

M
FROM: Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Donohoe Building
6th and D Streets, S. W
Washington, D C. 20591

REMARKS BY LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE 43RD ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF HIGHWAY OFFICIALS OF NORTH ATLANTIC STATES AT LORD BALTIMORE HOTEL, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1967 AT 2 P.M.

Before you stands a man completely convinced of the needs, purposes, and objectives for which the new Department of Transportation--now only 12 days old--was born. That our country's largest industry, efficient and productive as it is, should have severe and complex problems, was recognized by Congress in creating the Department.

Congress agreed with President Johnson that coordination of Federal programs and funds affecting transportation was vitally needed if our Nation is to have the kind of transportation system it requires. Today, that broad and pressing need for coordination is at the heart of the new Department's purpose. The job of the Federal Highway Administration will be to do all that is necessary to carry out DOT's objectives, working with fellow members of the DOT team under Secretary Alan S. Boyd. Thus, the Federal Highway Administration can be expected to play a leading part in the development of highway policy within the Department. In the broadest sense, the Federal Highway Administration will be serving as the promotional spokesman for highway transportation and those--virtually all Americans--who depend upon it.

Our Nation's highway network is its most valuable and productive transportation resource. Certainly the fantastic growth of our highway system has produced problems. Any undertaking of this magnitude must have its tribulations. But we do ourselves and our country an injustice when we allow concern with the problems to cloud the dominance of the highway as a force for America's fantastic growth and prosperity in the 20th Century.

FR
1344

bridwell 670412
BRIDWELL 2/28/69 FAA-SM1

00133

-more-

The highway which seems sometimes to bring us problems, let us not forget, has brought a better way of life to every American touched by it.

It is worth repeating before this audience the well-known fact that no other force in modern society touches so many lives so deeply as does motor travel. Everybody knows, or should, the blessings borne by the motor vehicle. You who have stimulated and extended its influence through our highway system know much about the gains produced by motor carriage, but too few people outside the highway industry realize these things. It is appalling to realize how true this is of an influence so great as our modern highway system.

Nor, frankly, do people outside your profession know all that they should about the very real environmental challenges involved in highways and their use. You know these challenges well, and it is my purpose here to discuss the role of the new Federal Highway Administration in responding to them. That role is the proper Federal one of leadership, played conscientiously in concert with the states, local governments, industry, and science. Such teamwork has brought us the good that we have today in our highway system.

When I speak of the "highway system," I think of it with a capital "H", and of course, I mean a total national resource, vital to our total population. It is the job of the Federal Highway Administration both to improve the Nation's use of this resource and to improve this resource for the Nation's use. This is the common, overriding goal of all components of the new FHA.

To meet that goal, the Federal Highway Administration must be much more than a collection of programs and agencies housed under one roof. That would be purposeless bureaucracy. Construction, engineering, finance, research, development, planning, standards, motor vehicles, drivers, economics, safety, beautification, inspection--these are all elements of the coordinated whole. Our bureaus are interacting elements of the Federal commitment to a better highway resource for America.

Please keep that in mind as you watch the Federal Highway Administration and its programs in the future.

You know already that we are composed of four previously separate governmental units. You are too intimately familiar with the history of the Bureau of Public Roads to need any briefing from me as to its past performance and programs. You doubtless are aware that the National Traffic Safety Bureau and the National Highway Safety Bureau (formerly known as "agencies" rather than "bureaus") were created last year by two extremely important Acts of Congress. The Office of Motor Carrier Safety, our fourth component, has served the public with distinction for many years as a program of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The record of each of these units is an enviable one--so, you may be forgiven for some immediate skepticism when I tell you that the President and Secretary Boyd expect the Federal Highway Administration to produce far more in results than would be expected from the sum total of these four components.

These four units, with the support of our administrative and policy team at the Federal Highway Administration, must work together, share their resources and capabilities to mutual benefit, and participate to the best advantage of each in meeting our common goals.

These goals, no matter how they are phrased, all boil down to this essential: The Federal Highway Administration is obligated to give America the best total highway resource possible; maintain and improve that resource as Americans require, and assure that Americans make the best possible use of that resource. I expect to be making this point quite persistently for some time to come and, at the risk of repetition, I will do so to remind you, others, and myself of what the Federal Highway Administration is all about.

I want to talk now about the challenges confronting this new governmental organization since, after all, we must identify and solve our specific problems in order to meet our broad mandate. The first challenge facing the Federal Highway Administration is the pure and simple inadequacy of our national highway system.

Any road map will show that America possesses a vast weave of roadway stretching the length and breadth of our country. It is impossible to argue that we do not have an impressive highway system--in fact, the world's best.

Yet this must not cloud the fact that we are not spending enough on highway construction and improvement today. I say this with full knowledge that in little more than 10 years, the Federal Highway Trust Fund alone has accounted for nearly \$31 billion in expenditures. This opened to traffic 23,475 miles of the new Interstate system by the end of 1966, plus work underway on another 15,945 miles, for a total of 39,421 miles -- 96 per cent of the 41,000-mile system. In addition, the Trust Fund has financed \$17.7 billion worth of work on 208,000 miles of primary, secondary and urban highways.

An impressive set of figures--yet we are falling farther and farther behind on some segments of the total road system, partly because of our understandable concentration on the interstate program. This has inhibited the much needed buildup of primary and urban highways and streets, where traffic will increase by an alarming 150-160 per cent in the time that we are building the interstate system.

Dictated by public need, and in harmony with other social and economic goals, we are going to need substantial improvement and some extension of this primary road network. I will happily retract that statement, by the way, when a tested alternative to highway travel emerges on the transportation horizon. But frankly, I do not expect that any development in the field of transportation--technological breakthroughs included--is going to measurably counter our increasing national need for more and better roads over the next two or three decades.

Just as highways are a basic element of our national transportation system today, so has the highway resource become a fundamental part of our national environment. This has produced a new kind of challenge, in which the public wants the best of both its transportation and its environmental worlds--and deserves to get just that.

Demand for roadside beauty, total highway safety, clean air, and reasonable noise levels, resistance to highway development which ignores other social and economic values--these are challenges to which the Federal Highway Administration must respond, and we will not be able even to give them fair consideration, much less resolve them, unless we are ready to assess them in terms of very broad national aspirations. Our highway requirements need not conflict with other desires of society. On the contrary, it must continue to be one of society's major tools for achieving those desires.

Some of the responses to these challenges are already available to us, in on-going programs of the Federal Highway Administration's components. Other responses are being developed for Congressional consideration. An example of this is President Johnson's proposed legislation to develop fringe parking in urban-suburban areas, to be used in combination with express bus service to and from city centers. This is one element in a much-needed attack on the commuter problem and its little brother, the downtown parking problem.

A program which holds much promise for helping cities to increase their transportation capacities is now underway in the Bureau of Public Roads. In his remarks to you later this week, Bureau Director Frank Turner will tell you more about TOPICS (for Traffic Operations Program to Increase Capacity and Safety). Briefly, this concept makes use of highway aid money on a State-Federal matching basis to get at the complex problems of safety and capacity and the flow on city streets. As you know, this is not major construction work but is restricted to improvement of traffic operations.

Among the main points of attack in the TOPICS program are new devices for control of traffic, and methods of traffic engineering to improve traffic flow and enhance safety. Better signs, signals and lane markings and other traffic engineering techniques can, with relatively little cost, increase traffic volume by a significant factor, at the same time stepping up speeds 25 per cent.

TOPICS may involve channelized intersections, added approach lanes to signalized intersections, pedestrian and highway grade separation, control systems tied directly to traffic conditions, separate bus lanes, reverse-direction lanes, and improved truck and bus loading stations. There is much more to come.

TOPICS means, then, road utilization. Idle highways are expensive, the unused potential is just as wasteful as a \$5 million airplane sitting empty in the hangar. With mounting costs, longer trip times, greater delays and less space for operation or expansion, the daily use of the roadway looms more and more valuable. Repairs, construction work, accidents and utility tie-ups are causing growing concern. The traffic engineer sees the one-lane

tie-up in a two lane road say at rush-hour, as a 50 per cent loss; in a four lane road it is still a one-fourth loss of potential at capacity demand. The resultant loss not only is expensive, it breeds dangerous congestion.

The biggest weakness in urban highways is that we have not put space-age technology to work where it counts. We are faced, in too many areas, with 20th Century demands on a 19th Century system. In most places, urban systems have been improved only in very small increments.

Another response to challenge in the transportation field today is the urban joint development program, i.e., the joint development of freeways, urban housing, parks and recreation centers and commercial facilities. It is rather simple in essence, but is the key to efficient use of land in the crowded city, with the highway serving the social and economic ends of the community as well as those of transportation.

The heart of this program is the acquisition of entire blocks or squares of city property rather than just the segments that are necessary for the right-of-way. The total cost of such piecemeal acquisition inevitably mounts due to damages to the remainder. But the whole property could be bought with highway funds paying the largest share--generally about three fourths-- of the total cost, with the remainder being paid for by local authorities.

The highway department would buy what amounts to a sort of easement for the right-of-way (or an "air tunnel") and the rest of the property over and under and adjacent to the freeway could be used for a multitude of purposes by the city.

It is good common sense to use this plan to renew blighted areas. It is good sense to build replacement housing while constructing the freeway, with a resultant minimum of displacement of the people who live there. It is prudent and wise to use such opportunity to establish parks and recreation facilities for which these areas have such crying needs, and still be able to keep a large part of the adjacent property on the city's tax rolls.

Not surprisingly, this program has met great enthusiasm from planning authorities, but we have very few examples that we can point to.

What more can be done? That remains for us to find out. Again, in a coordinated program we must look to expanding technology in other fields as well as our own. We hope to find some answers in electronics and materials research. We could also learn from aircraft communications and other technological endeavors.

The Federal Highway Administration has plans to add a science advisor to its staff. His duty will be to lead us into new means and methods for a better highway system, and to give us a basis for sound judgment of such programs and proposals.

As you know, we have assumed responsibility for safety of motor carriers in that branch of the Interstate Commerce Commission which was transferred in the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. We look for some extra

benefits by interchanging research results between the highway safety program and this group, but we plan no significant changes in the operation of the group itself as it is integrated with the Administration. In our view, the industry does an exceptionally good job in hardware research and development for motor carriers. The best help we can offer in this field is in economic research.

I come now to one other element of our total resources, highway and traffic safety. As seen by the Congress in the legislation passed last year, this vital program was devised to remove the worst stigma that we bear in the highway world.

Surely we need not dwell on the human suffering and the cost involved in this highway toll. The fact that automobile traffic deaths are so very commonplace has hindered public attention and action on this problem. That our death toll each day is equivalent to a few months in the Viet Nam conflict is well-known, but the auto accident slaughter has become more or less routine news. Still, it is the biggest fraction of our national annual accident toll, with a cost pegged at a staggering \$10 billion.

It seems to me, however, that economics and death, tragic as they are, do not tell this story. Injury does. Injury by automobile affects 9,000 persons every day. In human suffering, disfigurement, and all other tragic ways, that is a real dimension affecting more than 3,200,000 of our fellow citizens, young and old each year.

Although the Federal Government's attack on safety has come about in two pieces of legislation, and is therefore treated in two bureaus within our Administration, I shall discuss them here as one, because they are so closely inter-related.

Undeniably we have, as a Nation, done wonders in air safety and in other modes of transport. Our military people have performed virtual miracles in the safety field of warfare. The jungle fighter today has a measure of lower anxiety due to the knowledge that he will, if injured anywhere on the globe, be evacuated to the finest possible medical care seemingly in an instant.

We are determined to apply this same all-enveloping attack on traffic safety. The National Transportation Safety Board, taking over some of the safety functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission, will organize soon under our new Department to handle the problem at the highest level. It will review accident investigations and accident causes, determine compliance with standards and scrutinize the safety standards in effect.

Within the Highway Administration we are concerned with cause and effect, prevention and alleviation. There has been some confusion about this program, whose consequences are likely to be so widespread.

In accident causes we expect to learn what are really the factors to blame in the first place. We are determined to find out why accidents happen, what injury and what destruction takes place in them, and what can be done about the aftermath. There is a great deal of opinion and speculation in this field. Some is informed, some is very good, some is hardly more than guesswork.

We want facts, and we want to see what truths these facts add up to.

What is the role of drunkenness among drivers, of medical and mechanical failure or road defects, of deficiencies in the vehicle and its subsystems? What about the principles of crash design -- no one wants to design vehicles just to make them crash, but what can be done about the problem if the vehicle does crash? Our third interest, the aftermath of the accident, has to do with emergency treatment, facilities and procedures.

The law requires us to issue safety standards for new automobiles, and we are in the process of carrying out that provision. I don't believe this needs further elucidation, because of the great amount of publicity generated on the subject to date.

The other phase of the highway safety effort -- the concentration in the States and local communities -- has received less attention but is even more vital in the drive to reduce accidents and make our roads safer.

Under the Highway Safety Act, each State must have a uniform, Federally-approved highway safety program. The Federal Highway Administration has issued initial draft standards for these programs. We have been receiving comments and suggestions from the States and hope to recommend final standards within a month or so.

These standards will cover such vital areas as tighter regulation of driver licensing and dealing with drunken drivers; motor vehicle inspections; standards for tires; uniform traffic laws, modernization and maintenance of highways, comprehensive driver training programs, and a wide range of research, testing, education and safety demonstration projects.

Finally, there is the subject of highway beautification, a subject of more pleasing implications than any other in our program. In its first year, this program drew proposals for more than 100,000 miles of highway for landscape treatment, shielding of 12,000 junkyards and other eyesores, and installation or improvement of 6,300 rest and recreation areas, parks and viewing points.

Landscaping and scenic enhancement, which represent most of the funds in this program are your opportunity. They represent a prime means for state highway departments to earn the gratitude of highway users and promote good will. And they are one more important aid in the safety program.

Because it is easily the most visible, eye-appealing part of the beautification program, scenic enhancement calls for action. In many areas, prompt action is needed because the opportunity is shrinking to acquire

land for scenic strips as a means to preserve the natural beauty that exists. The chance if not taken now, may be lost forever.

And now a word about cooperation -- it is impossible to do anything to meet our challenges without joint local and Federal decision and action. To coin a phrase--if you will permit--all of us in the highway world should know how to work on a two-way street.

In fact, it is more than a two-way street, it is full, close working relationship that is mandatory. That means your Federal Highway Administration needs the inputs from local officials now at the outset.

Because of this need, we have raised the status of our people in the 10 regional offices to administrators, to carry out a higher degree of authority and, more important, greater responsibility in Federal aid to the states, in safety coordination and in motor carrier safety work. No program can be successful except as it is implemented with the fullest partnership of the local governments.

We have more than half a century of Federal-State cooperation in the highway field on which to build--an example of democratic endeavor unmatched anywhere else in the world.

With this kind of cooperation in the future, I am sure we can attain even our highest goals. Thank you.

-END-

mm
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D. C.

STATEMENT OF LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, FEDERAL HIGHWAY
ADMINISTRATOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE HIGHWAY
BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

May ~~2~~³, 1967

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee on behalf of H. R. 7797. Secretary Boyd has outlined the Department's general objectives with regard to the Highway Safety and Beautification Program. It is my intention to discuss with you the Highway Beautification Program as it has been conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads and some of the specific problems encountered by the Committee.

First, I would like to compliment the Committee and its able Chairman for its patient and understanding attention to the many witnesses who have testified at length to the many and varied areas of concern attendant to the administration of the Highway Beautification Act.

We will not attempt to minimize these problems, for the Act is a far-reaching and complex law, not easily understood in all of its ramifications, and certainly not easily administered to the satisfaction of all affected or interested parties. We feel that

FR
1352

bridwell 67 0503

BRIDWELL

2/25/69

00134

FAA-SH/

the hearings have been productive, and have served a very useful purpose in highlighting these areas of concern.

Sections 302 and 303 of the Act required the Secretary to report to the Congress, not later than January 10, 1967, the results of a detailed estimate of the cost of carrying out the provisions of the Act, the results of a comprehensive study of the economic impact of the Act, and the standards, criteria, and rules and regulations to be applied in carrying out the outdoor advertising and junkyard control provisions of the Act. Each of these was to some extent dependent on one or both of the other two, and all were closely interrelated. Without knowing the standards for outdoor advertising control to be applied in a state, it is, of course, impossible to accurately predict the cost of outdoor advertising control, or the economic impact of such control. The important point to be kept in mind is that these three factors, the cost, the effect, and the standards are dependent upon each other, and must be considered collectively.

Much of the concern over the economic impact and the estimated cost of the outdoor advertising control provisions of the Act can be directly attributed to a misunderstanding of the status or intent of the proposed standards and criteria contained in the January 10

report. I feel that these hearings have cleared the air effectively on this point.

To emphasize our position, I would like to quote briefly from a statement made by Secretary Boyd to all the Governors assembled at a meeting at the White House March 18. The specific purpose of the meeting was to explore better methods of Federal-State cooperation.

Secretary Boyd cited the Federal-aid highway program as one of the truly outstanding examples of Federal-State cooperation and partnership and went on to talk about the Beauty and Safety programs.

"We fully expect the same kind of cooperation in the Beauty and Safety programs," he said. "We are talking about a two-way street in both programs -- not a situation where the Federal government hands down a set of criteria. We want you in on the formulation of standards, and in arriving at the necessary agreements.

"In the Beautification program, for example, the Act required and we held separate hearings in each of the states to obtain the benefit of the state and local community thinking and suggestions on future standards. Based on the testimony presented at those hearings, we have proposed standards. I want to make it clear that WE HAVE NOT PROMULGATED FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR THE CONTROL OF BILLBOARDS. In the first place, the Act does not call for or

permit such Federal standards. Instead, we have drafted standards which I, or my representatives, will use as a basis for negotiation with you.

"Individually, your states can take any position you think proper, so there is ample opportunity for you to help determine the standards for your state. We are not assuming uniformity among the states in billboard control. We would, of course, hope to achieve agreement on some general principles. And we must, of course, carry out the intent of the Act, which is to control billboards."

My letter to the Speaker of the House of Delegates in West Virginia, which attempts to make essentially the same points, already has been read into the record during these hearings.

Our files are replete with examples of letters we have written to Governors, members of state legislatures, Members of Congress, and others in which we stated that standards to be applied in any state would be those agreed to during the course of negotiations.

I want to reassure this Committee, and each state, that the Department is ready and willing to consider all factors which should have a bearing on the standards and criteria to be applied within each state.

There has been considerable discussion that we have been urging the state legislatures to pass "blank check" laws, authorizing a state official or agency to set the standards to be applied within the state through negotiation with the Secretary. We would prefer this type of legislation for two very good reasons. This approach would permit true negotiations, with all factors carefully considered, and with both the Secretary and the State on an equal, uncommitted basis. If the state legislature writes into its law the standards to be applied, there is no room for negotiation on the state side. Secondly, we did not want to see implementation of the Highway Beautification Act delayed one or two years in any state, through legislative inaction, simply because the legislature misunderstood the status or intent of the standards printed in the January 10 report. We would like to point out to the Committee, as we did to each state, that no sign would have to be removed before July 1, 1970, and the legislature in each state would therefore have ample time to consider any agreement entered into prior to its being carried out.

A number of questions have been asked during these hearings about the cost estimate. First, I would like to point out that the estimate contained in the January 10 report is based on the

application in each state of the proposed standards printed in that report. Although this is the best estimate which could be made with the available information, I would like to emphasize that, since we have not entered into agreement with any state, as to the standards to be applied within that state, there was, and still is, no way of accurately estimating the cost of controlling outdoor advertising within any single state, or nationwide. Any change from the proposed standards contained in the January 10 report would bring about a change in the estimated cost of controlling outdoor advertising within the state, and nationally. Since the standards contained in the January 10 report can be regarded as virtually the maximum to be put in effect in most states, the overall effect of any changes resulting from negotiations will result in commensurate reductions in the estimated cost.

Our cost estimate has been questioned as to the basis for reducing the estimated cost of controlling outdoor advertising, as submitted by the states, to that contained in the January 10 report. Simply stated, the states' estimates were based on the draft standards published in January 1966 and used for discussion purposes at the public hearings, whereas the report estimates were based on the standards contained in the report. Since the discussion, or

hearing, standards were considerably more severe in impact, the cost of effecting these standards was greater. Public Roads cost estimate instructions indicated to each state that this adjustment would be made using Public Roads' computer program, after the latest proposed standards were developed.

The reduction in unit costs for signs for each state has also been questioned during the hearings. These have not been reduced. Variations in apparent unit costs have occurred since the report estimates were based on the report standards, which contained a so-called "grandfather" clause for signs in commercial or industrial zones and areas not conforming to size and/or spacing requirements. It was estimated that these signs would cost only about one-third of their original cost, when finally removed on or after January 1, 1973. This estimated reduction in the cost of removing these signs accounts for the apparent reduction in sign unit costs.

A number of witnesses at these hearings have recommended amending the Act to remove the mandatory just compensation requirement. Others have recommended extending the requirement to include severance damages, payments for loss of business to establishments losing advertising, and many other damages not ordinarily compensable under existing state eminent domain laws. The Administration is opposed to both extremes. We feel that the provisions of the Act contain the most equitable approach.

The Committee has heard considerable discussion about the possibilities of controlling outdoor advertising in scenic areas instead of the present statutory requirement of exercising spacing, size and lighting controls in zoned and unzoned commercial and industrial areas.

In testimony before Congressional Committees and in discussions with representatives of the Administration, outdoor advertising industry spokesmen repeatedly have stressed the point that they believe outdoor advertising is a legitimate and proper business and should be permitted to do business where other commercial activity is undertaken. We agree.

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 is, in effect, a scenic highway piece of legislation. It states as its purpose the protection of the public investment in highways, the promotion of the safety and recreational value of public travel and to preserve natural beauty. It specifically recognizes the rightful place of outdoor advertising by stating that it shall be permitted and, in fact, promoted, within zoned and unzoned commercial and industrial areas subject to certain limitations mutually agreed to between the Secretary and the states.

We recognize the difficulty of developing definitions and regulations and standards to deal with such a complicated area of

economic activity. But we would stress that defining commercial and industrial areas through the local zoning process is a well established and accepted procedure. We likewise contend that definition of unzoned commercial or industrial area is just as susceptible to quantification through agreement between the Secretary and the states.

Suggestions to change the basic program policy to one of excluding advertising from scenic areas should be reviewed very carefully. It is quite possible to define and measure a commercial or industrial activity. But is it as easy to define and quantify in the highly subjective arena of scenic areas?

California established a Citizens Advisory Committee to cooperate with the Department of Public Works to develop standards and criteria for scenic highways. It worked three years.

An official California State publication entitled, "Criteria for the Designation of Official Scenic Highways" states:

"No exacting specifications can be established for the delineation of corridor boundaries, nor can they replace the judgement of trained or experienced persons from state or local agencies, private firms and citizens. These criteria only form bases on which to formulate a judgement."

The California criteria includes such ones as:

Angle and duration of vision by the driver --
the ease of vision.

Providing the motorist with a total and
continuous, though varied visual experience.

Vegetation.

The type of structures located in the corridor.

Natural and man-made features (typical list).

We believe this partial list of criteria illustrates the problem. Would it be possible, for example, for members of this Committee to agree on a scenic area which provides the motorist with a total and continuous, though varied visual experience?

The Highway Beautification Act is a scenic area law. It states that except for zoned and unzoned commercial and industrial areas, our Federal-aid Interstate and Primary Systems are scenic and worthy of protection. It protects a tobacco farm in southern Maryland, a pine forest in Florida or Georgia, the corn fields of Illinois -- just as it does a different type scenery along the rocky coast of Maine or the Big Sur country of California.

It also has been discussed the extent to which the information obtained during the public hearings was considered in working out our proposed standards. One witness indicated that our proposed standards were made more severe after the public hearings. The

fact is we dropped from consideration, following the hearings, such standards as setback, sign height, a number-per-mile rule, and numerous other more restrictive requirements. On the other hand, we did not merely accept from the industry the standards they wanted. Industry spokesmen, in meetings held with them, stated "customary use" was not equivalent to present practice. In addition to "customary use" and accepted industry practices, we had other guidelines, clearly stated in the Act. These are protection of the public investment in our Federal-aid highway system, promotion of the safety and recreational value of public travel, and the preservation of natural beauty. All of these guides and goals were carefully weighed and considered in the development of each individual proposed criteria.

To illustrate the problem of developing criteria reasonable to all, let's look at the 500-foot spacing rule, which says that there should be 500 feet between signs along the Interstate System, freeways, and non-freeway rural primary highways. A past president of the Outdoor Advertising Association of America testified at the public hearing in Indiana that this was customary spacing in rural areas. Two knowledgeable industry witnesses testified before this Committee recently that 500 feet would be reasonable spacing on

open, high-speed highways. As one of our research reports shows, reading time almost dictates this spacing for safety and sign effectiveness. This criterion would seem to have solid support. Yet, over 84,000 signs in commercial and industrial zones and areas are estimated to be non-conforming to this one rule. To us, this is clearly a matter of the industry recognizing a desirable criterion, but failing to follow it. A spokesman for one advertising industry association conceded to this Committee that self-regulation had not worked very well.

One of the very important points discussed during the hearings is the extent to which states should come forward with their own standards and criteria. We hope they do. They always have had, this opportunity. They still do.

A representative of each state highway department sat as a member of the panel at each state hearing. A copy of the transcript and all exhibits were made available to each state. Each state, therefore, has essentially the same information and capability as we do to work on this task. We fully expect each state to enter into negotiations with us, with the full opportunity to express its requirements in entering into an agreement.

Just as one example, there has been considerable discussion before the Committee that regulation of outdoor advertising in zoned commercial and industrial areas should be left to local control. This also has been requested by the few states in which we have started negotiations. In each instance, we have said we would accept this position if the regulation was undertaken by an agency which had the authority and actually conducted a program of comprehensive land use control. This fact has been known for some time by the outdoor advertising industry and by the staff of this Committee.

Lastly, we would like to discuss the point that has impressed us the most during these hearings -- the concern over the possible economic impact of the outdoor advertising control part of the Highway Beautification Act.

Without question, there are wide differences of opinion over the effect outdoor advertising control will have on individual businesses and communities. This Committee has heard considerable testimony on all sides of this issue. The fact is that there was a dearth of organized research on this subject until the Bureau of Public Roads and the State Highway Departments undertook 25 research projects in an attempt to use organized, scientific and analytical tools to find the answers.

We are pleased that the Chairman of the Committee has asked that three other persons who conducted research projects be called to testify on their findings. We commend to the Committee the very detailed studies which have been made by colleges and universities as a part of the economic impact study. Reports on a number of these studies have been furnished to the Committee, as has Public Roads' summary analysis.

We are completely sympathetic with the points of view expressed by several witnesses before the Committee on what they believed the economic impact would be on their respective businesses or members of their associations. We respectfully suggest, however, that a number of witnesses were not informed as to which highways or sections of highways were to be controlled. In most instances, the witnesses gave no indication that they had considered relocating their advertising signs to zoned or unzoned business areas. And in no case, did a witness indicate that he had even considered the alternative of placing his advertising in an informational site despite the fact that in some places businessmen have found this to be an excellent way to accomplish their purposes while improving the esthetic qualities of their communities or regions.

There are effective alternatives to plastering the countryside with advertising signs and we believe this Committee acted wisely in 1965 when it made specific provision for the development of informational areas either as specific sites for that purpose or in conjunction with the construction of safety rest areas.

In addition to information centers, there are other alternatives which have been successfully demonstrated. These include directional and informational signs on the right-of-way, strip maps and other local area maps, directories, brochures and similar material published by motorists organizations, state highway departments, travel agents, state promotional agencies, hotel and motel associations, restaurant associations and others.

Roadside information centers are by no means new, but they now are undergoing a resurgence that makes them far more important and effective than they have been in the past. The ingenuity of private enterprise is rendering them far more attractive, efficient and productive. They can be located near important intersections with Interstate highways, at junctions of other principal highways, and near tourist attractions.

Perhaps their most productive and efficient use is in conjunction with safety rest areas or roadside parks as they frequently

are called. These rest areas are being developed along our entire Interstate System and the authorization of funds under Section 319b has made it possible to plan the construction of these facilities at much more frequent intervals than has been possible in the past.

We have a number of slides of information centers either already in existence or planned which we would like to show you. It is important to note that most of these have been planned and carried out by private enterprise.

We believe now just as we believed in 1965 that the Congress enacted a good, workable program. We believe strongly that it can and should be carried out in cooperation and partnership with the states in the best tradition of the Federal-aid highway program.

We earnestly seek Congressional approval of the authorizations contained in HR 7797 so that we can get on with the job.

Thank you.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20591

REMARKS BY FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE CONFERENCE ON IMPROVED UTILIZATION OF EXISTING STREETS AND HIGHWAYS THROUGH TRAFFIC ENGINEERING, CONDUCTED BY THE HIGHWAY RESEARCH BOARD, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 22, 1967 AT 1:50 P. M.

It was with unusual pleasure that I accepted your kind invitation suggesting that I speak with you here today.

Your Conference is assembled to discuss a subject with a tongue-twisting appellation -- the "improved utilization of existing streets and highways through traffic engineering." To you who will participate, the title is informative. It tells each of you -- highway engineer, traffic engineer, designer, urban planner, or administrator -- that you will be talking in detail about such hard-nosed issues as improved traffic flow, better traffic control devices, parking limitations and provisions, street lighting, and a host of other elements of the total road system.

I compliment you on the range and depth of your planned discussions. And yet, without intending to slight the authors of your program, I am going to offer an amended title to your Conference. I am going to suggest that it could very appropriately and very effectively be called, "The Conference on Improving the American Highway Resource."

That, in effect, is the laudable goal you have set for your discussions over the next three days. It is a goal which, I am afraid, some people in our land believe to be non-existent. And over and above your many other tasks and responsibilities you implicitly share the worthwhile burden of making it clear, as often and in as many ways possible, that a major purpose of "highway engineering" today is the raising of our existing national road resource to new levels of safety, efficiency, productivity and -- to wrap it all up into a single term -- public service. Your Conference and you, as individuals, are dedicated to the proposition that roads can, should, and will provide ever higher levels of service to all of the public.

2/26/6
FAA-5

R
961

00098

You will be dealing in your Conference discussions with facts and practicalities, so I do not intend to start your meeting off in an unwarranted aura of platitudes. You will be talking about things being done or planned on behalf of the travelling public. I want to slightly reverse the order of that relationship, to talk with you briefly about that same travelling public today, and about the effect of your work and your actions upon it.

One need only glance through the list of your agenda items to become aware that the public with the most to gain from your work is the urban public, including those who live in and around urban areas and those who regularly travel into and out of urban areas. As you are aware on a day-to-day working basis, this accounts for an immense portion of our national population.

This urban public is very much in the national eye today. It is intimately a part of our growing concern with the problems of cities and suburbs -- overlapping problems of air pollution, lack of space, inadequate services, rising costs, crime, the slum, imbalances in employment, educational facilities, and a myriad other concerns. This public is rather sharply stratified as between core city dweller, city worker living in the suburbs, and suburban dweller working in the suburbs -- and it is also stratified, of course, by economic considerations.

Depending on which stratum an individual inhabits, his goals for the future of his urban area may vary greatly. But one goal long shared by most members of this urban public has been adequate transportation -- transportation, that is, which meets the often varying requirements of the urban community's citizens to move with relative ease, speed, flexibility, economy, and safety to and from all points within and beyond the urban area. Relative, in this sense, means able to meet those criteria better than any existing service or system.

The urban highway and road network was, quite simply, a response to that demand. It was the best available response early in this century, when the

advent of the motor vehicle challenged Americans either to drastically improve their roads, or else abandon them as a national resource. And despite the problems it has encountered -- and some it has engendered -- it is the best available response today. Conferences such as yours, of course, indicate that we intend to keep it that way.

But what about tomorrow? Will our national network of urban streets and highways be the best available response to tomorrow's -- next month's, next year's -- demands by the urban public for transportation which meets its many standards? And even if so, will our "best available response" be good enough?

I wish that I could give you the final answers to those questions. I do not, of course, have the final answers. You do, and every decision, plan, and project which you advance will determine how these questions are to be resolved. But if you feel, as I do, that our cities' roads and highways can be as good as rising public expectations require, we at least can discuss the atmosphere which surrounds our steps toward improving this basic transportation resource.

As a first principle, perhaps we should agree with the statement carved at the door to the National Archives Building here in Washington. "What is Past is Prologue," it declares. We and the public can learn from and build upon our past in highway planning, design, construction and traffic control -- but let us not fling the past at each other, either as a weapon of recrimination or a source of smug self-defense.

I do not take too seriously the idea that a great wave of public disenchantment will prompt the tearing down of important segments of our roads, or the withdrawal of our mandate to improve the national road system. By the same token, I cannot endorse the idea that highway engineers are justified in taking a "my way or no way" attitude toward road building. Certainly, the

Federal Highway Administration does not take such an attitude.

If the past is instructive prologue, it teaches us that the planning, design, construction, and operation and use of highways is no more static than the continuing expansion of the universe. On the contrary, the evolution of our urban highway and road system is an unparalleled example of motion and growth, and this suggests to me a second principle which we might do well to adopt: The present is our eternal opportunity to influence the future. Perhaps that smacks of platitude, but I believe it has a very practical implication to the future of urban roads. For if we pass up our opportunities today, other forces and considerations of the present certainly will dictate the shape of our road system for the future, whether urban or otherwise.

This opportunity has its greatest possibilities in our urban areas and will come about in the beginning through a more flexible approach to our present roadway development pattern.

It is an interesting paradox that many of our opportunities in road development today are presented in the guise of frustrations. To the planner, builder, engineer, administrator, or anyone else whose life is committed to creating and improving a national highway resource, it is frustrating indeed to be told, by sincere city dwellers, newspapers or officials that "roads are destructive to society," or that "rail transit is better than highways in urban areas," or that such-and-such a stretch of road will "blight the neighborhood." To reply in defense of highways is to court the charge that one is "narrow" and "pro-highway," or "anti-rail." In few areas of national discussion it is difficult to hold the middle view, and so-called "highway people" are forever finding themselves in one extreme corner of an argument they never asked for.

Yet we would be dangerously unwise to withdraw farther into that corner. Tougher though it may be to stay in dead center, that is the only place where we have an opportunity to answer the sound questions, and work toward a restatement of the unsound ones. Moreover, that is the only place in which we can distill our opportunities from the seeming frustrations of the discussion.

We know, for instance, that there is no such thing as "bad" road. There may be poorly built roads, roads needing improvement, or roads which are not operated safely and efficiently -- but not "bad" roads in the moral sense. When we leap to the defense of "good" roads, however, our stamp of endorsement implicitly goes on the "good-bad" argument. When our actions -- such as this Conference -- signify efforts to improve existing roads and the use of existing roads, we are successfully holding the middle ground and making the most of our opportunities.

Likewise, the middle ground is the most productive -- and the most difficult to secure -- in the "roads are destructive to cities" discussion which flares up with increasing frequency. We know that roads can be destructive to cities, and we know of past instances where, because of poor planning and coordination, false economies, and other reasons, construction of roadway had produced unnecessary injury to segments of the same urban community which benefited as a whole from the involved stretch of road.

But far more important, we also know that roads should not and need not be a destructive element in the city development process. You know, and your Conference signifies, that our existing urban streets and roads are the **skeleton** upon which America's cities have been built -- and that to remove the skeleton would be to eliminate the city, totally. We also are painfully and actively aware -- again, witness this Conference -- that the skeletal bones need constant attention and strengthening, else the city will become a very sick patient,

plagued with the traffic congestion, hazard, and enervation which already has attacked some major urban areas.

In this regard, most of you are familiar with our TOPICS program, initiated early this year by the Bureau of Public Roads. TOPICS is an effort to extend traffic engineering improvements to principal urban streets not previously eligible for Federal-aid highway funds.

TOPICS is a technique -- a present, applied technique -- to insure that our city road systems remain the best available response to urban America's demand for safe, efficient, economical, flexible transportation. It is not, of course, the only way. One of the opportunities held out by the present is the challenge, put to us by public need and public sentiment, to develop additional improvements both in our urban road system and our use of that system.

Solely in the cause of making our existing urban street system a far more productive resource, we must explore many other avenues of opportunity. The shrinking availability and mounting inconvenience of parking in and around many urban areas offers not only a present opportunity, but a hard challenge, to all of us. Legislation now is being developed which will make a start toward fulfilling the Federal share of this responsibility.

In my personal opinion, we need to do much more in this area to obtain the maximum return from our very large investment in roads. After all, the road itself is only a means to an end -- and no place to park makes the trip frustrating, if not downright useless.

I have made clear a number of times already my conviction that our concern must not be limited just to the adequacy and technical acceptability of our existing urban road systems, but also to their productivity. And this,

of course, means concern over improving our use of these systems. I for one am sometimes appalled at the uses -- more to the point, non-uses -- to which we have subjected major portions of our urban street and highway network. History, let us hope, will not relate that the society capable of building the world's most magnificent highway system proved incapable of using that system properly.

A dismaying example of this is our near total failure to recognize and exploit our urban highway system as an effective means of mass transportation -- a ludicrous situation in a Nation so deeply and justifiably concerned with the problems of moving huge numbers of people into and out of cities during two peak periods of every working day! If ever an opportunity was ripe for fulfillment by highways and so-called "highway people," this is it. It demands the harmonizing of a combination of factors, two of which are first a willingness by the private and public bus industry to commit itself to a true mass transit service and second, cooperation by city and suburban officials, highway designers and administrators, and the public (which, after all, stands to gain the most) in defining and applying the lane control, loading facilities, proper signalization, and other techniques needed to bring about the desired public-service result. Frankly, I am convinced that this is an opportunity demanding fast and aggressive action, and within the scope of my responsibility I intend to promote it as vigorously as possible. TOPICS, by the way, recognizes this aspect and is a start toward doing something about it.

Your Conference by its title and agenda, is explicitly concerned with existing streets and highways as contrasted with planned or required future roadway. With this in mind, I have endeavored to keep my comments so far within the framework of your interest at this meeting in discussing and

developing means to improve road resources, and the public's use of those resources, which already are in operation.

But as you are acutely aware, the challenge of refining existing roads to better meet public demand is only half the story in highway needs today. The other half is, of course, our growing national need -- both in and beyond urban areas -- for additional components to the American highway network. And, you certainly recognize that these additional components must be planned, developed, integrated, and physically built with close attention to a wide swatch of other economic and social considerations, particularly in our urban areas.

The basis for an adequate, comprehensive development of new Federal-aid highways in the context of other community needs and desires is provided in the continuing comprehensive transportation planning process required by the 1962 Federal-aid Highway Act, this planning process is now active in some 230 urban areas. Through it communities can establish their developmental goals and see that highway improvements are compatible both with these goals and with other forms of transportation development.

But as was recognized then, and is even more apparent today, additional techniques and -- to use a fashionable Washington word -- "inputs" are required if future highway development in urban areas is to be adequately responsive to public demand.

One such technique, which the Federal Highway Administration is working hard to advance, is the so-called "joint-use" approach to urban highway planning. Oversimplified, this is the same kind of multiple-use concept which, applied to highway development, can produce results even more impressive than it has generated in the planning and construction of municipal centers, schools, and other public buildings.

This concept provides for the complementary development of an urban freeway corridor. It has advantages in making the best use of scarce urban space, and in making public dollars do double duty through the economics of land acquisition. It can help provide replacement housing, parks and recreational areas, parking or commercial development, and other community facilities along with needed freeways.

We believe joint development presents a logical, practical approach to a range of difficult urban problems. We are encouraged by the interest it is receiving, as for example here in Washington where feasibility studies point to the construction of apartments over a portion of the Inner Loop. And we look for the profitable application of this approach to urban freeway planning in the years just ahead.

I have talked with you this morning about only a few of the many opportunities which the present holds out to all of us concerned with highway development and improvement. I mean neither to cast criticism where those opportunities are being left untaken, or to suggest that no frustrations will be encountered as they are pursued. I mean only to make clear my belief, without reservation, that we can and will meet the national demand for an even higher-quality, more productive, and more harmonious highway system, that we are capable of distilling, from public comment and public need, a legitimate mandate for change and improvement in response to changing social and economic circumstances -- and, finally, that our actions in the coming months and years will continue to demonstrate that highways are for, and not despite, any and every element of the American public.

If I am correct, we have nowhere to go but forward. Thank you.

7-3025

99.9

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20591

REMARKS BY LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE REGULAR COMMON CARRIER CONFERENCE, BOARD OF GOVERNORS MEETING, WASHINGTON HILTON, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 8, 1967

There is a quotation -- a bit of verse -- which goes:

"Of all plagues, good Heaven, thy wrath can send,
Save, save, oh save me from the candid friend."

Personally, however, I am more inclined toward Emerson's view, when he said, "A friend is a person with whom I may be sincere. Before him I may think aloud."

Therefore, with your forbearance, and because I know I am among friends, and hopefully still will be when I've finished, I would like to use the next few minutes to do some thinking aloud, and indulge in some plain talk.

First, I would like to talk about the mission -- the commitment, if you will -- of the Federal Highway Administration, and its relationship to you, the motor common carrier industry.

I think we can agree that by definition, by the breadth of its component programs, and by force of the statutes it administers, the Federal Highway Administration is the chief instrument for carrying out the Federal commitment to a highway system of unparalleled excellence in the United States. The creation of the Department of Transportation makes it imperative that we add one qualifier to that mission. We are committed to the creation

0608

00097

FAA-S#1

FR
949

of a highway system of unparalleled excellence within the context of a total transportation system.

What does that mean? Only that we can no longer think about highway systems in a vacuum -- as a mode of transportation separate and apart from all other modes. If we are to realize the full potential of highways in the movement of people and goods, we must design, build, and use them so that they present maximum opportunity for interchange with other modes.

I think we can also agree that it would be short-sighted indeed for anyone to conclude that the Highway Administration is concerned with all elements of the highway system except the element of productivity.

Just as the Department of Transportation is concerned with the productivity of the total transportation system, involving all modes, the Federal Highway Administration must be concerned with the productivity of the highway system.

When we speak about productivity in connection with highways, we of course mean the movement of people and goods. When we talk about the movement of goods in relation to the highway system, we're talking about the motor carrier industry. It thus becomes crystal clear that the Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration must be greatly concerned with the health and vitality and the expansion of the motor carrier industry.

Secretary Boyd has designated the Federal Highway Administrator as the advocate of all highway matters in the Department of Transportation. I intend to serve in that capacity, which in my view encompasses advocacy of anything that will increase the productivity of our highway system.

In reaching for this goal of increased productivity, there are several problem areas which we must all consider carefully. I should think that one of the foremost of these is the need for greater uniformity in size and weight limitations. This problem of what maximum desirable weights and sizes should be permitted on the Federal-aid highway system has remained unsolved for more than 10 years. It has worked hardships on Federal and State governments, on private industry, and on the public at large. I think it is time we begin to move toward a resolution of this nagging problem.

Prior to 1956, as you know, the policy on weights and sizes of commercial vehicles was a matter left entirely in the control of the individual States. The 1956 Highway Act, in effect, divided the responsibility for the development of policy between the States and the Federal Government. As a result, a number of policy problems have been left unresolved which actually work against the implementation of the basic policies established by the Congress for the Department of Transportation.

It has already become apparent that the many variations of size and weight limitations established by the individual States act as restraints upon the system operation of interstate commercial motor carriers. It is also

becoming increasingly apparent that variations are occurring on the weight and size of commercial vehicles within individual States for the classes of highways upon which the trucks are operated. This adds even more restraints to system operation.

We believe that in the interest of maximum efficiency for our transport system an effort should be made to arrive at a national policy for the weights and sizes of motor vehicles operating in interstate commerce. Such a policy should provide specific weights and dimensions which establish both maximum and minimum levels for trucks, and above all, should be as nearly uniform as possible. This uniformity is of greatest concern to State highway departments because of their responsibilities for maintenance of the highway system and whatever the final compromise or agreement, it is important that it be determined at the earliest possible time.

It is to be hoped that adoption of a national policy will be one of long standing, so that the agencies responsible for the construction and maintenance of highways can develop long-range plans, so that your industry, together with equipment manufacturers, can develop long-range designs.

Another problem area to be considered as we search for ways to improve productivity is the need for much greater interchange between motor carriers and other transport modes. The trend toward containerization with its benefits and advantages will surely act as a spur toward greater interchange of shipping modes.

In this connection, I was greatly heartened, as I am sure you were, by the recent Supreme Court decision upholding ICC rules for intermodal use of trailer-on-flat-car service. This decision endorsing the right of access of motor carriers to rail service for their containers on the same basis as other shippers, seems to me to be a reaffirmation or reemphasis of the principal of common carriers.

Lest it be forgotten, the court ruling reflects great credit on the present Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, William Tucker. It was he, you will recall, who as a Commissioner wrote the original ICC decision whose principle, after all this time and litigation, has been upheld by the highest court in the land.

One of the strongest motivations for the creation of the new Department of Transportation was the strong belief that transportation should be considered as a total system; one which provides for the movement of people and goods from origin to destination as rapidly, efficiently, conveniently, and safely as possible. The obvious implication of this belief is that various components of the transport system -- the various modes, if you will -- should be sufficiently compatible as to permit national policy to be carried out without undue disruption to any segment of the system.

Just as there is need for greater uniformity of weights and sizes of trucks permitted on the highways, I think we are rapidly approaching a time in the development of containerized shipping when we must begin to think

seriously about establishing standards or uniform sizes for containers. Such a step -- taking into consideration the requirements and characteristics of all transport modes -- would greatly facilitate the efficiency and flexibility of our transportation system, as well as increase productivity.

The third major area which merits the concern of all of us is the pressing need for a concerted effort to work toward reducing, or at least inhibiting further increases in, the unit operating costs of motor carriers.

We all recognize that costs are going up. We also recognize, I believe, that motor carrier rate levels cannot be significantly increased without the very real possibility of diverting customers to other modes. This is something neither you nor your customers want -- they wouldn't be your customers, after all, if they didn't appreciate the advantage of flexibility your service provides. But they will remain customers only so long as any advantages of your service are not outweighed by economic and cost factors.

Your industry has made it clear many times that you are greatly concerned with finding ways to reduce unit costs -- to be able to provide more motor carrier service for each dollar spent. There is no magic solution, although there are several avenues you can pursue which together might provide the solution. First, of course, we recognize the necessity for continued improvement in productivity. And, some increase in vehicle

size and weights will make a contribution. But the trucking industry must also look to improvement in the highway system and in vehicle performance as the most likely avenues for increased efficiency and reduction of unit costs.

A growing number of motor carriers are using the Interstate highways as additional mileage of this great system is open to traffic. The high-speed design of the Interstate highways permits higher operating speeds, reduced travel times, reduced costs, and less damage and breakage of goods in transit.

In this connection, I am sure you are all aware that the question of the use of Interstate highways by regulated motor carriers is pending before the ICC at this time. An examiner's report has been issued in Ex Parte MC-65 and exceptions have been filed to the industry request for modification of route certificates to include authority to use Interstate highways. As you also probably know, the Department and the Highway Administration are a party to those proceedings. We are hopeful that the case will be resolved in such a way that motor carriers will be encouraged to make the most productive use possible of this magnificent highway system in the near future.

Unquestionably, the Interstate system will provide you and the general traveling public with tremendous advantages in terms of convenience, safety and economy. The fact of the matter is though that even when it is completed, its 41,000 miles of super-highways will constitute only a fraction of the

total National highway system. What happens, then, when you get off the Interstate?

I have said before, we have, as a matter of National policy, been concentrating for the past several years on the completion of the Interstate system. The time has now come when our concern should be directed with equal vigor toward the upgrading of our present primary and secondary highway systems. The difficulty, as always, is money. It is obvious that there is not enough highway user tax revenue to do all that needs to be done -- and I say this with full knowledge that in a little more than 10 years the Highway Trust Fund alone has accounted for almost \$31 billion in expenditures. The truth of the matter is that we are falling farther and farther behind in meeting the needs of our total road system.

This should be a matter of prime concern to your industry. Who has a greater interest in the support of highways, and in helping to assure that there is enough money in the Trust Fund to do the job? The job, by the way, must include a concerted effort to solve the urban traffic problem.

Here again, your industry and the Highway Administration have a commonality of interest. When your trucks are on the road, time means money. What value is there in saving an hour in transit time between city A and city B, if the time saved is lost again in inner city traffic jams?

The TOPICS program, initiated early this year by the Bureau of Public Roads is one effort to help solve the problem of urban traffic congestion and traffic flow. The program concerns itself with traffic engineering techniques, devices, and improvements already available and proven. Application of these techniques and methods to entire downtown grids should enable us to greatly increase existing street capacity, improve traffic flow, and increase average speed with much less financial investment than it would cost to add more lanes.

But this program takes money. So does the Bureau's program to eliminate high hazard locations and features from existing roadways. The Spot Safety Improvement Program now being carried out by the State highway departments may prove to be one of the most effective attacks on the highway safety problem yet mounted. Most of these individual projects are relatively inexpensive. Yet in toto, with literally hundreds of projects programmed in each State, the financial cost is in the millions. The return in lives saved and accidents avoided is worth every cent we spend on this program.

The State highway departments in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads and the American Association of State Highway Officials are even now pursuing a detailed and comprehensive study to determine what the Nation's highway needs will be when the Interstate highway system is completed. This study...and the report on it which is due to the Congress in January...should be a revealing source of information on just how far we are falling behind in meeting our highway needs.

Surely this is of great interest to your industry, and most certainly the problem of raising sufficient revenues for highway needs must be of high priority in your conferences and deliberations. I can visualize few matters which hold more import and greater potential for the motor carrier industry.

Safety, of course, is one of the primary concerns of the Federal Highway Administration as it is of your industry. In our new organization we now have combined, for the first time, all the elements necessary for Federal leadership of a comprehensive national attack on the highway safety and traffic accident problem. It includes the Highway Safety Bureau, which provides motor vehicle safety standards and aid to States and community safety programs. But of greater importance to you is the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety whose functions, powers and duties were formerly held by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I want to assure you that, although the name of this function has been changed, you will still be dealing with the same people, for along with the authority came all of the ICC personnel from its Motor Carrier Safety Section.

In carrying out this area of our responsibility, we will do everything within our power to promote safety both off and on the highway.

For example, we will want to continue to upgrade regulations in handling hazardous materials. There is no doubt that expanded safety measures are necessary, what with the tremendous expansion of chemical production as well as the introduction of new compounds.

We will want to completely review existing accident reporting criteria to determine any present shortcomings and to see if a greater degree of uniformity can be attained in this field as well.

And we will want to develop the methods and personnel necessary for a truly effective and strong roadside check program.

All of this is to say that you should expect changes from the new Bureau. To leave you with any other impression would be less than honest. After all, if Congress had not intended changes and improvements to be made in all phases of our National transportation system, it would have found no need to create the Department of Transportation.

Let me add, however, that seeking change is not synonymous with seeking additional power. Occasions will undoubtedly occur when the Federal Highway Administration will be asked to make a contribution in the development of Departmental policy affecting motor transport matters, either before Congress or regulatory bodies. When this situation presents itself I can assure you that we will give the fullest consideration to the needs and problems of your industry, along with every other element of the highway community.

In summary, I think you will agree that our major goals are yours as well. We both want and need an improved transportation system for the well-being of our people and our Nation. And just as surely as our goals

are harmonious, so just as surely must we work together in order to attain them.

The Federal-aid highway program has been hailed for years as the prime example of Federal-State partnership. I think in all honesty that this can ~~and~~ must be expanded into a tripartite Federal-State-Industry partnership -- for only through the wholehearted cooperation of all of these elements will we be able to solve the problems and meet the demands that face our national highway resource and its users as they prepare for the bigger jobs of tomorrow.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20591

REMARKS BY LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, FEDERAL
HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL HIGHWAY
ADMINISTRATION, U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION AT THE INTERNATIONAL
MUNICIPAL PARKING CONGRESS, LOS ANGELES,
CALIFORNIA, JUNE 26, 1967

If there is one aspect of the highway transportation system that has suffered from neglect in the past, it has been the adequate control of parking in urban areas.

For years, little or no attention had been paid to what we all recognize today as the close link between parking facilities and the flow of traffic on our city streets.

Many of you who come from moderately-sized cities remember when unrestricted parking was the rule rather than the exception; when all-day curb parking was not discouraged; when even traffic congestion along the main business street on "shopping night" was viewed with civic pride as an indication of a city's economic vitality.

But shortly after World War II, a change in attitude was discernible. The exodus to the suburbs began in earnest to be followed soon by the construction of large suburban shopping centers with acres of adjoining parking space.

The Main Street merchant became apprehensive and began to worry about all-day parking and traffic congestion. Were they driving potential shoppers away? What steps should be taken to make Main Street more accessible to customers?

ER
0937

0626
265/10

00096

CAA-541

Initial efforts to cope with the problem were confined mainly to installing parking meters in the hope that all-day parking would be discouraged. In some cities, municipal officials were elated because they saw in the parking meter a new source of municipal revenue. Parking meters soon gave rise to the meter-feeder who chose to drop nickles or dimes into the meter rather than move his car.

When it became obvious the meter-feeder was frustrating the purpose of parking meters, legal limitations were imposed on the time he could occupy a parking space.

But this was only a temporary palliative. The number of motor vehicles in the country was climbing. Vehicle registration in the last two decades has almost tripled, increasing from slightly over 34 million in 1947 to today's 94 million. By 1975, our motor vehicle population will be nearly 120 million.

At the same time, the United States was growing more urbanized, resulting in the need and demand for more urban highway capacity to handle the proliferating number of cars and trucks. The urbanization is continuing at such a rapid pace that by 1980 almost 80 percent of the Nation's population will live in urban areas.

It became increasingly apparent, not only to the moderate-sized municipality where the meter-feeder was an annoyance, but to urban areas of all sizes that on-street parking was decreasing drastically the traffic-carrying

efficiency of city streets. Lanes that were built to move traffic were being used as storage space for vehicles, making them, in effect, tremendously expensive parking lots. The maneuvering necessary to get into and out of curb parking spaces was delaying and impeding the free flow of traffic.

Many cities took steps to eliminate curb parking in their central business districts as necessary attack on traffic congestion. But they were then faced with the problem of providing adequate off-street parking as an essential link in the highway transportation system. Parking facilities had to be made available to those who drove to the central city to work, shop or for any of the myriad reasons that bring motorists to a city.

Different cities approached this problem differently. In some, public or quasi-public agencies were created to cope with the problem. In others, private enterprise provided parking lots and garages. In still others, a combination of both sought to furnish the needed facilities. The national investment in parking and related real estate grew from \$1 billion in 1947 to slightly under \$5 billion in 1961.

Downtown parking today has become a major urban land use and an important community function. A study of parking in the city center made by Wilbur Smith and Associates for the Automobile Manufacturers Association found that:

"Downtown parking is an important complementary land use which reinforces the vitality of major activities, serves as an incentive to investment decisions, and is a dynamic force in shaping and directing new developments."

Two examples right here in California were cited by the study as illustrative of the relationship between parking facilities and economic growth. They were Pershing Square in Los Angeles, with its underground garage, which has become the scene of new office development, and property adjacent to the Union Square garage in San Francisco, which has shown a sharp rise in value.

The study also pointed out that because more downtown travelers will come from auto-oriented suburban areas in the future, downtown parking space demands and needs will continue to rise in all cities. By 1970, it was estimated, the Philadelphia downtown core will need over 6,000 more parking spaces. In medium-sized cities such as Charlotte, North Carolina; Chattanooga, Tennessee; and Hartford, Connecticut, 1,500 more spaces will be needed.

Throughout the country, the central business district is undergoing a rebirth and assuming a new role in expanding urban regions. However, the adequacy of transportation to a large extent will determine whether our downtown areas flourish or wither away.

Failure to provide facilities for storing vehicles once they enter the downtown area will throw an effective roadblock into the smoothest-working transportation system. It is crystal clear that if traffic congestion is to be relieved and traffic strangulation is to be averted, the need for more off-street parking must be met, and met soon.

To use the highway resource for anything but its prime purpose -- the safe and efficient movement of people and goods -- is wasteful, costly and downright foolish. We can no longer continue to curtail the productivity of the highway facility by using it for car storage. All cities need every bit of highway capacity obtainable if they are to cope with the streams of traffic flowing into their central business districts daily. On-street parking in core areas is a luxury most cities can no longer afford.

There are some, of course, who have a simple, instant solution for the traffic congestion problem -- bar all cars from the central business district. But, like most simple solutions for complex problems, this is not the answer.

The storage of cars in the central business districts of our cities -- the downtown parking problem, that is -- is but one major factor in the traffic congestion problem. It is a factor which deserves special and accelerated concern, because it has so long been left unattended, and in a moment I will discuss the kind of concern being placed by the Federal Government on the parking problem.

It is vitally important, however, that we not lose our sense of perspective when we talk in terms of "solving the parking problem," or "relieving highway congestion." These are dangerously inadequate frames of reference, because what we are in fact discussing is the need to make vastly improved use of our highway system, both of itself and as part of the total national transportation system.

It is clear, therefore, that the parking problem must be resolved within that context. As to parking as an element of the highway system, a workable solution must offer the user a variety of alternatives for the storage of his motor vehicle at the urban end of its trip -- including the alternative of storing that vehicle beyond the boundaries of the high-density metropolitan center. But this alternative will appeal to no highway user unless it is part of a total transportation package which provides economy, comfort, speed, flexibility, and dependability equalling or exceeding the level he has learned to expect from his automobile as through unit of transportation between points in the core city and its environs.

To put it more bluntly, do not expect John Q. Citizen to leave his car at a fringe parking lot -- even though this is the cheapest way to store that car while he is in the city -- if we cannot provide him with a way to get from that car downtown, and back, which is as appealing on balance as was his automobile. He simply will not treat his car as one element in a multi-modal travel pattern to and from the downtown area unless that pattern can compete with the car as a through means of travel. Nor will he and his automobile enter into a multi-modal mix for regular travel between suburban points, if that mix is not competitive with the car as a sole source of transportation.

For a few cities, rail mass transit will be able to contribute to the pattern, at least in its suburban-core city travel aspect. For many, many more, the highway which moves the automobile provides the greatest potential for

partnership in this multi-modal pattern. It is an untapped potential, for the most part, whose promise is blurred by our failure to make use of the urban highway to its highest capabilities.

I have no reservations in saying that to my mind, one of the most productive uses to which our highway network in urban areas must be put is in the volume movement of people between points in the core city and its suburbs during peak hours of travel. In our infatuation and infuriation with the private automobile as a means of commutation, we have sadly neglected this potential of the magnificent highway resource now being constructed in and between our metropolitan centers. Rubber tired mass transit is generally regarded as a very mediocre element of the urban transportation system -- and often rightly so, since its travel and schedule patterns, convenience, costs, dependability, and comforts do not add up to a total package having sufficient appeal for the car-oriented commuter.

Rubber tired mass transit must make -- and, I am convinced, can make -- a massive effort to assume its rightful role as a fully competitive member of the urban passenger transportation pattern. We at the Federal Highway Administration will work for the day in which this vital means of urban movement can claim to be an effective alternative to the automobile in travel within, to, from, and around the downtown area, as well as an effective partner to the automobile in such travel.

In a message to Congress last March, President Johnson clearly and succinctly addressed himself to parking as an element within our national transportation system, and not isolated from it. He said:

"To improve public transportation systems and to reduce traffic congestion, I recommend legislation to authorize the Secretary of Transportation, under the Federal highway program, to participate in the cost of acquiring land and developing public parking facilities on the outskirts of large cities. This authority would enable the Secretary to promote the multi-purpose use of space over and under expressways and to develop areas alongside of highways for parking terminals."

I can assure you that legislation will be sent soon to Congress by the Department of Transportation to implement the President's recommendation. Even though I cannot discuss specifics now, I can give you a broad picture of what the legislation will reflect.

The parking program will operate within the procedures of the traditional and successful Federal-State highway relationship. Its funding will be carried out with regularly apportioned highway funds.

The chief emphasis of the program will be on helping urban areas to develop publicly owned parking facilities in harmony with the total transportation needs and capacities of these areas. These facilities would be provided in one or both of two general locations -- in the central business district or outside the periphery of the urban area.

Fringe parking would be developed in conjunction with adequate public transit facilities which would speed motorists from parking stations to their destinations in the core city. This means improved and more sophisticated bus transportation service; better equipment, and more responsive schedules.

The legislation will recognize that no one can force motorists to park in any particular place. But if the proposed Federal-aid parking facilities are made sufficiently attractive through reasonable fees and satisfactory accessibility, they will be preferred to the present daily struggle of the motorist to find parking space downtown. It is anticipated, for instance, that the legislation will provide for a price break for fringe parkers as an incentive for them to keep their cars out of the central business district.

The additional public parking facilities contemplated by the proposed legislation will in no way eliminate or impinge on existing privately operated parking facilities nor will they interfere with the expansion of private facilities. The need for off-street parking in most of our urban areas is so great that there is rapidly expanding patronage for both types of facilities.

There is no better time than right now for the development of Federally aided parking facilities. There are still 2,500 miles of urban freeways to be built under the Interstate Highway program, and such parking facilities can be planned and located so they will be integrated with the new freeways.

I don't want to give you the impression that additional parking facilities alone will automatically solve our urban traffic congestion problem. They won't. But I am confident they will help relieve the situation.

The Federal Highway Administration is exploring every possible avenue to increase the traffic-carrying capacity of existing roads so that vehicles might move more efficiently.

Research has already demonstrated that relatively inexpensive improvements to existing roads -- such things as reversible lanes, efficient signal timing, intelligent pavement parkings can accomplish what would require many millions of dollars of investment if we were to build entirely new road facilities. Surveillance and computerized traffic control systems in some of our large cities are demonstrating their tremendous value in improving traffic flow and reducing congestion, but their potential has hardly been explored up to now. Steps such as these can double urban traffic volumes and increase average speeds by 25 percent.

A new major effort has been launched by the Federal Highway Administration's Bureau of Public Roads to improve traffic flow in urban areas through the employment of traffic engineering techniques, rather than expensive construction or reconstruction of highways.

The program is known as "Traffic Operations Program to Increase Capacity and Safety." We call it TOPICS. It involves an expansion of the Federal-aid primary system to permit the selection of principal streets and

downtown grids in areas of 5,000 or more population to receive Federal assistance for traffic engineering improvements. Special attention will be paid to streets that carry a heavy burden of local traffic and also control the efficiency of trip movements between main highways and ultimate trip destination.

A new category of Federal-aid primary system will be established within urban areas which will be eligible for Federal aid on a 50-50 basis from regular Federal-aid apportionments. TOPICS may involve such improvements as channelized intersections; additional approach lanes to signalized intersections; left-turn lanes; pedestrian and highway grade separations; separate bus lanes; improved bus and truck loading stations; and coordinated traffic signal operations.

We are looking forward eagerly to the implementation of this program because we see in it an important contribution toward unsnarling the traffic congestion plaguing our cities. Several cities have been selected by the Bureau of Public Roads for a pilot project from which we expect to derive valuable information about traffic engineering improvements. What we learn in the pilot cities will aid other cities that ultimately will participate in the program.

What we are striving for, of course, is greater utilization of existing roads, thus providing more traffic service at minimum cost.

But improving the productivity of existing roads is far from the total answer to our urban traffic difficulties. Some of our larger cities are in desperate need of new urban freeways to speed traffic into and through congested areas if today's traffic bottlenecks are to be broken. The complete success of our Interstate System hinges to a degree on how effectively traffic moves through built-up streets.

We in the Federal Highway Administration are aware there is no pat, easy solution for our urban traffic problems. We are not only willing but anxious to explore every possibility that might help. We are acutely conscious of the responsibility that has been placed on us to provide the highway transportation system our country must have to sustain its viability. We welcome whatever assistance we can get from every segment of our society.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20591

REMARKS BY LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, FEDERAL
HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL HIGHWAY
ADMINISTRATION, U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION AT THE WESTERN GOVERNORS'
CONFERENCE, WEST YELLOWSTONE, MONTANA,
JUNE 27, 1967

The timing of your meeting here today, and your gracious invitation that I talk to you about the Department of Transportation's highway safety program, could not have been more propitious.

Just a few hours ago, in Washington, the Secretary of Transportation held a news conference at which he made public the uniform standards under which this critically important national program will begin to go forward. It is my purpose today to tell you about these standards -- what they contain and what they imply for the future safety of our national highway system. It is also my purpose to discuss with you some of the funding and other elements of the program which are not contained in the standards, but nevertheless are of vital interest to every State.

Were I to detail for you the intensive efforts which have contributed to development of the standards issued today, there would be little time left to discuss the standards themselves. Many, many people have devoted long hours and hard thought to the standards development process. Our first draft of uniform highway safety standards was issued in February

BRID LK

67 06 27

00138

2/28/69

F44-081

of this year. Between then and now, these proposals have been analyzed and improved by the efforts of the Governors and officials of the States; the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee appointed by President Johnson; and scores more of interested organizations and individuals in the public and private sectors. It is impressive to realize that so much has been accomplished in the short time span since Congress, at the urging of the President, enacted the National Highway Safety Act in September 1966.

Equally as impressive, however, is the magnitude of the task ahead. The Act of 1966, the subsequent work of these many public-spirited individuals, and the issuance today of the standards -- these are but fledgling steps in a national crusade to raise the level of highway safety in America to a point equalling the safety of our other transportation components. The real work still lies ahead. It is the work of translating the goals raised by these standards into meaningfully applied programs, and ultimately into achievements which can be measured in terms of lives saved, injuries prevented, and property damage avoided.

All of you, I am sure, are familiar with the areas in which these goals have been set. Our February release of draft standards set forth these 13 goal areas, which are consistent with the Act. They are Periodic Motor Vehicle Inspection; Motor Vehicle Registration; Motorcycle Safety; Driver

Education; Driver Licensing; Codes and Laws; Traffic Courts; Alcohol in Relation to Highway Safety; Identification and Surveillance of Accident Locations; Traffic Records; Emergency Medical Services; Highway Design, Construction and Maintenance; and Traffic Control Devices.

These also are the goal areas in which our final standards have been established. These are the areas, in other words, in which the Federal-State-local cooperative effort envisioned by the Act will initially stimulate new or improved State programs aimed at achieving higher levels of highway safety.

Let me briefly summarize for you the standards themselves:

PERIODIC MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTION -- Under this standard, each State shall have a program for periodic inspection of all registered vehicles or an experimental, pilot, or demonstration program approved by the Secretary of Transportation. Every registered vehicle in the State must be inspected at time of initial registration and at least annually thereafter, or at intervals designated under its approved experimental, pilot or demonstration program. The scope of inspections must equal or exceed criteria now being drafted by the National Highway Safety Bureau of the Federal Highway Administration.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION -- Each State is required by this standard to have a motor vehicle registration program, and a record-keeping system able to provide rapid identification of each vehicle and its

owner. These data will be made available for accident research and safety program development. Gross laden weight of all commercial vehicles also must be registered under this standard.

MOTORCYCLE SAFETY -- This standard requires that individuals must be licensed and examined specifically for the operation of motorcycles. Operators are required to wear approved helmet and eye protection when operating cycles, and seats and footrests are mandatory for motorcycle passengers, who must also wear approved safety helmets. Each cycle will have a rear-view mirror under this standard.

DRIVER EDUCATION -- Comprehensive driver training programs which meet standards set by the State will be made available to all youths of licensing age under this standard. It requires certification of instructors and licensing of commercial driving schools and also calls for research, development, and procurement of practice driving facilities such as simulators and other tools, for both school and adult training programs. Further, it requires training and retraining programs for adult drivers.

DRIVER LICENSING -- Each State will conduct a driver licensing program to insure that only persons physically and mentally qualified may drive -- and equally important, to prevent needless denial of the right to drive to any citizen. Physical and eyesight examinations, knowledge of traffic laws, ability to comprehend traffic signs and ability to operate the vehicle for which an individual is licensed, will be required by this standard. It directs

that drivers shall be re-examined at least once every four years for visual sharpness and knowledge of road rules. It calls also for establishment of a medical advisory board to advise the State licensing agency on physical and vision standards. And, it requires the keeping by each State of continuing records of driver histories as well as the means for quick retrieval of these data.

CODES AND LAWS -- Under this standard, each State will develop and implement a program to achieve uniformity of traffic codes and laws throughout the State, including uniform Rules of the Road for all public streets and highways. It also will be encouraged to develop a plan to make its Rules of the Road consistent with those of other States.

TRAFFIC COURTS -- A procedure by which State Traffic Courts notify the State traffic records system of all convictions for moving traffic violations is called for in this standard. Also, it recommends that individuals charged with hazardous moving traffic violations be required to appear in court. It further recommends uniform accounting systems in each State for traffic fines, and uniform court procedures for traffic cases.

ALCOHOL IN RELATION TO HIGHWAY SAFETY -- This standard requires that each State, in cooperation with its local subdivisions, develop a program to reduce traffic accidents generated by persons driving under the influence of alcohol. States are required to establish specific test procedures for determining a driver's blood alcohol content, and the blood

concentration level at which a driver may be deemed in these procedures to be intoxicated shall not be set higher than .10 percent by weight. A person placed under arrest for operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated or under the influence of alcohol is deemed to have given his implied consent to an alcohol content test. Finally, alcohol content examination of fatal accident victims and surviving drivers of such accidents is urged by the standard.

IDENTIFICATION AND SURVEILLANCE OF ACCIDENT LOCATIONS

-- Under this standard, each State, in cooperation with its county and other local governments, will operate a program for identifying and investigating high accident locations and maintaining surveillance of locales with high accident rates. A systematic program for development of methods for making safety corrections at these locations also is required in the standard. Measures are called for to reduce accidents, and to evaluate safety improvements at these sites.

TRAFFIC RECORDS -- A Statewide system, and compatible local systems, to include all traffic data for the entire State, are required by this standard. These systems will be capable of providing summaries, tabulations, and special analyses of data, and they will include driver, vehicle, accident, and road records that are compatible for purposes of analysis and correction.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE -- By this standard each State, cooperating with its local subdivisions, will have a program to insure prompt emergency medical care for accident victims. The standard calls for first-aid training for emergency service personnel. It requires development of criteria for the use of two-way communications systems for dispatching aid. Further, it specifies that systems for operating and coordinating ambulances and other emergency care facilities will be established. The standard also calls for comprehensive State planning of emergency medical services.

HIGHWAY DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE -- This standard directs that existing street and highways be maintained in a condition that improves safety, with modernization of existing roads and new highways being carried out under safety standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administrator. It requires lighting of expressways and other major arteries in urbanized areas, high accident locations, and major intersections. And, it calls for such design features as clear roadsides, break-away signs, special guardrails and bridgerails, and signs at freeway interchanges directing motorists to emergency care facilities.

TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES -- The final standard directs that each State, in cooperation with county and local governments, will have a program for traffic control devices (signs, signals, markings, etc.) which will

conform with standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administrator. Existing control devices also are required to be upgraded to conform these standards. Preventive maintenance, repair, and day-and-night inspection of all traffic control devices is called for by this standard.

Each standard provides, incidentally, for periodic evaluation of programs developed or improved under it. This will be carried out by our National Highway Safety Bureau in cooperation with the States.

Let me touch briefly on some of the broad questions relating to implementation of the standards.

As you are aware, no basis was -- or could have been -- available to the Congress for estimating the long-term cost of carrying out the national highway safety program. Congress therefore wrote into the Act a requirement that we submit to it, by January 10, 1968, a detailed estimate of the cost of continuing the program. This will be accompanied by recommendations for Federal, State and local matching funds. We will work closely with the States, of course, in developing this estimate. While it is premature to predict the levels which we will estimate in January for the program's future costs, there is no doubt that they will be substantially higher than our presently authorized funds.

Our current authorizations through the period ending June 30, 1968, total \$167 million. As the law directs, 75 percent of the authorized Federal-aid

funds for State and local highway safety programs have been apportioned to the States on a population basis. The act gives the Secretary discretion in apportioning the remaining 25 percent of the funds, and we are currently developing a formula for that apportionment.

Within each State, the Federal-aid funds provided in the Act will be allocated on the basis of State programs whose implementation or improvement is aimed at achieving the performance goals raised by our standards. Also as directed by the law, at least 40 percent of the funds thus apportioned will be directed at the advancement of local-level highway safety programs intended to meet the goals of the standards.

Each State seeking to qualify under the Federal-aid provisions of the Act must show, first, that it is in the process of implementing or improving programs aimed at achieving the goals of our standards and, second, that current expenditures for such programs by the State and its political subdivisions -- exclusive of Federal funds -- equal or exceed the average level of such expenditures for the two full fiscal years which preceded enactment of the National Highway Safety Act.

During the course of developing the highway safety program standards announced today, we have been asked many questions, from many quarters, about the "policy" under which these standards will be administered. Rather than attempt to sum up the questions, let me instead take the more meaningful task of summing up the answers.

Our approach to the standards -- some might call it "policy" -- is this: We believe that the National Highway Safety Act of 1966 represented the intention of Congress that the Federal Government support, stimulate, and help the States toward achieving the nationally mandated goal of much greater safety on America's highway network. We believe that despite disparities between the levels of road safety in many States, every State wants to and can do more than it is now doing to improve highway safety. So we see the future of our standards, and the State programs initiated or improved under them, as a future of close cooperation between and among the Federal and State governments in this area of critical national need.

One specific question relating to our approach perhaps deserves an added comment at this meeting. We have been asked on numerous occasions about the Act's language giving the Secretary discretion to withhold 10 percent of a State's Federal-aid highway fund apportionment if that State has not complied with the Act and our standards. As has been stated by every involved official of the Department of Transportation, we believe that the Congress intended us to take a totally reasonable approach to the administration of the Act -- an approach characterized by Federal-State cooperation and joint progress, and certainly not by an adversary relationship between the parties. That is our approach today. That will be our approach in January 1969 -- the earliest point in time at which the provision can become operable. And that will be our approach throughout the future of this program.

In closing, let me talk briefly about that future. Wisely, I think, the Congress placed no hard and fast time limitations upon either the implementation of the standards issued today, or upon the process of developing additional standards. Our goal is progress in both areas. We will look for continuing progress in every State under the standards issued today. And, through the developmental process which produced these standards, we will seek to identify and define additional areas in which such performance objectives for State highway safety programs may be needed.

Finally, the future success of this effort will depend in large measure upon the public's awareness and understanding of it. There will be many questions and some misunderstandings generated by our standards and the State's programs to effect them. So it is vitally important for all of us involved in this effort and committed to its success to communicate fully and productively with the public at every opportunity concerning our actions and goals. The Secretary of Transportation has asked the Federal Highway Administration to spearhead Federal participation in this area, and we will work closely with every State toward that end.

The Nation's crying need for safer highways is common to every citizen, every community, and every State. Our striving to meet that need must be a common striving. I deem it an honor, a privilege, and a challenge to share in it with you.

Thank you.

mu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20591

REMARKS BY LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, FEDERAL HIGHWAY
ADMINISTRATOR, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,
DETROIT, MICHIGAN, JULY 31, 1967

Thank you for your kind invitation to speak here. I am delighted at the opportunity to discuss with you the implications of our recently issued highway safety standards. I am well aware of your special interest in these standards, and in programs which they will generate, and I hope that my remarks will be directed to that interest and to answering some of the questions you might have about this entire highway safety program.

The issue of death, injury, and damage as unhappy byproducts of our otherwise impressive national highway system is, of course, central to the new standards and to the National Highway Safety Act of 1966 which mandated them. It is an issue which only now is beginning to receive the degree of concern and understanding necessary to stimulate a meaningful corrective campaign.

Our traditional national attitude toward highway safety has been characterized all too often by indifference. Losses in lives, in injuries, and in property damages have been largely accepted with an individual and national sort of

FR
0970

~~160731~~

26568 FAA-5#1

00099

fatalism -- a fatalism that smacks more of medieval superstition than of 20th Century scientific reasoning.

For year after year, in no other aspect of our society has life been so casually taken or lost. Many states and communities, not to mention individuals, scarcely bothered to take the subject of traffic safety seriously. There was a great deal of lip service paid, and large numbers of "safety campaigns" consisting of slogans, phrases, and catch words. You're all familiar with this type of effort. For one week, or one month, there is a concerted campaign involving all local communications media urging people to "Stay Alive" -- "Be a Safe Driver" -- "Drive Carefully" -- or "Obey Traffic Signals" -- or "Work through your church or PTA for greater traffic safety."

Now, however, our relationship to automobile safety is entering a new phase. There is thankfully an increasing national concern with the hard, complex issues of safety on our highway system, and a growing willingness to at least examine the automobile, the highway, and the driver in that context. We seem, at last, to be shedding our fatalistic view as regards highway accidents, and to be arriving at

the realization that if we can conquer space, we can surely devise scientific ways to reduce the carnage on our highways -- that maybe all of these highway deaths and injuries are not, after all, "ordained by fate."

We cannot be absolutely sure what has caused this rapidly emerging change in attitude. Perhaps it has been the very burden of numbers -- the cumulative effect of emphasizing the numbers of crashes and fatalities -- finally penetrating our collective shell of indifference. How often the grim statistics have been cited:

-- By almost ten to one over all crimes of violence, injury-producing highway crashes are by far the leading form of violence in our daily life.

-- Almost 10,000 injuries each day. Imagine the public outcry if the Defense Department reported 10,000 wounded each day in Viet Nam.

-- 52,500 highway deaths last year, an average of more than 140 per day.

-- Economic losses each year near the \$10 billion mark.

The increasingly staggering totals have at last prompted public demands resulting in Congressional action -- providing two primary pieces of legislation which together comprise a

balanced attack on the entire problem. It is our job to help carry out the intent of this legislation, and it is difficult to put a measure to the magnitude of the job ahead of us. Concisely stated, the legislation calls for a national crusade to raise the level of highway safety to a point approaching the safety of our other transportation modes.

The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 provides us authority to set safety standards for automobiles, their tires, and equipment. You are all aware, I am sure, of this phase of the overall attack. Our concern here today, however, is with the Highway Safety Act, which in our view holds the greatest potential for -- and over the long haul will be infinitely more critical to -- the overall goal of reducing traffic accidents, injuries and deaths.

As you are probably well aware, Federal standards have been issued under the Act which set program and performance goals in 13 separate areas. They are: Periodic Motor Vehicle Inspection; Motor Vehicle Registration; Motorcycle Safety; Driver Education; Driver Licensing; Codes and Laws; Traffic Courts; Alcohol in Relation to Highway Safety; Identification

and Surveillance of Accident Locations; Traffic Records; Emergency Medical Services; Highway Design, Construction, and Maintenance; and Traffic Control Devices.

In other words, these are the areas in which the Act envisions a cooperative effort between Federal, State, and local governments to stimulate new and improved programs aimed at achieving higher levels of highway safety. However, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that this is not -- repeat NOT -- a Federal program. It is a national program calling for substantial State and local effort, and depending in the main for its success on the effectiveness of that State and local effort.

Let me summarize briefly the meaning of the standards which have been issued.

PERIODIC MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTION -- Under this standard, each State shall have a program for periodic inspection of all registered vehicles -- or an experimental, pilot, or demonstration program approved by the Secretary of Transportation. Every registered vehicle in the State must be inspected at the time of initial registration, and at least annually thereafter, or at intervals designated under an approved experimental, pilot, or demonstration program. The scope of the inspections

must equal or exceed criteria now being drafted by the National Highway Safety Bureau of the Federal Highway Administration.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION -- Each State is required by this standard to have a motor vehicle registration program, and a record-keeping system able to provide rapid identification of each vehicle and its owner. These data will be made available for accident research and safety program development. Gross laden weight of all commercial vehicles also must be registered under this standard.

MOTORCYCLE SAFETY -- This standard requires that individuals must be licensed and examined specifically for the operation of motorcycles. Operators must be required to wear approved helmet and eye protection when operating cycles, and seats and footrests are mandatory for motorcycle passengers, who must also wear approved safety helmets. Each cycle will have a rear-view mirror.

DRIVER EDUCATION -- Comprehensive driver training programs which meet standards set by the States will be made available to all youths of licensing age under this standard. Further, it requires training and retraining programs for adult drivers.

It requires certification of instructors and licensing of commercial driving schools, and also calls for research, development, and procurement of practice-driving facilities such as simulators and other devices, for both school and adult training programs.

DRIVER LICENSING -- Each State will conduct a driver licensing program to insure that only persons physically and mentally qualified may drive -- equally important, to prevent needless denial of the right to drive to any citizen. Physical and eyesight examinations, knowledge of traffic laws, ability to comprehend traffic signs, and ability to operate the vehicle for which an individual is licensed will be required by this standard. It directs that drivers shall be re-examined at least once every four years for visual acuity and knowledge of road rules. It also calls for establishment of a medical advisory board to advise the State licensing agency on physical and vision standards; and it requires each State to keep continuing records of driver histories as well as the means for quick retrieval of the data.

CODES AND LAWS -- Under this standard, each State will develop and implement a program to achieve uniform Rules of

the Road for all public streets and highways. It also will be encouraged to develop a plan to make its Rules of the Road consistent with those of other States.

TRAFFIC COURTS -- A procedure by which State traffic courts notify the State traffic records system of all convictions for moving traffic violations is called for under this standard. Also it recommends that individuals charged with hazardous moving violations be required to appear in court. It further recommends uniform accounting systems in each State for traffic fines, and uniform court procedures for traffic cases.

ALCOHOL IN RELATION TO HIGHWAY SAFETY -- This standard requires that each State, in cooperation with local subdivisions, develop a program to reduce traffic accidents generated by persons driving under the influence of alcohol. States are required to establish specific test procedures for determining a driver's blood alcohol content; and the blood concentration level at which a driver may be deemed to be intoxicated shall not be set higher than .10 percent by weight. A person placed under arrest for operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated or under the influence of alcohol is deemed to have given his implied consent to an alcohol content test. Finally, alcohol content examination of accident fatalities and

surviving drivers involved in fatal accidents is urged by this standard.

IDENTIFICATION AND SURVEILLANCE OF ACCIDENT LOCATIONS --

Under this standard, each State, in cooperation with its county and other local governments, will operate a program for identifying and investigating high accident locations and maintaining surveillance of locales with high accident rates. A systematic program for developing methods for making safety corrections at these locations is also required.

TRAFFIC RECORDS -- A statewide system, and compatible local systems, to include all traffic data for the entire State, are required by this standard. These systems will be capable of providing summaries, tabulations, and special analysis of data. They will include driver, vehicle, accident, and road records that are compatible for purposes of analysis and correction.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE -- By this standard, each State, cooperating with its local subdivisions, will have a program to insure prompt emergency medical care for accident victims. The standard calls for first-aid training for emergency service personnel. It requires development of

criteria for the use of two-way communications systems for dispatching aid. Further, it specifies that systems for operating and coordinating ambulances and other emergency care facilities will be established. The standard also calls for comprehensive State planning of emergency medical services.

HIGHWAY DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE -- This standard directs that existing streets and highways be maintained in a condition that improves safety, with modernization of existing roads and construction of new roads being carried out under safety standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administrator. It requires lighting of expressways and other major arteries in urbanized areas, high accident locations, and major intersections. And it calls for such design features as clear roadsides, break-away signs, special guardrails and bridge rails, and signs at freeway interchanges directing motorists to emergency care facilities.

TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES -- The final standard directs that each State, in cooperation with county and local governments, will have a program for traffic control devices -- signs, signals, markings, etc. -- which will conform to standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway

Administrator. Existing control devices are required to be updated to conform to the standards, and preventive maintenance, repair, and day-and-night inspection of all traffic control devices is called for.

Those, then, are the areas of interest. I would like, in my remaining time, to discuss these standards from the standpoint of how counties and other local governmental units fit into this safety program and the implementation of the standards.

First of all, recognize that the legislation itself provides that 40 percent of all Federal funds in the program must be spent by local -- that is, city and county -- government units. (That is, unless the Governor submits a request to the Secretary of Transportation, who can waive this requirement for an individual State if it is determined that there will be an insufficient number of local highway safety programs in the State to justify the expenditure of such a large percentage of Federal funds during the fiscal year.)

The key to your participation, then, is for local governmental units -- both cities and counties -- to pick up the ball. Work closely with your Governor and his

designated people. Remember, he has jurisdiction over the State programs, and he is responsible for his State meeting the standards. However, at the same time, you should be working diligently at your own county level to develop a plan and programs for your county which will be compatible with the State activities.

I am sure that as I went through the standards, you all recognized that some of the areas covered are actually better administered locally than at the State level. This is characteristic of the program -- each aspect has its own best level for administration. The counties should be looking closely at programs which can best be administered at the county level. Herein lies the potential for the development of new and improved programs which will qualify for Federal matching funds.

For example, driver education programs may well involve county governments to a great extent -- both the young driver training programs and the adult retraining programs.

You should be drawing up your own programs to assist in attaining uniformity of traffic codes and laws, and uniform records, accounting systems, fines and penalties in your traffic court systems.

The standards require your cooperation in the development of programs to reduce accidents involving the drinking driver and in providing facilities for administering tests to determine alcohol blood content.

Counties will surely be involved in the identification and surveillance of high accident locations.

You will be required to have, and should be working toward the development of, traffic record systems that will be compatible with your State system.

Most assuredly you will be deeply involved in developing plans for providing emergency medical services and facilities. You are probably aware that your Association has already been granted a research contract in this particular area of interest in which so little has been done. It is rather shocking, and sobering, I think, to learn that according to our best information only two States -- New York and Louisiana -- required first-aid training for ambulance attendants prior to this year. This is but one indication of how much remains to be done.

Updating, improving, and installing uniform control devices, signs, and markings provide another area in which

county governments in some States may be involved. In short, there is plenty to be done -- for all of us. We have but taken the first fledgling steps in what must surely become a massive national effort. This program will not reach maturity overnight. Too many answers are still missing, the issues are far too complex, and the needed changes far too profound.

We should all be aware that changes and transitions such as called for in this program do not occur without some public turbulence. This entire matter of highway safety, in all its dimensions, is -- in essence -- a problem of man in relation to his environment. We are fortunate, I believe, in that the American public, private industry, and various levels of government are showing a very encouraging and constructive attitude on the issue thus far. This might indicate that the social turbulence may be less than could have been expected.

Nevertheless, I think a word of warning is in order as to the financing of these programs. Congress has written into the Act a requirement that we submit to it by January 10 of next year, a detailed estimate of the cost of continuing

this program. This cost estimate will be accompanied by recommendations for Federal-State, and local matching funds. We will, of course, work closely with the States, counties and cities in developing these estimates.

In closing, let me add this as to the Federal government's approach to this program and to implementing the standards. From the Department of Transportation to the lowest office in the Federal Highway Administration, we view this program this way: We believe the Act represents the intention of the Congress that the Federal government support, stimulate, encourage, and help the States to greatly improve highway safety. We believe, despite the many disparities between levels of performance and effectiveness of safety programs among the many States, that every State wants to and can do more than it is now doing to improve highway safety.

We see the standards, and the State programs that will be initiated or improved under them, as a potential for close cooperation between the States and the Federal government in this area of critical national need.

We believe that Congress intended us to take a totally reasonable approach in administering the Act, and we intend

so to do. We envision our role as one of cooperation and joint progress with the States -- certainly not one of an adversary relationship between parties. We believe our mandate is to work with the States and local communities in a mutual effort to substantially reduce the slaughter on our highways.

We firmly believe that the effectiveness of this effort depends on the concerted attack that will be waged by State and local governments. We in Washington can provide financial assistance, establish broad goals, and set forth guidelines. We cannot tell how you must do the job. How you reach the stated goals in each standard, and for that matter, how effective your State and local programs are -- this is entirely up to you.

I can, however, think of no greater challenge, and of no more important or worthwhile endeavor which merits our minds and our dedication. I know that you and your Association will join us in this critical effort.