technology are already accepted. Less accepted perhaps is transportation's impact on our daily lives, on our society. We are building airports today to accommodate 747's -- last year a promise - this year almost commonplace. We are looking ahead to the SST and trying to plan and project its impact upon the way we move about and the way we live. At the same time, we look to tracked air cushion vehicles, no longer a figment of the imagination of the editors of Popular Mechanics but an engineering fact now well within our reach. Icebreakers of proportions and durability thought impossible only a decade ago have crossed the Arctic Seas to demonstrate easy access to another source of petroleum and petroleum products in order to feed today's greedy transportation technology.

My grandmother used to say, "Will wonders never cease?" and today's answer to her question might be, "Probably not, but should they?" This is a question which merits consideration. In the past, wonders have meant change, change has meant progress, progress has always been considered an improvement over what has gone before. Now progress for progress' sake alone is no longer sufficient. It must be tested in the crucible of its total long range effect on the quality of life itself.

I may have misled you when I identified myself as the representative of the "new age of transportation". This is an age, a time in which I and many others are seeking to make progress and technology, including transportation technology, compatible with desires for a more humane approach to the problems of our society. We seek progress toward human objectives, rather than progress toward solely technological objectives.

Secretary Volpe spoke at Hyannis last month to the Sons of Italy in America. He spoke that ours is a time of coming change and of his belief in change. At the same time he spoke of the need for a

deep commitment to preserve and protect all that is good and fine which has come to us from the past. Dr. Pusey of Harvard in speaking to its graduating class, stated his own belief that many of the disturbances which have shaken our campuses -- and our society as well, come from a feeling of revulsion against the values and modes of living which we have come to associate with technically oriented society.

I hardly consider myself a member of "The Now Generation" but I do share what I believe to be much of the deep concern and many of the real questions which have been raised by the young people of today. Some of their questions deal with a society in which big equals good, more equals better, and material progress is the total of life's goals. Our young people and many of us who are not so young, are deeply concerned about what we consider to be the sacrifice of real value to transient needs and goals in the society of 1970 and the years ahead. One of the significant expressions of this concern about contemporary values was manifested with real meaning in the activities which led to Earth Day in April. On that day the continuing concern of young and old Americans for the environment and for what we are doing to the environment found a national focus. For too long I am afraid too many Americans have ignored the impact of their own physical actions on the physical world in which we live, air, water, sounds and smells. I think that today's increasing awareness and concern about the environment is a very positive development, a very real contribution to the broader effort to examine the values, the goals and the priorities which our society serves and which it seeks. In Earth Day discussions, technology's impact on the environment was epitomized by references to what is called "spaceship earth".

When I first heard this expression, my inclination was to reject it as a slogan-maker's effort to dramatize the situation. As I thought about it, however, I came to realize that the words "spaceship earth" dramatize the very real situation in which we find ourselves and the very real problems which confront us.

For our earth is finite. And our resources are finite. All the urge for exploration, all the creativity, all the talents for innovation

which have brought us where we are today must deal with a future world in which physical limits are a factor.

This is not the way we thought when I was young. This is not even the way many of us thought just a few years ago. But I am convinced that we must begin to think in these terms today. We must begin to think about planning and living in a society and in a world in which there is a limit on the resources which are available to us. The situation, the physical realities have not changed, but our ways of thinking about them must change.

I am not preaching but I am calling for a re-examination of the way we plan our lives, our cities and our world. Conservationists speak of their enormous advances in promoting public recognition of the need for conservation during the last 50 years. They now realize that during the next 50 years there must be ever greater and more revolutionary change in public attitudes toward resources or, as one leading conservationist has pointed out, "There will be no environment and no inhabitants to protect."

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 whimper of an environment burdened to the point of collapse may come before another 50 years have passed. I do not necessarily agree with this gloomy prediction, but I do believe that the time has come to face the monumental task which lies ahead of us. We cannot postpone action because we are waiting for either the bang or the whimper. Either one will mark the end, not the beginning of any chance -- or hope -- of undoing our past mistakes.

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 as "civilization" and, through technology designed to improve our standard of living, we have used these beneficial tools to ease our way to potential disaster, a disaster helped rather than hindered by our talent, by our technological excellence.

In his State of the Union message, President Nixon said: "Never has a nation seemed to have more and enjoyed less" -- the time has come for a new quest -- a quest not for a greater quantity of what we have -- but for a new quality of life in America".

In the same speech, President Nixon raised what I consider to be the real question which confronts us today, "In the next 10 years we shall increase our wealth by 50 percent. The profound question is - does this mean we will be 50 percent richer in a real sense -- 50 percent better off -- 50 percent happier?"

When problems have confronted our nation and its leaders in the past, it has sometimes been necessary to create a crescendo of public concern to make possible a crescendo of public response and public action. This has been true in the case of the present environmental near-crisis. The Federal establishment -- the Executive and the Congress -- have assumed positions of real leadership in the effort to design action programs which are capable of responding to the public alarm, the public need, the public demand.

Let me tell you some of the steps which the Federal Government has taken.

We have adopted clean air legislation which sets standards of air quality and which has already made significant strides toward reducing industrial pollution, especially in our cities and metropolitan areas. We have adopted clean water legislation which seeks to restore our rivers and streams to the quality which was once theirs before an increasingly urban America turned them into the polluted bodies of water which we know today -- from which we cannot drink, in which we cannot swim, and around which we do not like to breathe.

As one of the first acts of his new Administration, President Nixon established an Environmental Quality Council, now the Cabinet Committee on the Environment, within the Executive Office of the President. Quasi-governmental agencies such as the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering and the National Research Council have brought their efforts together into an Environmental Studies Board. The President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty has now become the Presidential Committee on Environmental Quality.

The depths of the concern over our environment has caused a flood of legislation to be introduced in Congress. During the first session of this Congress, 100 members introduced legislation on a variety of subjects relating to the environment. This legislation was referred to 19 different committees, with areas of responsibility ranging from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During the seven months of this session, increasing public interest in the quality of the environment has lead to more than a hundred additional pieces of legislation, all of which seek to restore, repair or preserve some aspect of the quality of the environment in which we live.

Perhaps the most important piece of Federal legislation affecting the environment was signed into law by President Nixon on January 1. This legislation, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, has enormous significance in terms of the operation of Federal agencies such as mine and in terms of providing a Federal response to public concern in environmental matters.

The Act goes beyond statements of policy and goals. It calls on all agencies of the Federal Government to undertake specific actions in order to meet the demand of the American people for greater effort, at every level of Government, to reverse the degradation of our environment. Specifically, the Government is required to bring together, in a systematic interdisciplinary approach to problems, the talents of natural and social scientists and of designers, in planning all programs which may have an

impact on the natural resources upon which we depend for life itself. Further, in order to overcome some of the shortcomings of past Federal planning procedures which made decisions on the basis of narrow cost-benefit analyses and in response to specific economic or technical concerns, the law requires that unquantified environmental amenities and values be given appropriate consideration in decision making.

To my way of thinking, this is a significant step and one which can have far-reaching implications in a society which is deeply concerned about the human quality as well as about the physical features of the world in which it lives. For the first time, Federal agencies are required by law to use ecological information in planning and developing those projects which have an impact on our treasured natural resources.

We in the Department of Transportation are pleased that our Department was in the vanguard of Federal agencies insofar as implementing this legislation was concerned.

Shortly after Governor John A. Volpe of Massachusetts was appointed by President Nixon to his present position as Secretary of Transportation, he concluded that there was a need for a different kind of transportation planning, a different approach for relating the needs of people and communities to the realities of transportation technology. I have called myself a representative of the new age which, within our Department, is represented by Secretary Volpe's new approach to problems of environment and to problems of movement and of transportation within the urban area. My office of Environment and Urban Systems has been called by Secretary Volpe, the "conscience" of the Department. We also represent the forces which are seeking more humane resolutions to the need for transportation and greater consideration of all that transportation means and all that it brings to our society. It is not enough if transportation service is fast. It is not enough if it is efficient. It is not enough if it is safe. And it is not enough if it is clean. It must be all these things and it must be more. Transportation can be a most important tool for creating quality in life both in terms of the humanity

which it serves and the environment in which it functions. We must be ingenious enough to find ways to continue to provide needed transportation facilities while at the same time meeting these goals. I am sure that all here today recognize these needs and out of your wealth of experiences and expertise will be able to make invaluable contributions to their solutions.

Finding these answers is not easy in spite of legislation, in spite of dedication in the Congress and within the Executive Branch. New approaches are required -- "innovation" and the vision and courage to adopt new ideas.

Planners and engineers who have been governed by a particular set of standards all their lives must rethink their own attitudes in order to include environmental considerations as major factors in determining the decision they must make.

Technology has made it possible to improve the American standard of living beyond anything that was thought possible 50 or 100 years ago. Transportation technology has played an important part in bringing about that change. In the process, however, environmental quality has deteriorated to a point which would have also have been unthinkable 50 or 100 years ago, and, again, transportation has contributed its part to that deterioration.

In highway planning, a step to correct this was taken in 1969 by means of amendments to the Federal Aid Highway Act. Up until that time there were no legislative requirements to prevent "economic", and "engineering" considerations from dominating the decisions of highway planners. As of 1969, the law required that consideration be given to, and I quote: "social effects of such a location, its impact on the environment, and its consistency with goals and objectives of such urban planning as has been promulgated by the community."

Planning for all modes is being rethought in order to give greater consideration to environmental concerns that has been the case in the past.

As an example, we intend to incorporate such considerations in the planning of Federal airports. We are trying to see that the rapid

transit systems of the future also give consideration to their impact upon the urban environment in which they will operate. In all such planning, the goal must be to make transportation a contributor to the quality of the environment rather than an overriding element to which we must reconcile our demands and our values.

We believe that transportation programs, often destructors of environmental quality in the past, can be made contributors to such quality. We are trying to see that this is done. The problem is one of education. It is hard to convince every public official and every taxpayer that the cheapest way is not always the best. There is, however, a growing body of opinion that social and esthetic values must be given equal weight in transportation decisions. Incorporating these considerations into our thinking, into our planning, and, most important perhaps, into our budget process is not easy. We must accept the fact that no matter what our determination, our objective will not be reached fully today nor tomorrow no matter how great our concern may be. But we must not be deterred, we must proceed with courage and determination. We must proceed with the knowledge that the best, the most progressive, the most innovative, the most dynamic, even the best funded effort to restore and conserve the quality of the environment in which we live, will not succeed if we do not achieve public support. Even harder sometimes than educating public officials is the education of private citizens. Citizens must learn how to translate their sometimes conflicting, sometimes inconsistent, sometimes prejudiced, sometimes poorly articulated desires into goals and objectives. They must transform community desires and values into terms which appointed and elected officials, promoters, and planners, young and old, pragmatists and idealists, can and will accept as an articulation of the community's goals and values, into programs for action.

We, as makers of policy, you as implementers of policy and those who are aware of policy only in terms of its impact on their daily lives must find common cause. We must re-examine our goals and we must re-examine the tools, the technology which makes it possible for us to achieve those goals. We must decide whether

we are seeking stability and sufficiency or surfeit. We must decide whether our objective is science for the sake of knowledge or for the sake of power.

When Gulliver traveled to Lilliput, he held his watch to the ear of a Lilliputian who said, "We conjecture that this engine is either some unknown animal or the god that he worships."

Gulliver's watch in Lilliput and technology in our time are like forces. But, unlike the Lilliputian, we know that technology is neither an unknown animal nor a god. It is there, like Gulliver's watch, to help us to order our own lives and to order our society and its priorities so that we can achieve the greatest good, not just for today -- as measured by the watch, but for the years and for the generations yet to come.

#####



DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION

56  
NEWS

**OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

52-1001-70

REMARKS BY J. D. BRAMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, DELIVERED AT THE ALASKA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MEETING, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, AUGUST 10, 1970

To a native of the State of Washington, visiting Alaska is like having the opportunity to spend some time with one of your best friends. As Mayor of Seattle at the time of the great earthquake, I was privileged to see from very close range the resilience and imagination with which you people, and I mean particularly the businessman of this community, immediately started to rebuild an even greater Anchorage. I have the utmost admiration for the manner in which my good friend Wally Hickel, then Governor, now Secretary of the Interior, together with all the local officials, gave leadership in that most trying time. If there is one State in the Union where ability to conquer severe and unusual problems has been tested, it is here in the 49th State.

Having the opportunity to speak to the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce gives me a chance to be with the kind of people that I have associated with throughout my life. In a career that has seen me active in many fields, I take particular pride in having served as President of my two trade associations, the Associated Lumber Dealers of Seattle and the Seattle Retail Hardware Association, and also a term as President of the Lake City Chamber of Commerce -- so you see before you one of your own.

It is a pleasure for me to be here with you today as a representative of Secretary Volpe and of the newest Cabinet Department. Long before the Department was established in 1967, the various programs now included in the Department of Transportation played an important part in the daily lives of Alaskans from Barrow to Juneau. The Coast Guard -- safety and service to Alaska for over 100 years; the Federal Aviation Administration -- its service makes possible Alaska's web of air service and commerce; the Alaska Railroad -- which links 50% of your communities together; the Urban Mass Transportation Administration -- now working on Anchorage's request for technical study funds for planning; and of course, the Federal Highway Administration which plays a vital role here - even though Alaska has five miles of air route for every mile of highway. The St. Lawrence Seaway is the only part of the Department not represented -- perhaps because it is an agency which closes down its operations for the winter months, which is hardly the way to do business in Alaska.

Governor Volpe, as the second man to fill the Office of Secretary of Transportation, brings to Government a wealth of experience, a large part of which he acquired as a successful businessman in the construction industry. He has served as President of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce and as the National President of the Association of General Contractors. Before becoming a member of President Nixon's Cabinet, Secretary Volpe had served as the first Federal Highway Administrator and subsequent to that was elected three times to serve as Governor of Massachusetts. Secretary Volpe and I, to some extent, share similar backgrounds in that we each developed our own business and served in our respective trade associations and then entered into public life. I believe there is no better training for developing an ability to combine that which is desired and that which is possible. We are practical men who recognize that progress does not have to mean destruction.

Secretary Volpe is leading the fight to bring about a number of major changes in the Nation's transportation system. I think it is fair to say that all of these changes will have an impact on Alaska. I would like to describe three of these new directions briefly, and give you my impression of how they may affect this great State.

First, are new concerns for safeguarding the environment, as a part of our transportation plans and programs. Second, is a similar concern for using transportation as a tool to help cities and towns and states develop and shape themselves in line with local planning goals. Third, and closely related to the first two, is the idea of a "balanced transportation system."

The Office which I head, the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems, was established by Secretary Volpe as one of his first official acts. He was determined to find a way to provide the highest quality transportation and, at the same time, make it compatible with our environment. It is my job to see that these determinations are carried out.

Let me tell you about activities within the Department which are representative of the Department's new concern for the environment and of the work of my own Office in that area.

The Congress has long been concerned about ways to provide maximum transportation efficiency and convenience while, at the same time, reflecting concern for its impact on the environment. In 1966, the basic Federal Highway law was amended to require urban highway planners to go beyond traditional economic and engineering considerations in locating highways. For the first time, they were also told to consider, 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."

Here in Alaska, the urban highway problem may seem far away. But elsewhere in these United States I am sure that you are aware of the problems which have arisen as major highway construction projects have moved more and more into congested urban areas. With the inevitable growth ahead of you and the expansion of your own highway system, you may be sure that the same problems lie ahead of you.

The 1966 law's requirement has meant that many of our highly competent highway engineers have had to rethink their approach to their highly important decisions. In the past, economic and engineering judgments were paramount. Today, as our society attempts to come to grips with a new set of problems and priorities, we are placing new demands on transportation planners and engineers. We now demand that equal or greater weight be given to conservation of the environment and preservation and improvement of communities and neighborhoods. There are no sets of easy rules or ready guidelines explaining how to do it, and the result is that we have -- quite properly I believe -- made transportation planning much more difficult.

When the Department of Transportation Act was passed later in 1966, the Congress included in it a requirement that the Secretary may not approve transportation projects which require the use of land from parks, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, or historic sites until he has determined that no alternative to the use of such land exists and unless all possible planning has been done to minimize harm to these lands. Secretary Volpe has charged my Office to implement that section of the law and we are trying to see that the job is done in a manner consistent with the intent of Congress. In most cases this does not mean that highways or other transportation facilities are stopped. It simply means that planners must give careful consideration to the impact of their plans on the entire community, not just that element of the community which is served by the transportation facility.

It seems to me that all Americans are fortunate that there is a new commitment -- which includes both public and private interests, city, state and Federal Governments, the Administration and the Congress -- to the search for new and better tools to preserve and enhance rather than degrade the physical environment. Too often in the past the pattern of pollution, congestion and destruction has been the way of life in many corners of the Nation. In this respect, as in many others, Alaska fortunately has time to avoid the mistakes made elsewhere.

No one -- or almost no one -- wants to stop or even impede progress. Technological advance and development of natural resources have meant economic security, greater production, greater efficiency, better lives. This must continue in the future. In Alaska, technology can do what it has done for millions of Americans elsewhere, bring

even greater security and prosperity to those of you who live here today and to the others who will come here -- new generations of Alaskans by birth and by migration.

I would like to tell you about one other piece of environmental legislation which was signed by President Nixon on January first, the National Environment Policy Act of 1969. In signing it, President Nixon spoke of the 1970's as "the decade of the environment."

This Act sets forth a declaration of national environmental policy. Its objectives for the Nation are the following:

- To fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;
- To assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
- To attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;
- To preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;
- To achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and,
- To enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

The Act goes beyond statements of policy and goals. The Government is required to bring together the talents of natural and social scientists and of designers, in all planning and programs which may have an impact on the natural resources upon which we depend. I think the

significance of this Act for Alaska is apparent. Your State, perhaps more than any other, has its resources and environment preserved in almost virgin condition. In most parts of our Nation, this law offers a formula for solving already existing problems which threaten to engulf and overcome us. In Alaska, it can be a positive guide to help prevent these problems from arising and thus preserve the qualities which make Alaska unique among the States.

Transportation technology has played an important part in improving the American standard of living beyond anything that was thought possible 50 or 100 years ago. But too often transportation has been considered only as a means to move people and goods, rather than as a useful tool to shape communities in which people may live in harmony with their surroundings. We like to think that this concept is beginning to gain much acceptance.

Secretary Volpe and I are deeply aware that efforts on the Federal level can only serve to support and reinforce planning and transportation efforts at the State and municipal levels. Again, this new view of transportation has major significance for Alaska and its cities.

As Anchorage (or any other city of Alaska) grows during the years ahead, you should be sure that planned transportation meets local development goals.

I strongly believe that the development of a good land use plan must precede the development of a transportation plan for an urban region. A community should take a long look into the future and decide how it wants to look 50 or 100 years from now. The land use plan should be broad enough to provide for the expected growth outside the present metropolitan limits.

A transportation plan should then be developed to serve the land use plan. Good all-modal transportation is by far the best and strongest tool to bring about land use as planned.

It is not too early for Anchorage to be thinking of its ultimate need for expanded public transportation as well as for new streets and highways.

The opposite approach -- creating a transportation system, then

forcing city development to conform to it -- is clearly a case of the tail wagging the dog. I think, this suggests how important it is that you have in operation a good local planning program, one which evaluates all the development options which are available to you, and which gives opportunities for all of your citizens to participate in planning their city.

Transportation should be the servant, not the master, but it takes a great deal of foresight and intelligence to make it serve you well.

Finally, I want to mention the concept of a "balanced transportation system" -- a rather ambiguous term which has the advantage -- or the disadvantage -- of meaning different things to different people. To some, it means more and better highways to serve the continuing increase in automobiles. To others, it means better public transportation facilities which will make it possible to reduce the American dependence upon the automobile.

Each city region has its own peculiar set of circumstances which dictate the best approach to a transportation system. The geography and topography prevailing, the present distribution of industry, commerce and homes, current travel desire patterns and many other factors make each city unique and different from each other. A land and transportation plan suitable to a Seattle, San Francisco or Anchorage would probably not be the choice of a plans city such as Denver, Phoenix or Houston.

Once the mix of transportation modes desired in each city is established then Federal assistance should be available to help implement the plan without distortion due to cheap money for one mode and none for another. The Federal Highway Trust Fund provides assistance for that mode and with the passage of the Public Transportation Assistance Act, now before the House of Representatives, equal assistance can be given to public transportation as well.

One of the most impressive statistics about Alaska which has come to my attention is the fact that you are the lowest of the 50 States in your automobile and truck ownership. Alaskans may wish that they ranked higher but as I and millions of our fellow Americans proceed through our daily traffic jams on clogged freeways and downtown streets, that

statistic brings a pang of envy. And we feel another pang when we realize that here in Alaska a wonderful opportunity exists to create a truly balanced system of transportation -- one which gives full consideration to your geography and your population distribution at the same time that it produces choices for the user, choices which are safe, efficient and convenient.

This is a luxury which is not available anywhere else in the country and it is one which should be used wisely and expended with concern and awareness of its value.

Here in Alaska, Department of Transportation activities are all aimed at helping you to create a balanced transportation system for the State as a whole and especially for your urban areas.

The recent oil developments on the North Slope, can if properly handled, bring great prosperity to your State as well as prove to be a tremendous benefit to the economy of the Nation as a whole, and can also improve its position in world politics.

Because of the Department's operation of the Alaska Railroad, as well as its possible future involvement in road development, we are deeply concerned that the proper decisions be made in the extension of these facilities to the North Slope, as well as to other areas containing mineral and other resources. Through its Office of Pipeline Safety, and the responsibilities of the Coast Guard, the Department is also following carefully the proposed pipeline construction and possible movement of tankers by sea.

In cooperation with the State of Alaska, the Department has initiated a \$3 million study, to evaluate a rail connection between the Nenana-Dunbar areas and Prudhoe Bay, with a possible spur from Bettles to Koubuk and ultimately to the Seward Peninsula. In undertaking this study, we are not prejudging any particular solution either as to the best route or the best way of providing transportation to these vast areas. The proposed Trans-Alaska pipeline system, combined with highway and rail, are all being studied to ascertain how we can best assist you to develop the resources of this great north land. Let me emphasize again that our purpose is to assist the State of Alaska, and we in the Department of Transportation have had excellent cooperation from Bob Beardsley, your State Highway Commissioner, and all other officials with whom we work.

The Department's efforts and those of its contractors -- Tudor-Kelly-Shannon, a joint venture made up of three engineering companies -- will be augmented by the efforts of Dr. George C. West of the Arctic Institute of Biology (which I am looking forward to visiting later this week). Dr. West hopes to draw on the experience of a wide range of experts from a variety of disciplines -- wildlife and fish biologists, foresters, specialists in game management, wildfowl experts, plant ecologists, soil scientists and others. We consider ourselves extremely fortunate to have our own efforts supported by those of Dr. West and his colleagues.

While I am here in Alaska it will be my pleasure to travel the various routes which are being studied as possible sites for the proposed transportation corridor. I am looking forward to a first-hand view of the possibilities which are available. It is a challenging and important project, one in which the Department of Transportation is playing and will play in the years to come, a significant role.

This is the reason why I have come to Alaska -- to see what you, at the State level, are planning for transportation and to learn what we can add to the gigantic steps now underway here to move Alaska forward. We hope that transportation -- and the Department of Transportation -- will continue to be a resource which will grow in usefulness to you, and that transportation planning will give full consideration to the State's need for progress and prosperity. At the same time we hope that transportation planning, while providing for the facilities necessary to advance the State's economy, will be such that it can contribute to the preservation and the enhancement of the unique and wonderful quality of the Alaskan environment.

It is a pleasure to be with you and I look forward to my visit to your State.

#####

57

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

STATEMENT OF J. D. BRAMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, BEFORE THE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, RESPECTING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT, TUESDAY, AUGUST 25, 1970.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to be here to represent the Secretary in explaining how the Department of Transportation is incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Protection Act into its decision-making process. With me today is Frank Turner, the Federal Highway Administrator, who will discuss specific applications of the Act to the highway program.

I have just returned from my home state of Washington and from Alaska. These are areas of outstanding natural beauty, and I have returned renewed, not only in spirit, but also in my determination to fight for the preservation of our environment.

We at the Department of Transportation are continually mindful of our responsibility for environmental preservation--a responsibility which is owed to the Congress and to the people it represents. In our view, and in decisions, environmental quality is a goal, not a constraint.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is an unmistakable indication of Congress's commitment to environmental quality. In spite of the fact that you are undoubtedly familiar with this legislation, I would very briefly like to describe its provisions. In essence, the Act does two things. First, it superimposes upon existing Federal standards a new and far-reaching set of environmental criteria designed to assure the conservation of our irreplaceable natural and scenic resources. Second, it creates a new operational requirement--the preparation of an "environmental impact statement"--in connection with every major Federal project which has a significant impact upon the environment.

On the first point, the Department of Transportation is moving to implement the new environmental standards in a positive way. We do not regard them, however, as a major departure from our past authority. In the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 are two provisions--sections 2(b)(2) and 4(f)--which have required from the outset that Departmental decisions be consistent with sound environmental policy.

The mandate in the new Environmental Policy Act is broader, of course, but we feel that our experience under the Department of Transportation Act has given us a meaningful head start in taking environmental factors into account.

On the second point, section 102(2)(C) of the Act requires that each Federal agency issue detailed statements with respect to "legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." This is an important requirement, not only because it assures consideration of environmental factors in the planning of Federal projects, but because the detailed statements will be fairly reliable indicators of the degree to which Federal agencies are complying with the law. Furthermore, the statements, which are to be circulated among all interested Federal, State, and local agencies, will provide to appropriate officials an early warning of potentially adverse environmental consequences.

Forthcoming Department-wide guidelines and those of each of our Administrations will prescribe a procedure for developing these detailed environmental statements and for insuring that they have the intended effect upon the planning of projects subject to the Department's approval. To date, we have been dealing with this requirement on an ad hoc basis, even though most of the projects presently being considered were well underway prior to the enactment of the Environmental Policy Act.

The Federal-aid highway program has received the most attention in this regard. The Federal Highway Administration looks first at the need for a particular highway; then at its location; then at its design, then at specific engineering specifications. Each of these steps terminates in a specific approval, and each approval leads to the commitment of substantial sums of money. Mr. Turner will shortly describe this process in greater detail. My purpose is merely to indicate briefly the complexity of the program, and the reasons for our approach to it pursuant to the new Act.

According to the Interim Guidelines of the Council on Environmental Quality, section 102(2)(C) is applicable to major Federal actions having a significant effect on the environment "even though they arise from projects or programs initiated prior to enactment" of the Environmental Policy Act. "Where it is not practicable to reassess the basic course of action," the Guidelines say, "it is still important that further incremental major actions be shaped so as to minimize adverse environmental consequences." Thus, in the highway program, we have attempted to treat appropriate projects as covered by the Act even where they were far along on January 1 of this year, when the law became effective. In many of these cases, of course, the statements reaffirm our earlier conclusions, and serve more as information about established projects than as an indication of alternatives still available. Nevertheless, we are not troubled by this. First, our past thinking, thanks to the environmental provisions in the Department of Transportation Act, was basically consistent with the criteria set forth in the Environmental Policy Act. Second, because we regard the "informational" function of the statements as important, we think that even statements produced after the fact are extremely useful.

Let me briefly outline the specific responses that the Department has made to the Act. At the end of January, Secretary Volpe held an executive retreat in Williamsburg, Virginia for the Office of the Secretary and the various Administrators. At that retreat, I briefed those assembled about the Act, and its application was discussed over much of that three day period.

On February 27 of this year, Secretary Volpe circulated a memorandum on the Act to all Assistant Secretaries and Administrators. In that memo, he emphasized the importance that he placed on the Act, highlighted several sections that he considered most relevant to the Department, and assigned the responsibility of overseeing the response of the Department to my office, in cooperation with the General Counsel. The Administrators were directed to become thoroughly familiar with the Act, and were asked to supply the Secretary with a statement of tentative plans for meeting its mandate.

In March, the Administrations sent to the Office of the Secretary a statement of their tentative plans for meeting the requirements of the Act. On April 24, a memorandum was sent from my office to the Administrations requesting proposed procedures for implementing section 102(2)(C).

During May, interim guidelines for implementing section 102 (2)(C) were received from the Council on Environmental Quality and comments were received from the Administrations regarding their internal procedures for implementing that section.

In June, a draft DOT order setting forth general Departmental criteria for implementing section 102(2)(C) was sent to the Council and meetings were held within the Department on the draft order.

During July, the Administrations were advised that the Council wanted by September 1, 1970 a review of the policies and procedures, regulations, and legislation of the Department for consistency with the mandate of the Act. A second draft of the Departmental order on section 102 (2)(C) was also prepared and circulated.

At the present time, a final draft of the Departmental order on section 102 (2)(C) is being prepared. Each Administration will issue its own order or guidelines after the final order is issued. Each Administration has also been reviewing its policies, regulations, and laws and my office has received initial responses from them.

This Department can be proud of its long-standing sensitivity to environmental problems. However, the Environmental Protection Act does set forth a number of specific new requirements. To give you a clearer insight into our procedures, Frank Turner will now outline how the Federal Highway Administration is meshing the Act into its day-to-day operations.

At the conclusion of his testimony, we would both be pleased to answer any questions the Committee members might have.