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

STATEMENT BY LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR BEFORE THE OHIO SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS, CLEVELAND, MARCH 28, 1968, NOON

Thank you for this opportunity to return to Ohio and visit with you again. This past year, ending next Monday, April 1, has been the first year for the Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration. I won't attempt at this time to enumerate or assess the year's accomplishments in the Federal Highway program. But I do want to discuss what I believe may turn out to be a most significant development.

I am referring to our efforts to deal with the vexing problems of highway location and design in urban areas by calling on the talent, training, background and experience of several professional disciplines in addition to highway engineering.

The past year saw the first attempts to devise the administrative or institutional machinery necessary to carry out such an approach.

Today I would like to talk first about the need for the multidisciplined attack on urban highway problems; second, the general considerations involved and objectives to be sought; and finally, an example of how this translates into a program of action.

Our interest in innovation results from our recognition of a major problem, one that has been inadequately or unsatisfactorily met by existing techniques.

The problem is not how to build superior highway facilities. The development and refinement of the controlled-access freeway for the fast, efficient and relatively safe movement of people and goods has contributed enormously to the opportunities we enjoy today.

Rather, the problem is in the way we go about planning, locating and designing such facilities for highway transportation. Here, our accomplishments too often leave much to be desired.

Our performance has earned us a battery of critics. Their voices often are shrill; they speak a mixture of fiction and truth; but what they say cannot be dismissed.

I believe they have a real message. They are expressing relative degrees of dissatisfaction. They are telling us to do better. And they are stating the public belief that the development of highway transportation and its facilities must be much more closely related to a whole range of other public and private policies being developed simultaneously.

The hard fact is that in too many instances the close relationship necessary between a highway facility and the neighborhood it serves is not adequately evaluated and analyzed and planned in terms of the intimate human activities which take place in and around that neighborhood.

This is the fundamental reason why in city after city, real, intense and meaningful opposition has developed to the planning and construction of certain highway facilities.

The list of cities -- and it includes Cleveland -- is becoming all too numerous.

I see these so-called "anti-freeway revolts" as the manifestation of a breakdown in coordination of the values and assumptions and goals of urban dwellers, on one hand, with those of highway developers, on the other. They also show the failure of both sides to enter into the kind of communications which would close the gap.

The results can be wasteful and costly delay in the provision of needed transportation facilities, and painful and unnecessary degradation of non-transportation urban values. Is the situation so deep-seated as to defy solution? Or, as recent events in a few cities indicate, can it be resolved in favor of better cities and better highways?

I think we can have both.

But to do it, we must make substantial modifications in our methods of doing business -- and more importantly -- in our attitudes.

Highway planning, notwithstanding all of its highly diverse and complicated engineering detail, is not and cannot be a completely quantifiable process in which all elements can be measured and tested and assigned numbers representing cost, capacity and other criteria going into the decision process. To do that, we almost certainly would be ignoring, or at least not giving adequate weight and value to the unqualifiable elements which are equally important.

How do you measure the social viability of a neighborhood? How do you assign a number value to the social maturity and stability of a residential area? How do you test and assign a cost to the convenience of children going to an established school district, or parishoners to their church?

Lacking that ability to measure and test and quantify, we can weigh these factors properly only if we bring the right kind of talent to bear on the subject -- talent able to dig deeply enough into all of the social, cultural and economic factors to thoroughly understand them and then evaluate them with the attitude that the highway facility is only one element or thread in the fabric which represents the city, neighborhood or area concerned.

We are not choosing between a highway facility and the quality of the environment. Instead, we are analyzing, evaluating and making decisions within our policy and program responsibilities which will have consequences for good or bad in an influence area far beyond the edge of the right-of-way.

In order to accomplish the difficult and complicated task before us, we need the kind of talent, training and experience that is represented by several disciplines. The design of a highway is an engineering task. The planning and location of a highway facility involves many considerations other than engineering.

These considerations, of course, include the Federal, State, metropolitan and individual community goals. It is our responsibility in the highway program to see that we utilize our program authority and resources to meet those goals and objectives to the fullest extent possible -- either through direct action within the scope of the highway project or through support to other programs and agencies.

Each community is unique, and community goals must be identified on an individual basis. But there are several general areas of concern which are likely to be encountered in any major urban highway project, and I would like to review these briefly.

First, from a transportation standpoint, there is a need to plan and design a network which will accommodate the types and volumes of traffic anticipated for the ensuing 20 years, as required by Federal-aid highway legislation.

Federal law also requires that the alternative design concepts give full regard to safety, durability, economy of maintenance and "the particular needs of (the) locality."

Alternative design concepts should optimize the use of space (in all dimensions) which can legally be acquired under State and Federal laws. Through multiple uses of space in the highway corridor, other identified goals and objectives can be achieved. To this end, Federal policy will favor the coordinated construction of the highway and other facilities. This means that foundation work for other than highway facilities should be an integral part of development of highway construction plans, to the maximum extent possible, and would be eligible for Federal participation as a part of project costs.

Another concern is to maintain the tax base, represented largely by real property ratables, to the maximum extent -- and to enlarge it if possible. This objective is closely related to the joint use of space and places emphasis on the private development of facilities in combination with public improvements such as the highway.

Maintaining the social stability of affected residential areas is another important objective. In some situations, a significant number of residential properties will have to be removed, under almost any set of design concepts. This may or may not significantly interfere with the social stability of the neighborhoods depending upon the relocation policies and actions by the State, the communities, the institutions, and private interests. Highest priority on maintaining the neighborhood and adopting a complementary and supporting relocation program should go to those families which perfer to remain in the neighborhood.

Where low income families are affected, a viable relocation program

must recognize economic ability of the families as well as such factors as proximity to places of employment; educational and religious institutions; social, recreational and cultural facilities; and ethnic groups. It also must recognize family relationships. Several programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development can be brought to bear on this problem, particularly if HUD and the Federal Highway Administration work in concert. The opportunities for greater cooperation between the two Federal programs are increasing with the designation of Model Cities neighborhoods in several planned highway improvement areas.

Obviously, relocation plans cannot be based only upon joint development of replacement housing within the highway right-of-way. It must include the full range of alternatives, including exchanging an existing non-residential land use in the neighborhood outside the right-of-way for additional residential space. That is, joint use space may be made available for a commerical or industrial activity in order to make the space it now occupies available for residential purposes.

Consideration should be given from the beginning of the positive influence a highway facility can produce in delineating land uses. A possibility that should not be overlooked is the design concept of independent roadways, with development of "median" thus created.

Another probable objective is the maintenance or development of job producing commercial and industrial activities. The joint planning of industrial parks or shopping centers quickly suggest themselves. Another possibility concerns existing commercial or industrial activities, with close affinity to the community, that are being carried on in old and inefficient buildings. Might not they welcome the opportunity for private investment in new facilities if public programs assembled the space, land or air, for their use?

Maintaining or improving community amenities and aesthetics is yet another goal which cannot be ignored. These factors are difficult, if not impossible, to define and quantify. But they are real and must be given realistic consideration. For now, I will just offer to define them as the human relationship and interaction with churches, schools, places of recreation, avenues of communication, retail shops and landscape setting.

These, then, are some of the general considerations and goals that will likely be accounted for in design concept studies. Many others could be involved, such as the interplay of highway transportation with recreation or historic sites, or with academic or religious institutions.

Interaction between personnel engaged in studying the design concept alternatives and the affected public is essential. In view of the fact that some of the goals and objectives involve factors which are difficult or impossible to quantify, they can be "measured" and assigned relative importance only through the expressed views of these to whom these factors are of significant consideration. Interaction means two-way communication so it also gives project personnel the opportunity to explain the consequences of any alternative actions or decisions.

In this connection, I believe it would be most desirable for a State highway department to establish readily accessible offices and encourage people from the affected communities to visit, explain their points of view and receive information on the planning project. Apprehension of the unknown almost always represents a more difficult problem than the results of rational communication and exchange of views.

I stated at the outset that I wanted to follow up this general discussion of the multi-discipline design concept approach with an actual example. Our prototype is the "Baltimore Design Concept Team," which was formed last year to plan and conceptually design the city's limited access highway system. Its specific institutional arrangements may or may not be the best way to go about the job. Others will be tried in other locations.

The Baltimore team, however, recognizes that the tasks we face are so complex that various talents are needed to work on them.

This team represents engineers, architects, sociologists, urban planners, economists, and others. It was assembled to examine the highway corridor, and location and design alternative within it -- and all this in the framework of overall community goals and plans. On the basis of its analysis, the team will recommend to the city and the State a program for the development of highways and other community improvements to achieve identifiable opportunities in the broadest range of community values.

The team is subdividing its activities into three time frames: development of its conceptual framework, followed by feasibility and schematic studies, followed by actual design of the programs it will recommend.

Within each time frame, smaller "teams" are assigned specific tasks. One team is undertaking analysis of the entire transportation system, present and projected, as a basis for coordination between that system and the planned highway segment. Another is conducting in-depth study of the broad area through which the corridors pass, determining the qualities, quantities and values of its social, economic, structural, historical, open space characteristics. This team, which is spending much of its time talking with and listening to groups and individuals in the corridor, ultimately will be looked to for identification of neighborhood hopes and needs which should be fulfilled in the resulting projects.

A third team, meanwhile, is exploring the opportunities for "joint

development" -- multiple use of space -- above, below and along the highway presented by the project. Their work ranges from abstracting pertinent zoning zoning laws to analyzing current and needed housing, industrial and school development plans. At a later point in the planning process, they will also become concerned with structural design questions presented by potential joint development opportunities offered by the highway.

How could fragmented and uncoordinated programs -- and funds -- of three levels of government and the private sector be pulled together into the cohesive force necessary to translate the planner's products into applied programs? The job of a fourth team within the "joint venture" is to find the answers to that question.

A fifth team is concerned with the design of a harmonious highway facility which will meet the highest attainable engineering, safety, operating and esthetic standards. A sixth provides close and constant liaison between the joint venture and governmental programs. Finally, a monitoring team carries oversight responsibility for the entire process.

At dozens of points, formal review and coordination will be required between and among the various small teams. In addition, they work together on a day-to-day basis, sharing talents and resources whenever necessary. At key intervals, they will submit progress and planning reports for review by the city and the State.

Public meetings to discuss the project already have been held in neighborhoods and communities along the corridors, in addition to scores of less formal contacts between the planners, city and State officials, and citizens and business interests. The joint venture and neighborhood

groups will maintain local offices in neighborhoods along the corridor, at which personnel and material will be available to explain details of the planning process, and to listen to the views of residents and businessmen.

There has been some grumbling, of course, from those who believe that the system has been needlessly and expensively delayed by the planning process. One cannot deny there have been delays. But don't overlook the alternatives to this kind of delay -- alternatives which include a poorly designed and disruptive highway through the city; a loss of irreplaceable community values; a missed opportunity to substantially improve the quality of living in the city; possibly, placards and court suits; possibly, no highway at all.

Perhaps most important of all, the city, State and Federal Governments, the businesses, churches, schools, and the whole community will know that full resources were brought to bear on the program.

In the final analysis, the success of the highway program -- or any public works program -- in any city will depend upon the initiative of the people to identify and articulate their own future.

As highway developers and as citizens, we must do everything within our power to foster that iniative.

Thank you.

# # #

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

REMARKS OF LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR
PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE LOGAN COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
ANNUAL BANQUET, LOGAN COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA, MAY 7, 1968

I am happy to have this opportunity to discuss with you the Appalacian Highway Program both because of what it means to you and because it is a classic substantiation of the philosophy that underlies highway building.

To those concerned with supplying the Nation with the highway transportation facilities it needs, there is a direct link between a road improvement and the sociological and economic well-being of the United States.

The advantageous effects are first felt by those living in the immediate vicinity of the roadway. Benefits are then enjoyed by those living in the corridor traversed. And like a pebble dropped in a body of water, the ripples spread far and wide until the State and Nation reap the benefits resulting from improved accessibility and mobility.

For too many years, Appalachia has suffered from an insufficiency of highway transportation. Here is a beautiful area of our country, bountifully endowed with natural resources but with a virtually untapped potential for tourist, recreational, commerical and industrial development partially because of the lack of adequate transportation facilities.

The Appalachian Mountain range stretching in a general northeast to southwest direction has been and still is a barrier to the east-west and north-south movement of goods and people.

Much has been written about Appalachia in the past. But probably the best description I have read was in the report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission published in 1964 which said:

"Appalachia is a region apart - geographically and statistically. It is a mountain land boldly upthrust between the prosperous eastern seaboard and the industrial Middle West - a highland region which sweeps diagonally across 11 States from northern Pennsylvania to northern Alabama. Its ridges and twisted spurs and valleys measure to 165,000 square miles - an area 10 times the size of Switzerland.

"Appalachia has natural advantages which might normally have been the base for a thriving industrial and commercial complex. Below its surface lie some of the Nation's richest mineral deposits, including the seams which have provided almost two-thirds of the Nation's coal supply. The region receives an annual rainfall substantially above the national average. More than three-fifths of the land is forested. Its mountains offer some of the most beautiful landscapes in America, readily lending themselves to tourism and recreation.

"Yet this natural endowment has benefited too few of the 15.3 million people of Appalachia."

But in 1965, through enactment of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, Congress took affirmative action aimed at opening the region to development. Among other things, the Act provided for a system of roads throughout Appalachia that would augment the Interstate and Federal-aid primary and secondary systems. During the course of committee hearings preceding the approval of the Act, it became obvious from the testimony of witnesses that what Appalachia needed above all was an adequate highway system that would penetrate the region's isolation.

This view was shared by the President's Commission which said: "The remoteness and isolation of this region lying directly adjacent to the greatest concentrations of people and wealth in the country is the very basis of the Appalachian lag." The Commission emphasized the need for highways by pointing out: "Its (Appalachia) penetration by an adequate transportation network is the first requisite of its full participation in industrial America."

As you know, the 1965 Act authorized $840 million in Federal funds for the construction of 2,350 miles of development highways and 1,000 miles of local access roads over a six-year period. States included in the program were Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia. The Act was amended in 1967 and authorized

an additional $175 million in Federal funds for the construction of 350 more miles of development highways and 600 more miles of local access roads. Mississippi was added to the list of States.

The 2,700 miles of development highways will improve accessibility of the region, and reduce both the time and cost of highway transportation to and within Appalachia. We anticipate that when they are completed, they will help accelerate the overall development of the region. The reduction in cost of transportation will be reflected in the price of goods and thereby will place Appalachian industrial plants on a better competitive basis with industries elsewhere. The same will hold true for agricultural and forestry products. Within Appalachia, the worker will be able to accept desirable employment at distances from his home which now are virtually closed to him because of transportation difficulties.

The 1,600 miles of access roads will serve special recreational, residential, commercial and industrial needs, and will facilitate school consolidation programs. These roads may provide feeder links to development highways or Interstate routes. Some are local service routes to industrial parks. Some will exploit the potential of new investments in recreation.

You in West Virginia have an important stake in this program. With $1.015 billion authorized by Congress for highways within the region, $945 million is to be used for construction of the development system. The Appalachian Regional Commission has alloted $261,908,000 or 27.7 percent of the $945 million to West Virginia.

This is a sizeable share of the total amount. Your State will have about 428 miles or about 15.9 percent of the 2,700 miles authorized by the Appalachian legislation.

For the construction of local access roads, West Virginia has been allocated $5,371,159 of the $70 million authorized by Congress for this type of highway.

The normal Federal share of Appalachian funds is 70 percent, except for the development highway system where funds for construction of 4-lane highways is limited to 50 percent.

To date, $50.2 million has been made available to West Virginia for expenditure on the development highway system, and your State has obligated $34.1 million of this amount.

Local access road funds made available by Congress for immediate expenditure have been limited to $1,833,000, which includes $1,333,000 to be used toward replacing the Point Pleasant Bridge that collapsed into the Ohio River last December, taking 46 lives. The total cost of the bridge and its approaches has been estimated at $17 million. In addition to Appalachian funds, the bridge will be financed with money from the Federal Highway Trust Fund, and money from the States of Ohio and West Virginia.

Total obligations for local access roads stand at $387,030.

To you in Logan County, the development highway system should prove of incalculable importance. Your county will have 24 miles of the 84-mile-long Corridor G extending from the Kentucky line near Williamson northerly to Charleston where it will be a 4-lane divided facility with the cost of construction estimated at $133 million.

The schedule for Corridor G calls for the acquisition of right-of-way this year and next year, while construction will start in 1969 and continue into 1971.

Even though there ultimately will be 3,750 miles of the Interstate System in Appalachia, this mileage will not have a major effect on the more isolated and undeveloped areas of the region. But the Appalachian development system consisting of 21 route corridors will form a regional network of highways complementing the Interstate System. These routes, integrated with other Federal-aid highways, will provide access to areas not served by the Interstate System.

Corridor G will figuratively bring Logan County closer to the Interstate System, enabling your county to take advantage of the Interstate's many benefits. With improved highway transportation, there is a strong possibility that the decrease in population your county has experienced will be reversed. I understand that the population has fallen from 61,570 in 1960 to an estimated 56,425 in 1965.

I am sure many of those who left did so to seek employment elsewhere. As I mentioned earlier, a good highway will enable job seekers to cover a wider radius, and if successful they can commute from their homes. It will no longer be necessary to move away to find employment in another area.

I am sure you have heard it said that America does not have its excellent highway transportation system because we are a rich country, but that we are affluent because of our unsurpassed highway system.

This may be overstating the case somewhat, but the statement does contain much more than just a kernel of truth. I doubt that the United States could have attained its high standard of living without a highway transportation system that enables people and goods to move efficiently.

The converse certainly is true. Those areas of the United States which lack an adequate highway transportation system invariably hurt and hurt badly. In a sense they are cut off from the mainstream of American life and are unable to share in the benefits that the most affluent society in history has to offer. Economic growth is stunted because business and industry are disinterested in areas without the transportation facilities they must have. As a result, these areas suffer, even though they may have the potential for economic development.

Not only are such areas economically depressed but they are sociologically disadvantaged as well. Young people impatiently look forward to the time when they will be old enough to leave for fields of lusher employment opportunities. As a result, these areas often are abandoned by the youth whose initiative, imagination and energy are so important to the welfare of an area.

What is tragic about this whole problem is that the young people frequently leave beautiful parts of the country such as you have in Appalachia for urban areas with their tensions, congestion, pollution, and high crime rates.

I don't mean to imply that improved roads alone would halt the

urban gravitation that has been underway for some time. But I do feel that many would prefer remaining home if they were not so isolated, and if there were greater economic opportunities for them.

The Appalachian Highway Program should prove a boon to the 13-State region that will benefit. The new highways that are planned will eliminate some of the restraints that have socially and economically isolated sections of the region.

You may be interested in the progress of the program. As of March 31, Federal and State funds totalling $410 million were obligated for development highways and local access roads. The Federal share was $244 million.

About 464 miles were completed or under construction, an increase of 70 miles since December 31, 1967. Completed mileage totalled 87 for development highways and 58 for access roads. Engineering and right-of-way acquisition were underway on 1,145 miles.

Construction has begun on 233 miles of development highways, Preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition were underway on an additional 1,001 miles, and centerline locations had been approved for another 338 miles.

Of the 368 miles of local access roads approved to date, construction had begun on 86 miles, preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition were underway or completed on an additional 143 miles, and centerline locations had been approved on 12 miles.

In terms of engineering and construction, it is plain to see that the program in Appalachia is making progress. But you can't measure the progress here with traditional yardsticks. We really won't know how well

this experiment in Appalachia has worked until it has had time to work.

When we finish a beltway around our large cities these days, we know that as soon as we cut the ribbon and jump back, the road will be aswarm with autos and trucks. We know that isn't going to happen immediately when we open up Appalachia with these splendid new highways--but we are betting that it eventually will.

Whether our bet pays off is up to the people--those of the region and those attracted to it. No one can be absolutely sure that it will happen as planned. But a trip through the majestic mountains and countryside of West Virginia leaves me with the feeling that it can't miss.

# # # # # # # #

~~50550 - 3200~~

Remarks by Lowell K. Bridwell, Federal Highway Administrator, at the 14th Annual National Educational Seminar, American Right of Way Association, Chicago, Illinois, June 24, 1968

"All things to all men" is a term often used to describe a two-faced or equivocating person. But when St. Paul told the Corinthians, "I am made all things to all men," he spoke in praise of an attitude and a breadth of mind which could consider the diverse problems of each individual.

Today in the United States, the highway program -- and the role you play in its success -- is being asked to become "all things to all men" in the original sense of the phrase.

To the traveller, the highway represents a means of movement: to the trucker, an improved artery for transporting goods. There is no question that the aspirations of these individuals are being met, successfully and increasingly, by modern, high quality highways.

But what of the homeowner, or shopowner, or tenant, displaced by that same new highway? To them, does it help fulfill an aspiration for a better climate of working or living? Or does it ignore that aspiration as a matter remote from the concerns of the transportation system?

6-27-69 #0894 R-2

BRIDLK680624

00'288

11/18/16

What of the urban community through which the highway runs? Is the highway, to this community, a catalyst for vitally needed renewal and restructuring? Or is it planned, routed, and designed without attention to the urban community's needs?

The answer is twofold. Not often enough in past has the highway been developed with attention -- advance attention -- to its impact upon the urban individual and the urban community which it will directly and irrevocably affect. But, as every one of us involved in the highway program are aware, the tools are rapidly becoming available to enable the job to be done right.

What are these tools?

First, there is the well-known device called teamwork. Recently, Sam Houston sent me a print of your Association's new film, "Liaison: A Way of Life." Those of you who have seen this production know what teamwork involves. In the words of the film itself, it means advance planning; advance coordination between and among business, government, and citizen; advance identification of needs and intentions, and advance establishment of open lines of communication.

For highway planners and builders, the day of go-it-alone activity is over. For too long, the professional highway designer

and engineer has been expected to be "all things to all men" in an unrealistic sense -- not only a trained and experienced craftsman, but also a community relations expert, a sociologist, an architect, a landscape planner, an urbanologist, a housing expert, and a land use forecaster.

Neither the highway expert, nor other professionals, nor communities involved in the highway program have been well served by this gross misallocation of responsibility. In recent years, recognition has come of the unfortunate consequences of such lack of teamwork. Signs of permanent change are now being seen in highway-related activities across the country.

In Chicago, an experiment in multi-disciplinary highway planning is well underway. In cooperation with local, State, and Federal authorities, a Chicago design concept team has assembled a cross-section of experts from such diverse but interdependent professions as urban planning, highway engineering, transportation analysis, land use planning, housing, finance, and law.

The job of the team is to advise the city and State of alternative ways to locate, design, and construct a segment of the Interstate System -- alternatives developed not in a vacuum

or a test tube, but on the basis of close and continuing communication with leaders and citizens in the community through which the highway corridor passes.

I cannot say that this application of the multi-disciplinary team approach to urban highway planning will solve every problem and meet every challenge generated by the involved segment of highway. But I can assure you that it will come closer to doing so than any urban highway project which fails to anticipate the broad spectrum of community aspirations and concerns that are intimately bound up in such an undertaking.

In Baltimore, in Manchester, Connecticut, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and in Los Angeles, California, variations on the basic use of teamwork in advance highway planning are being tried and improved, with growing success. Despite differences in detail, each embodies two universal premises: First, that no single expertise or discipline can properly plan and carry out an effort of such magnitude as an urban highway project, and, second, that no amount of advance planning and preparation will work unless the people themselves -- those who lead and those who live in the affected community -- are a part of the process.

Another tool which is absolutely necessary for a highway program to be sensitized to community aspirations is sufficient provision for adequate, thoughtfully planned relocation housing. Unhappily this tool, unlike the concept of interdisciplinary teamwork, is still short of reality in too many places.

Some States, to be sure, have moved vigorously toward reformation of relocation assistance and housing programs. They have acted on the belief, which I share, that the citizen whose home or place of livelihood is disrupted and demolished for the sake of public progress deserves the consideration and recompense of the public -- not just at a "fair market" or average level, but to a degree which recognizes the special needs and circumstances of each displacee.

"Fair market value" is determined by the marketplace, and he who voluntarily enters the market to buy or sell a home or shop is knowingly basing his decision on that fact. But the family, or the retired widow, or the small retailer, or the charitable home disrupted by a highway project is not voluntarily entering the market as a seller -- nor may they necessarily possess the means to enter as a buyer.

If you consider the pensioner living on a small fixed income in a wholly-owned bungalow, or the minority group family who had to pay well over market value just to purchase their mortgaged home in the city a few years ago, the point becomes painfully clear.

To impose a norm of "fair market value" on the acquisition of such properties for highway right-of-way, then, seems at best unrealistic, and at worst, brutal. Is there a better way?

There are many better ways. One of them is reflected in legislation now pending before committees of the Congress. Without running through a list of bills, I will simply tell you that these draft laws share a recognition that "fair market value" is neither useful nor justified as a basis for right-of-way acquisition.

In its place, they would create such provisions as:

-- Payment of up to $5,000 to dislocatees, over and above fair market value of the acquired property, as is required to enable the affected individual to acquire decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling of modest standards available on the private market.

-- Prohibition of Federally-aided projects unless decent, safe, and sanitary housing is determined to be available for dislocatees prior to their displacement.

-- Assistance payments of up to $500 a year for two years to individuals qualifying under the legislation as displaced tenants.

Let me make clear that this legislation represents one approach to the problem. We endorse it enthusiastically, as I have testified before committees of Congress in the past few months. At the same time, we are attentive and sympathetic to the efforts of various States to develop improved relocation housing programs on the basis not only of improved financial assistance to dislocatees, but also through such techniques as advance construction of replacement housing facilities under government-private sector agreements; sliding scale systems, and arrangements to insure that each homeowner disrupted by a highway project personally recoups at least an amount equal to his actual equity in the property.

The goal of all these approaches is the same: To recognize and accommodate the special needs and special discomforts imposed upon the individual, family, and businessman who through no choice of their own find themselves in the path of a planned highway.

If the highway finds a slum in its path, society is right to expect that it will leave in its wake not a new slum in another

part of town, but an improved and healthier living condition in which the horizons and opportunities are expanded for each citizen. Until relocation housing is substantially improved, the expectation too often will go unfulfilled.

The role of the highway in our most congested, land-scarce urban centers is a subject of high and sustained interest these days. Here again, tools are available to make the role a constructive one. One of the major mechanisms available to the core city and the suburb for increasing land productivity, in fact, is founded on the highway itself.

I am referring, of course, to the concept of joint development -- also known as multiple use -- of land and air space attendant to a highway. It is a concept much talked about, but perhaps given too little practical attention.

The best contemporary description of the joint development concept is contained in a book entitled, "The Freeway in the City." This new publication, which contains the thoughts and recommendations of a distinguished group of architects, engineers and planners who have been advising us on interactions of freeways and urban areas, puts it this way:

"Out of all serious dialogue on urban expressways today emerges one insistent and compelling idea: that of using the highway to structure or restructure the city. This concept involves multiple use of the highway corridor both vertically and horizontally -- the space above and below the road, as well as the space alongside it -- in such a way that all of it, the entire corridor, is planned and shaped as an integrated whole. It is a dramatic concept of a magnitude to match the drama of the problem . . . ."

The consultants continue that joint development encourages, and is based on, the acquisition of whole blocks of land along a freeway route, and improvement of land not needed for the highway itself through private and public development projects. They point out that the cost factor associated with highway construction becomes less critical when revenue is produced by subsidiary uses of the corridor.

They conclude in the book:

"This is the strength of the concept -- its benefit to the highway department in terms of more peaceable land acquisition and its benefit to the city in terms of better traffic access,

possibilities of renewal on a more significant and creative scale, the removal of less land from the tax rolls, and for all concerned, the reduced long-range cost of freeway construction. The highway would no longer be the intruder. It would be a welcome component of the new city structure -- as much a part of its architecture as a fine building."

That, I think, is a phrase worth remembering and an objective worth striving for -- the freeway as "a welcome component of the city structure." We can be sure that unless the freeway enters the city as precisely that kind of component, it will bring with it more chaos than contribution, and more pain than productivity. Joint development of highway-related land and airspace, as a practical and applied consideration in the earliest advance planning stage, holds the promise of making the highway a wholly welcome addition to the urban environment.

Local participation, multi-disciplinary advance planning, greatly improved relocation housing provisions, imaginative use of the joint development concept: These, then, are tools which we possess or are developing to insure that the highway in fact becomes "all things to all men" -- or at least, to as many as possible.

Underlying our successful use of these tools, however, must be a progressive and innovative spirit that is attuned to the aspirations of not just our client who travels, but our less apparent clients who work, play, live, and grow in the communities through which the freeway will pass.

The "man in the street" pays for and underwrites our programs, says the hero of your film on liaison, and we are "obligated" to him to do the best possible job of spending his money. With the right tools, the right attitudes, and a constant sensitivity to the concerns of every citizen affected by the highway program, we can be sure of meeting that obligation.

105.7

REMARKS BY FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR
LOWELL K. BRIDWELL BEFORE THE WESTERN
ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS,
CHEYENNE, WYOMING, SEPTEMBER 17, 1968

I was reading a newspaper account recently of the Congressional discussions which preceded passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968. In the twentieth paragraph or so, I came across this phrase:

"The Federal highway administrator, who is generally considered to be in the pro-highway camp, has testified..." etc., etc.

Perhaps my reaction was naive. But react I did -- by wondering to myself when, in the name of the national good and a healthy transportation system, we are finally going to emerge from the era of polarized thinking over highways. When will the days of "pro" and "anti" highway labels finally be left behind?

Who has ever heard of the "anti-airways" movement? Or the "anti-sewer" campaign? Or, perhaps, the "block-the hospitals" faction? We would laugh at such a notion, should labels like these emerge in the national eye.

Yet we have seemed to take seriously, for the past few years, the same kinds of labels when applied to public and private interests involved in the highway program, or affected by it. Unhappily, this holds just as true for rail transit programs. And the fault lies not so much with the media who have publicized the labels, but with the groups who have adopted them.

6-16-69 # 0574 V-2

BRIDLK680917 80951 9/19/68

On the one side, too many agencies and individuals involved in planning and building highways have shortsightedly boasted of being "pro-highway." Toward their work, they have sometimes tended to adopt John Ruskin's quip that "there is really no such thing as bad weather, only different kinds of good weather." That premise is no more valid for highways than for thunderstorms.

On the other side, just as many agencies and individuals in public and private life have decided, and vociferously declared, that highways are "bad." Proudly they bear the label of the "anti-highway" movement. One must suppose that these same people, on being shown a poorly planned hospital, would enthusiastically endorse a national anti-hospital crusade.

What a waste!

Happily, however, the furor has not fatally detracted from the hard work and thoughtful progress achieved by the many, many people -- industry people, government people, and community people -- who are neither "pro" nor "anti highway." They have continued to seek, constructively and creatively, new ways to improve our national transportation system and harmonize its relationship with every other facet of our country's environment.

Since they can't be handily labelled ("pro-transportation" and "pro-improved environment" are hardly the kinds of phrases that make headlines), we hear less about these people than about their more vocal counterparts who would transform the highway program into a contest of pat accusations and hastily conceived retorts.

The people who are trying to improve the planning, building, and operation of our highways are far too busy to enter the lists of the pro-anti highway tournament. They are busy because the job of shaping a needed national transportation program to meet a host of new environmental concerns is an awesomely demanding one.

On the success or failure of that job, I am convinced, hangs the future of the Federal-aid highway program itself.

Stepping away from the clamor of the "pro" and "anti" highway factions -- who really aren't interested in listening to hard realities anyway -- let us consider the magnitude of the highway program's tasks today. The mandate is clear. It calls for:

-- A basic sensitivity and a wholehearted response by highway planners to the social and environmental hopes of communities and neighborhoods through which new highways may pass.

-- A commitment to better cities, achieved through the imaginative/ multi-purpose use of scarce land and the enhancement in urban areas of intangible -- and often invaluable -- community identities.

-- A greatly improved system of Federal-aid highways, not simply in the sense of added mileage, but of fundamental improvements in the safety, capacity, utilization, and esthetic quality of streets and highways already in existence.

Just as clear as the mandate are the means to accomplish it. Some of them have been at hand for some time. Others are now taking shape in the workshop of highway planners and builders, as a result of legislative action and enlightened administrative efforts at all levels of government.

Conceptually, the means to the end of more responsive highway planning is based on acknowledgement that highway planners and builders are <u>not</u> urban renewal experts, sociologists, attorneys, financial wizards, or architects -- and that without the full participation of those talents in the highway planning process, the resulting product is not going to meet the demands of the market.

For today, the "market" for hundreds of miles of planned highway is the densely-populated, often troubled city. It wants and needs better transportation: at the same time, it wants and needs better living conditions for its citizens, more open space for its children, quality buildings to hold and attract business, expanded municipal services, and many other things it does not now have.

The highway which ignores or defies these aspirations of the city is always wasteful, and sometimes dangerous. And it is certain that a highway planned without full reliance on the combined efforts of the talents I have identified will fail to realize its huge potential for community good, not only as an essential transportation artery but also as a positive contributor to local attainment of local goals.

Baltimore, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York -- there are a few of the metropolitan areas which have initiated or are considering the so-called "design concept" method of multi-disciplinary team planning for new highway development. Through this method, a spectrum of talents is brought together to identify the social and economic needs of the affected community -- and then, using those needs as a framework, to plan a highway which meets them as constructively as possible.

A key participant in the highway planning process must be the public itself. Whether in individual contacts between planners and community leaders, or in public hearings to assess individual views toward proposed highway alternatives, the public must be allowed -- indeed, stimulated -- to have a voice in the process which ultimately results in highway location and design decisions. The public, after all, is "the market" for the highway program's product, whether in city, town, or rural environment.

A highway facility need not be an either-or proposition -- "either build a highway here, or build a library." Prominent in the working tools of highway planners today are technological and design techniques which encourage, particularly for scarce-land cities and towns, the multiple use of space through which a highway passes.

The result has knitted freeway construction in many cities to simultaneous planning and building of municipal centers, post offices, parks, convention halls, business complexes, and recreation facilities which can productively make use of the untapped space above, below, and alongside the highway. We have only scratched the surface of this so-called "joint development" approach to highway development. But in doing so, we have come an important step closer to the day in which urban planners, housing redevelopers, private investors, and highway builders will work in concert, as a matter of course, with the highway serving as a catalyst to imaginatively conceived environmental improvements in our cities.

Because of their quality, visibility and newness on the landscape, the Interstate highways now under construction tend to create much greater public awareness than the well-travelled streets and roads which served our fathers before us. It is understandable, then, that the three million miles of streets, roads and highways which have long crisscrossed our country sometimes seem to fade into the shadow of the 41,000 mile Interstate System.

But be assured that they cannot and will not remain in that shadow. Our municipal street and road networks, built over many generations to meet dissimilar needs, are in a sad state of misuse and inefficiency. In too many cities, these downtown street systems break down twice a day under the strain of contemporary peak-hour traffic demands. The rabidly anti-highway crusader might conclude that urban road travel is hopeless and beyond redemption. The pro-highway zealot might retort that the only answer is more, more, more new highways.

In fact, of course, the answer is that an abuse of a basic national transportation resource is crying out for correction. To eliminate the abuse, it is essential that the most modern available engineering and traffic control techniques be focused on the task of streamlining urban street and road networks through the systematic identification and elimination of bottlenecks, inadequate traffic control systems, shortsighted traffic flow patterns, and a host of associated weak links in the urban street chain, including rational plans for parking.

It is just as essential that we focus those same techniques on the task of realizing the highway's grossly neglected potential as a mass mover of peak-hour travellers -- a potential which will only be achieved when efficient, dependable, and expedited bus service is available to compete successfully against the private automobile as a prime mover of twice-a-day volume travellers.

Congress recognized this in the recently-passed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, when it provided for two new programs. The first, called TOPICS (Traffic Operations Program to Improve Capacity and Safety), authorizes $200 million a year of Federal-aid highway funds to be spent on precisely the kind of systemized urban street and road improvements which I have outlined. The second provides for the use of Federal funds in construction of parking stations connected with urban transportation services at the fringes of large cities -- an essential ingredient to meaningful improvement of methods to move peak-hour volume traffic as efficiently as possible.

The Act recognizes, as well, that millions of miles of primary, secondary and local roads in and beyond the urban area are in uncertain and sometimes unacceptable condition. It calls for a thorough study of these roads -- a so-called "functional classification" -- by category of service they provide and standards of quality they meet. Thus by 1970, the completion time of the study, a firm basis will have been established for setting priorities to govern future Federal-aid highway activities.

For highway planners and builders, the world today is a busy and demanding place, and despite the title of a popular Broadway show a few years ago, it will not stop so that we can get off. Our cities are changing -- changing in their aspirations, environmental needs, physical personalities, and plans for the future. The highway program, to serve the city, must keep apace with the change, and in harmony with it.

HQ-610

104.19

REMARKS BY FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR
LOWELL K. BRIDWELL BEFORE THE NEW YORK SECTION
OF AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS, NEW
YORK, NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1968

I would like to begin today with a brief reference to history. I am concerned not so much with what has happened, but with what is happening and what will happen. This is history in the making, and it is our history because we are making it, whether or not our names ever appear in the textbooks.

When we look at what has happened -- at the growth of highway transportation in this century -- one fact is self-evident: nothing is more temporary than the status quo, nothing is more constant than dynamic change.

The highway professional is right in the midst of this change. He creates, he builds, he works in a changing world. To do this, he must know where he has been, and where he is going.

The recent history of highway transportation is not lacking in notable landmarks. If we were to select one date as the beginning of our contemporary era, I suspect the year 1956 would be a unanimous choice. In that year, Congress committed the Federal Government to an expanded highway construction program, to building the Interstate Highway System, and to financing the Federal effort with dedicated user taxes.

6-26-69 #0531

4-2

BRIDLK680918

00246

9/19/68

In the 12 years since then we have bent our efforts toward realizing the objectives incorporated in the 1956 Act. Those 12 years have seen many accomplishments. But just as surely, much remains to be done.

Our world has not remained static for the past 12 years. The "givens" of 1956 are today only a fact of history. While we were planning and building, the world was changing.

How has it changed?

In just 12 years the population of the United States has grown by 19 percent; our urban population by 28 percent. Our absolute growth since 1956 has been 32 million persons -- and all 32 million have been added to our urban population. That is twice the population of California as of the 1960 census.

Our economic growth has been more amazing. The real output of the Gross National Product is today nearly 60 percent greater than 1956. Remember, this is real output, over and above the rise in prices.

Highway transportation has grown with the economy. In these same 12 years, while we have worked to get two-thirds of the Interstate System open to traffic, vehicle registrations have increased 53 percent and vehicle mileage 59 percent. And I need not remind you that half of that travel today takes place in urban areas.

These are a few rough indications of the changes that have been taking place. These quantitative changes alone were bound to have a significant impact on our highway program. But to them we must add the qualitative changes that have been taking place in the economic and social life of the nation.

Together, these changes have acted to produce significant innovations in the highway program. We can see the evolution of this program reflected in its legislative history. To mention some of the highlights:

In 1962, Congress established comprehensive transportation planning requirements for all urbanized areas;

In 1965, the Highway Beautification Act was enacted;

In 1966, for the first time, a national highway safety program was initiated, and Congress moved toward the development of an integrated transportation system with the creation of a Department of Transportation.

Through these and other developments, the highway program has recognized the pressing needs for better urban transportation, and for getting more efficiency from highways as part of the total transportation system. It has recognized the evolving concern of our people with the quality of their environment, and their concern with human values -- whether this concern be for the needless slaughter and crippling from highway crashes, or the plight of the family displaced by highway construction.

Now, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 is to take its place in this historic sequence. It looks to the future, but it is mindful of the past and of the changing world in which it was created.

The 1968 Act promises to be a major milestone along the path just outlined. Like its predecessors, it reflects its times. It rises to emerging challenges. And it gives us in the highway program a mandate for progress.

It is our charter to pursue objectives which we could visualize, even though we had not always found the means available.

The 1968 Act gives us an opportunity to make history.

I should make that plural because it gives us more than one opportunity.

For purposes of discussion I should like to divide these opportunities into four groups. I hope you won't find my classification too arbitrary. I have not attempted to include every provision of the Act. Instead, I have intentionally singled out those aspects which offer us the best opportunities.

As I see it, the 1968 Act gives us an opportunity:

First, to increase the efficiency of highway transportation by getting better use of our investment in highway facilities;

Second, to continue our efforts to improve the quality of our environment;

Third, to improve our performance in our role as one of the nation's major employers; and

Finally, to develop an unprecedented program for the equitable treatment of those displaced by highway construction.

Let's turn first to the question of highway efficiency. A little exercise in mathematics can quickly dramatize this problem. I noted earlier that vehicle traffic has increased 59 percent since 1956. In absolute numbers, the difference is between one trillion vehicle miles this year, and 628 billion vehicle miles in 1956. That is an increase of 372 billion vehicle miles.

The Interstate System mileage now open handles more than 100 billion of these additional miles. But that still leaves something like 250 billion

additional miles to be absorbed by the non-Interstate highways, which consist of the 1956 system plus the improvements made to it in the past 12 years.

The Red Queen was right when she told Alice she would have to run awfully hard just to stay in the same place.

Congress has addressed itself to this situation in the 1968 Act by adjusting the balance of the Federal investment in the Interstate System and in the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems. It increased Federal funds for primary and secondary roads from the previous level of one billion dollars a year to a new level of $1,425,000,000 a year.

Moreover, it specifically earmarked $200 million of these Federal matching funds to be used for traffic operation projects in urban areas.

The Act declares it to be in the national interest "that each State should have a continuing program within the designated boundaries of urban areas of the State designed to reduce traffic congestion and to facilitate the flow of traffic in the urban areas."

It further stipulates that projects under this program shall be for "improvements which directly facilitate and control traffic traffic flow, such as grade separation of intersections, widening of lanes, channelization of traffic, traffic control systems, and loading and unloading ramps, if such project is based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process" carried out in accordance with the 1962 Act.

Many of you will recognize this as the TOPICS (Traffic Operations Program to Improve Capacity and Safety) program, which was initiated administratively in 1966. Up to now, TOPICS projects have faced tough competition with other needed primary and secondary road improvements.

But under the new law we will have $400 million a year, including the State matching share, to prove our contention that marked improvements in the capacity and safety of existing urban highways can be brought about by relatively inexpensive investments in traffic operation projects.

In addition to funding the TOPICS program, the 1968 Act authorizes fringe parking demonstration projects, to be financed with Federal-aid urban highway matching funds.

Such parking facilities must be located on, above, or adjacent to Federal-aid highways, and outside the central business district. One important provision is that they must be located and designed to be used with existing or planned public transportation facilities. Thus, such projects will help implement one of the underlying concepts of the Department of Transportation, which is to work for cooperative solutions to our transportation problems. In this case, we are seeking to combine the benefits of our highway investment with those of public transportation to find a more efficient method for moving large numbers of people.

The 1968 Act also looks to the future need for improving highway transportation through a rational investment policy. As an essential step toward such decisions, it requires a systematic nationwide functional highway classification study to be made in cooperation with State highway departments and local governments.

Our second area of opportunity concerns the environment. Here the highway program operates not only within a tangibly defined statutory area, but also in a larger area where judgment, attitude and ability play a large role.

It is no secret that the statutory program, born with the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, has had a turbulent childhood. But for all that, it is not an orphan. There are those of us who are trying to nuture it along. As long as there is life, I for one will not give up hope. And neither will many other highway officials.

We do not see this program as a short-term pretty-up project. The real beneficiaries are our children and their children. If we don't act now to preserve the scenic, natural beauty that remains of our roadsides, we will lose the opportunity forever. And future generations will only be able to imagine the resources we squandered.

Since the 1968 Act keeps the beautification program alive, it is incumbent on us to proceed within our authority to get the agreement of every State to regulate outdoor advertising and junkyards.

We still have the opportunity to demonstrate the need for this program, and to seek the necessary support to carry it through successfully.

The 1968 Act touches on another environmental area by amending the Department of Transportation Act and the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1966 to make uniform their provisions for preservation of parklands.

Frankly, I am dismayed by the criticism leveled at this amendment by some of our conservationist friends. I simply cannot agree with their contention that it weakens the earlier provisions of the DOT Act. It not only continues the prohibition against the use of publicly-owned parkland, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites for highway purposes unless there is "no feasible and prudent alternative,"

but it goes further by requiring the Federal, State or local officials responsible for such lands to determine their significance for preservation.

From my own experience, I have never had a reason to doubt that these officials are entirely capable of exercising such responsibility.

Going beyond these statutory mandates, the highway program has been increasingly concerned with environmental problems, particularly in our urban areas.

As you know, we are now encouraging the use of multi-disciplinary teams to plan new highway developments -- to use the "design concept" approach in an effort to see that highways make a positive contribution to the larger social and economic needs of the affected community.

We have published the recommendations of a distinguished group of urban consultants for highway planning and design, under the title of "The Freeway in the City."

And we are studying these and other ways to make highways more responsive to the needs of the communities they serve and to take advantage of the great potential of highway development for improving the quality of our daily lives.

The third area of opportunity for the highway program concerns its function as an employer.

The Federal-aid program, which dispenses more than $4 billion a year for highway construction, is responsible for hundreds of thousnads of jobs, both through the payrolls of State highway departments and through those of highway contractors and sub-contractors.

This brings me to our fourth area of opportunity -- the one presented by the landmark provisions of the 1968 Act under the heading of Highway Relocation Assistance.

This is, without doubt, one of the most significant pieces of housing legislation ever adopted by the Congress. It establishes equitable, uniform provisions to assist families, individuals, farmers, businesses and non-profit organizations to avoid the human and economic shock that can result from involuntary displacement by highway construction.

The Federal-aid highway program now is responsible for about 56,000 such displacements a year, with about 77 percent of these in urban areas.

To insure that those displaced "do not suffer disproportionate injuries as the result of programs designed for the benefit of the public as a whole," Congress determined that relocation payments and advisory assistance should be provided to all persons so displaced.

In addition to relocation payments, which may consist of reasonable moving expenses and/or a dislocation allowance, the law provides for payments up to $5,000 above the fair market value for homeowners whose properties are taken and up to $1,500 for tenants to rent suitable new quarters or to make a down payment on the purchase of a dwelling.

Under the relocation assistance provisions, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to establish standards for decent, safe, and sanitary housing for those displaced. The law further requires that no Federal-aid projects be approved unless enough such housing is available within a reasonable period of time before persons are displaced, such

In the 1968 Act, Congress has made it crystal clear that the employment so generated will be open to all persons without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

The Act provides a practical, workable way to bring the employment opportunities of the highway program to all citizens, and to do so within the framework of time-tested procedures.

It requires the Secretary of Transportation to obtain assurances of equal employment opportunity from each State and for the State in turn to spell out the employer's resonsibilities in its contract specifications. Through their assurances, the States must agree to establish the necessary procedures to prevent discrimination on Federal-aid projects and to check compliance by contractors and sub-contractors. They also must guarantee equal opportunity in their own hiring policies and practices regarding employes compensated in any part from Federal funds.

This is in no sense a make-work program. Instead, it provides authority to assure that apprenticeship or training programs are made available on an equal opportunity basis.

We have here the means to make the highway program a showcase -- to stimulate, to train and to place in productive jobs our fellow citizens, with equal opportunity for all.

We have the means; we also must have the will. In the end our success in seizing this opportunity will require a positive attitude and a cooperative spirit by the many who can contribute.

I can assure you that we in the Federal Government have the will, and we look forward to working with those who can help make equal opportunity a reality.

housing is within their financial means, and it is reasonably convenient to public services and centers of employment.

Until the passage of this Act, Federal law simply required States to furnish relocation advisory assistance, and offered a voluntary relocation payment program which only about half the States participated in.

Obviously, it will take a rewriting of State laws throughout the country to make the new program fully effective. For this reason, the 1968 Act provides that the Federal Government pay 100 percent of displacement costs until July 1, 1970, to give the State legislatures time to act. Thereafter, financing will be on a matching basis under the appropriate Federal-aid highway programs.

It is clear that Congress has acted forthrightly to guarantee fair treatment for every citizen whose home, however humble, is removed by highway improvements.

This is one of the most socially-important programs ever assigned to highway officials. It gives us an opportunity to contribute to decent living conditions in communities we serve.

It can and should demonstrate, in a most significant way, that highways are indeed a fundamental tool in community development, and a beneficial force for change and improvement when employed intelligently.

These are some of the major opportunities opened up to us by the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1968: Opportunities to increase the efficiency of our present highway resources, to improve the quality of our environment, to implement the ideal of equal employment opportunity, and

to establish new standards of equity for the treatment of those affected by public projects.

To a highway program whose success over the years has depended on thousands of skilled and dedicated people, these new tasks are not burdens -- they are challenges.

Highway people have never been satisfied with the status quo. They work amid change, and they make things change.

These opportunities -- these challenges -- show them the way to go.

Remarks by Lowell K. Bridwell, Federal Highway Administrator, at the Second Annual Meeting of the National Association of Women Highway Safety Leaders, Washington, D. C., October 1, 1968

The American woman has always been quick to mobilize behind worthy causes--particularly those which deal with matters of health and human life. There is abundant proof in history that women play a very substantial part in, and contribute significantly to, the success of many social efforts.

Some classical examples, of course, are the fight for women suffrage in this country, and the battle for child labor legislation, and for the elimination of sweatshop working conditions.

More recently, women have been extensively involved in matters of public health. Through such efforts, we have whipped the one-time scourge of our children--polio. We are well on the way to eradicating measles as a public health menace, through mass immunization programs. Cancer research, heart disease, muscular dystrophy, and a long list of other diseases and medical conditions are under concerted attack today. And women are playing an important role in all of them.

I suspect that if we can ever find a way to enlist the fervent support of the nation's women in the subject of highway safety--if we can really get them interested enough to devote their full energies and talents--we would take a giant step toward the goal of reducing deaths and injuries on the highway.

So this morning I would like to do my part in trying to enlist the active support of women in a fight that is just as important as any you have ever undertaken. In terms of actual numbers of fatalities and injuries, this battle is, in fact, more important than any of the others.

You should know, for example, that highway crashes are the third most common cause of death for children between the ages of one and four. They are the second most common cause of death for children ages 5 to 14. They cause more deaths among teen-agers and those in the 15 to 24 age group than the combined total of the next five causes.

Doesn't it frighten you to realize that some two-million Americans have been killed in highway crashes in the 60 years of the automotive age? Is it not staggering to learn that 53,000 American men, women, and children have been killed in each of the last two years, in addition to some four-million injured every year?

What these figures reveal is a public health problem of pressing magnitude, and yet we have never been able to muster the grass roots support that is so direly needed to come to grips with the problem. The reasons for this failure are difficult to determine; but one reason, surely, is the widespread belief that there is not much an individual can do to stop the highway slaughter. One purpose in my being here today is to try to disenchant you of that opinion if you now hold it, and to convince you that there are many things each of us can do to contribute to this effort.

The most important thing you each can do as a woman and a mother is to make sure that every member of your family uses the safety belts that are now being provided in all new cars. Insist that the car does not move until all passengers are buckled up. This applies particularly to small children. I am sure any of you would greatly resent any implication that you are not interested in the health and safety of your children. Yet we see every day mothers driving cars in flagrant disregard for their children's safety, in permitting small children to stand up in the seat or otherwise ride unbelted in the front seat. This is only one thing you can do, but an important one. This morning, however, I want to direct your attention to some other things you can do as individuals and as members of safety organizations to accomplish specific goals on a broader scale than safety belts.

The broad guidelines have been drawn for two years. I am sure you are familiar with the two companion pieces of legislation passed by Congress and signed by President Johnson in 1966. These two laws and the programs they authorize are excellent illustration of the complexity of the highway safety problem and the breadth of the effort needed to find solutions.

Dr. Haddon, who spoke to your meeting last year and again this morning at breakfast, has done an excellent job of pointing up some of the issues that need to be understood, and of explaining something about our Federal efforts to see that the vehicles we drive are safely built. This is one of the very important programs which is providing payoffs in reducing fatalities and the severity of injuries in crashes that occur. I am sure that Dr. Haddon made the point clearly that one of the issues the public must understand is, that because there are crashes it does not necessarily follow that there must be death and serious injury.

Some of our vehicle safety standards are already providing proof of that. We know that such safety devices as the energy absorbing steering assemblies, the safety belts, and the new laminated windshields are saving lives every day and preventing serious injuries. Additional standards which will go into effect January 1 will make vehicles even safer -- particularly the requirement in passenger cars for head

restraints, to reduce the likelihood of "whiplash" neck injuries in rear-end collisions.

But I want to talk to you this morning about the necessity of recognizing the total highway safety program that we have undertaken. Producing safer vehicles is important, but it is only one of the elements in what is really a very complex series of problems. Equally important -- perhaps even more important over the long run in its eventual effects -- are the programs authorized by the Highway Safety Act of 1966.

This law directs the Secretary of Transportation to issue Federal standards covering a wide variety of highway safety programs. These are standards to which the States must conform, and they deal with such subjects as periodic motor vehicle inspection, vehicle registration, motorcycle safety, driver education, driver licensing, traffic codes and laws, traffic courts, alcohol in relation to highway safety, traffic records, emergency medical services, etc.

The requirements of the 13 Standards issued in June of last year and the three additional standards now being developed, are much too specific and numerous to discuss here. But take my word for it they will affect every person who drives, or hopes to drive a vehicle for years to come.

The vehicle safety program applies to car manufacturers and is conducted and enforced by the Federal government. This program,

on the other hand, is one that calls for grass roots, local community, and individual participation if it is to succeed.

The Act makes the Governor of each State responsible for seeing that his State moves toward conformity with the Standards. It also establishes a program for matching Federal grants to assist the States and their local communities in improving, expanding, and overhauling their programs to bring them into conformity.

And here, the Congress showed its recognition of the importance of local action to the success of the program. It stipulated in the law that at least 40 percent of the Federal funds allocated to a State for grants must be spent by local political sub-divisions -- that is by cities, towns, counties, school districts, etc.

Therefore, while the Governor has the responsibility for developing State-wide programs, and for approving local program requests to assure that they are consistent with State programs and goals, the law also levels a real challenge at local communities to get to work and do something about improving these programs.

This aspect of the law opens up two areas for citizen participation. In the first place, many of these standards may require specific enabling legislation at the State level. Most of them will require State and local funding. This audience -- both as a group, as individuals and as leaders of effective organizations in your own State and community, can provide an effective force in actively supporting and working for passage of needed legislation.

The second area which invites citizen participation is in drawing up local action programs, urging local government officials to do the planning necessary, and to request Federal matching grants to assist in reaching their goals.

We know there is a vast, unexpressed, and unorganized reservoir of need in local communities for assistance in developing some of these programs. The need has long been recognized by local officials, but lacking the impetus and the funds, the programs have been pushed into the background and forgotten under the pressures of higher public priorities.

We think that the opportunities presented by this legislation are so great that it is time to reexamine those priorities, and pull those deferred programs off the shelf, and begin to deal realistically with this problem of highway safety. This is where you can do some very effective work in your local communities -- in making your city and county officials aware of the new Federal interest in these areas, of the opportunities to save lives, and of the availability of Federal matching grants.

Once awakened to the opportunity, these local officials will need assistance and advice, and support and encouragement to develop programs and see them through. Here again is where you and your organizations can be effective -- not only in providing such assistance, advice, and support, but in enlisting the aid of other safety-minded

organizations who might also join the effort, in drumming up public interest and support, and in conducting educational programs on what the needs are and how they can be met. In short, there is literally no end of opportunity for people and groups such as yours to be of assistance in these programs.

I sometimes think that the one thing that is really needed is proof that individual and group action on the local scene can actually accomplish something concrete which directly results in saving lives.

In the few minutes remaining to me, I would like to discuss briefly some examples of programs that can be accomplished locally.

One of our standards deals with motorcycle safety. You are all aware, I am sure, of the rapidly increasing numbers of these vehicles on our streets and highways -- and of the fact that the majority of the riders are young people. Among other things, the standard requires each State to have a law making safety helmets and eye protection mandatory for motorcycle riders and passengers; the vehicle must be equipped with a seat and a footrest for the passenger and a rear-view mirror. In addition, the State must require that each person who operates a motorcycle must pass an examination and obtain a license specifically for motorcycle operation.

These seem to be relatively modest requirements. Yet listen to the results. The National Safety Council says motorcycle deaths

actually declined nationwide last year for the first time in six years, and in the face of an increase in motorcycle registrations of 438,000 during the year.

Further, in the 30 States that required the wearing of helmets, deaths decreased from the previous year by as much as 59 percent -- the figure for New York -- with a 27 percent reduction in the death rate nationwide. On the other hand, California, which has no law requiring helmets, showed a nine percent increase in motorcycle fatalities.

We think this is dramatic proof that these standards and these laws can save lives. Does your State have an effective motorcycle safety law? You can do something about it.

The National Highway Safety Bureau recently developed after long study, and Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd recently sent to the Congress, a report on Alcohol in relation to highway safety. This report shows that "the use of alcohol by drivers and pedestrians leads to some 25,000 deaths and a total of at least 800,000 crashes in the United States each year. Alcohol has been found to be the largest single factor leading to fatal crashes." Drivers with very high concentrations of alcohol in their blood..."one to four percent of drivers on the road"... are accounting for about 50 to 55 percent of all single vehicle crashes in which drivers are fatally injured.

The Federal standard requires States to have established chemical test procedures for determining blood-alcohol concentrations. They must have an implied consent law under which any person arrested for a drunk driving charge is deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of his blood, breath, or urine to determine alcohol content. Refusal to submit to the test results in loss of the driver's license regardless of the outcome of the original charge.

The standard also requires a blood-alcohol concentration level of .10 percent by weight to define the terms "intoxicated" or "under the influence of alcohol."

To date, only 29 States have passed implied consent laws. Forty-three States have chemical testing, but only 10 States have the blood alcohol concentration level set at the standard's requirement of .10 percent.

Where does your State stand in dealing with the menace of the drunken driver? Do you have a chemical testing program. Are State or local police trained to give such tests? Do they have sufficient testing equipment?

Another major area of most pressing need is emergency medical services for those injured in highway crashes. I would wager that not one of you have any idea how primitive our emergency medical programs are in most States and local communities. We have full-time, well

trained, well-equipped fire departments to protect and salvage our property. But to salvage those of our fellows who are injured on the highway we have part-time drivers and attendants who are not required to have any first-aid training. They drive emergency vehicles that are not required to have any first-aid equipment. They have no communications systems to connect them to hospitals to alert the emergency room to prepare for the injured. And they arrive at hospitals too often not equipped or prepared to handle emergencies.

Contrast this with the situation in Viet Nam for example, where highly mobile, highly-trained medical aid men, operating under the worst of conditions, are able to save thousands of wounded men by the use of pre-planned medical evacuation procedures and efficient communications. We believe that what can be done under wartime conditions can easily be accomplished with some effort and planning on the civilian scene.

These are just three examples of programs which can result in the direct saving of lives. There is hardly a community or State that does not have serious shortcomings in all three. Our work is cut out for us, and you can be of great help.

Remember -- highway safety is a complex collection of problems. We will not achieve the substantial reduction in deaths and injuries that we are after, unless we pay attention to the full range of problems,

taking our payoffs where we can. We need new legislation. We need State and local financing, and planning, and effort. And most of all, we need public understanding and active support.

I urge you all to return to your home States with the determination to help in this effort and to influence other women and other women's organizations to join with you in this program. No effort you can undertake will be more important than saving the lives of your family and loved ones and protecting them from injury on the highways. Thank you for your attention.

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

REMARKS BY LOWELL K. BRIDWELL, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE FIFTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, HOTEL LEAMINGTON, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA, DECEMBER 3, 1968

We come together this year in a time of great change -- change in the national administration, change in public values, and change in the highway program itself.

It is important that we see, at this very fluid point in time, where we have come to and where we are going with the Federal-aid highway program. So instead of dwelling on ancient and recent highway history, I would like to confine myself today to the present and future tenses.

In the present tense, our programs seem sometimes to be plagued by problems -- problems of funding uncertainties, problems of irate citizens and neighborhoods, and problems of antagonism between highway professionals and professionals from other disciplines. Change has seemed to come too fast, too disordered, and too little anticipated. Public recognition and appreciation for the program's past achievements have seemed to dwindle in direct proportion to the increases in its problems.

To state it another way, highway programs and highway professionals are being confronted, with no immunity, by the same social and community forces that today confront every other basic national undertaking, whether in transportation, conservation, education, or the art of government. We and our programs are very much a part of, and participant in, the complex world which is America in 1968.

This being so, our present stance is the difficult one of having to define the options available to us for the future in setting policies and implementing programs. Just as each highway route and design alternative leads to its own peculiar set of consequences -- some beneficial, others injurious -- so will each policy and program option open to us today produce its own unique pattern of results.

What we do today in the highway program will determine the shape of our program tomorrow. It behooves us to carefully weigh each available option in terms of the contributions and consequences it will generate for the near and distant future.

One option not available is to disassociate and insulate our activities from the sweep of events in America today. To pretend otherwise would be the depth of self-delusion. Nor, in many cases, are we masters of these events. Our decisions must reflect our realistic awareness of this.

Our decisions must also recognize the common denominators which characterize and connect the symptoms of change in America today. Each new event, every developing confrontation contains these common themes, although sometimes they are twisted so badly as to be hardly recognizable.

They are themes of involvement -- of the new aspiration of the so-called "average citizen" to fight the tides of impersonalization, specialization, and population which seem at times to threaten his individual identity, and to wage his war by demanding a greater say in the shaping of forces and programs which influence his world, his community, and his family.

They are themes of the new quest for environmental excellence -- of concern over the injurious impact of man-generated changes in the environment upon man's health, his esthetic needs, his senses, and his relationship to nature.

They are themes of community self-identity -- of a conscious commitment, particularly by densely populated urban areas, to give top priority to retaining and improving the social and economic ingredients which welded a group of individuals into a town or city in the first place.

The present is a time of difficult choices between alternative courses of action for highway professionals and their programs. But the difficulty is matched, and possibly outweighed, by the opportunities available to us today to select program and policy directions which will produce constructive, beneficial results for the future.

We already have begun to move along some of these directions, partly to forestall public animosity toward our programs and partly, more progressively, in recognition of new potentials in highway development for achieving emerging social goals. What are these directions? Where will they take our programs, in the context of improved highway systems as well as responsiveness to the themes which characterize current public dialogue over broad national issues?

We have taken steps along the road to expanded public participation in our programs -- steps reflected in the Highway Act of 1968 and in stated policies of the Federal government and many State and local governments.

I cannot comment, of course, upon the pending proposal to require a minimum of two public hearings in connection with a Federal-aid highway project. But I can very confidently tell you this: The demand of a growing number of citizens, individually and communally, to have their views considered and reflected in our program's products is irreversible.

Complex and time-consuming though it may be, the democratic process of citizen participation in the affairs of government is going to apply with full and vigorous force to all government programs, whether through some kind of hearing requirement or in other ways. It is the task of the highway professional to make that process work as effectively and efficiently as possible. To do less will be to imperil the usefulness, as well as stability, of the program itself.

The pressure of concern with community identity, particularly as it translates into increased emphasis on the quality of urban life, likewise seems irrevocable. Here also, highway programs and highway professionals have begun to move in imaginative and productive directions. New technology, a new spirit of interprofessional respect and cooperation, and an increased sensitivity to the particular aspirations of urban America are fundamental to the changing role of highway development in our dense, problem-plagued cities.

The nature of highway development's new role in urban areas is reflected in steps already taken or initiated in dozens of cities across the country. They range from improved landscaping of the roadside to the sweepingly innovative planning of entire linear communities in conjunction with needed highway development. They embrace highway agency programs to provide roadside rest and scenic areas; development of airspace above and below new highways for such diverse purposes as offices, industrial facilities, parking, parks, and public transportation stations; and basic redesign of planned urban highway segments to enable depressed or other treatments to protect visual values of the community through which the highway will pass.

These and many other current steps signify that highway professionals already have chosen to recognize a larger responsibility, and a concomitantly larger role, for highway development in the context of community goals. Having done so, the job immediately before us is to formalize and institutionalize that commitment.

Among other things, this requires that high operational priority be given to the use of techniques and arrangements available for harmonizing highway development with other community goals.

One such technique is the joint development concept for planned multiple use of land and airspace associated with or produced by a highway facility. The concept is not new. Our emphasis on its broad practical application is, however, of recent origin. We intend to intensify policies favoring the use of joint development through issuance in the near future of an instructional memorandum encouraging maximum utilization of highway rights-of-way for both public and private development, carried out cooperatively with other agencies in the public and private sector.

The memorandum also will specify the conditions under which Federal highway funds may participate in planned multi-use developments -- conditions which reflect our belief that work needed to make a highway conform to its environment in a reasonable manner is a proper part of the basic highway plan.

The Highway Act of 1968 is a clear indication of directions which the highway program can and must pursue in meeting its obligation to communities and their values in the future. One provision of the Act, known as the Urban Impact Amendment, directs that highway programs consider the social effects, environmental impacts, and relationship to community goals and plans of highway location alternatives.

This mandate will not be achieved by any single technique or procedure, even one so useful as the Joint Development Concept. It can only be fulfilled by a fundamental reshaping of attitudes toward highway development in relationship to urban goals.

The concerns reflected in the Urban Impact Amendment call for co-operation and teamwork between highway professionals, urban planners and programs, architects, private investors, and community representatives -- teamwork exemplified by the multi-discipline design concept teams which have worked on highway planning in Baltimore, Chicago, and other cities. They call for meaningful public participation in the planning process -- participation through day-to-day contact with the community. Finally, they call for objective development and presentation of alternative locations, designs, and joint uses -- alternatives able to be discussed with the public at well-publicized, well-attended hearings.

These are the courses which highway professionals have begun to pursue -- not exclusively, but at least increasingly. These are the courses that will be followed, regardless of political changes or semantic differences, if the highway program is to succeed as a beneifical participant in the affairs of communal and urban America for the future.

They are not the only courses open to highway programs today. There are simpler, less constructive options available.

There is the option of frustrating the development of comprehensive planning and meaningful public participation in highway program decisions. The short-term outcome of that choice is to sweep the complexities and challenges of the democratic process under the rug, all in the name of "eliminating delays." The longer-term outcome is the annihilation, at the hands of a dispirited public, of the program as we know it today.

There is the option of resting on our laurels. The highway professional who selects it will be content to cite the admittedly impressive accomplishments of the program in past -- and to insist with dulling regularity that nothing is new under the sun. To select that option is to ignore Bismark's warning that, "History is simply a piece of paper covered with print: The main thing is to make history, not to write it."

Finally, there is the option of conflict -- of fighting the program's opponents with every means at hand. To choose this option is to enter into a prolonged cold war in which reasonable discussion is replaced by name-calling and anyone who questions the program becomes, at once, an enemy.

These simplistic reactions to change may sound silly and unproductive. But let us not forget that they are available and, in time of pressure, may seem easier to adopt than harder, more constructive solutions to the complex problems of a huge public works program in a nation of changing values and new goals. To resist the attraction of simple reactions to difficult challenges requires maturity, self-assurance, and perspective.

Difficult but progressive courses of action already are being pursued today by highway professionals in the areas of democratic citizen participation, achievement of broad urban goals, and enhancement of the environment. Whether the motive is self-protection rather than social concern is less important than the fact that forward movement is apparent and growing.

In the final analysis, the highway is a product— a tangible facility

designed and built primarily to permit mobility of people and goods. And, it is bound by rules which apply to most other products, including the rule of the marketplace.

The demands of the highway marketplace -- the American public -- are no more fixed than any other. Today our consumer, whether direct or indirect highway users, expect more from the highway product than at any time in the history of the programs.

So it is incumbent upon the highway professional and the highway administrator to know his market and, where possible, reshape his product and his way of doing business to reflect the new demands of the public. We cannot analyze the market by ignoring it. We cannot respond to its needs by wishing them away.

What we can -- and must -- do it to harness every bit of imagination, vision, and expertise at our command to fashion workable responses to new public needs involving or affected by the highway.

On his desk, Thomas Edison kept a sign which read, "Pioneer or Perish." For the Federal-aid highway program in America today, there can be no more fitting a watchword.