



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

122.30

27-DOT-73

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY
THEODORE C. LUTZ TO THE NEW YORK TRAFFIC CLUB
NEW YORK CITY, MAY 16, 1973

I am delighted to be here. One cannot come to New York City, to Vanderbilt Avenue, in the shadow of Grand Central Station, without sensing the majestic role railroads and railroad men have played in the development of America. The railroads still carry 35 percent of the Nation's intercity freight. Ever a one-day interruption in rail delivery service can scarcely be tolerated.

It was Mark Twain, I believe, who once commented that the reports of his death were "premature." There has been some "hardening" of our rail arteries, but the railroads are far from being a "terminal" case.

Strong forces are working to save and regenerate the Northeastern rail service system and to assure its continuation as part of a vibrant, flexible, and full-service national transportation system.

73-01337-S

One of those forces is the Traffic Club, always an ally and advocate of good transportation. Others throughout our economy - the farmer, miner, manufacturer, supplier, all of whom depend on the railroads - are equally committed. The railroads have many friends and champions in Congress. The rail industry has another loyal defender in the Department of Transportation and in the person of its Secretary - Claude S. Brinegar, who is giving time and effort to help solve the Northeast rail problem. He is convinced - as I am - that even the heavy cloud which hangs over the Penn Central can have a silver lining.

The plight of the railroads in the Northeast rail corridor is uppermost in my mind today, but I also want to share some thought on other issues which impinge on this problem.

A resolution of the Northeast rail crisis must begin with the realization that the current dilemma stems in part from basic changes in the economy and transportation environment of the region itself. Freight transportation in the Northeast has shifted sharply away from bulk commodities. Also, the density of residential and commercial populations in the Northeast requires a greater proportion of short-haul service than in the Southern and Western sections of our land.

As you know, the Northeastern roads grew up in the heyday of railroading - when the rails were literally the "king of the road." In time of prosperity (or of emergency, such as during World War II), there was little incentive - and perhaps even less opportunity - for the railroads to adapt to the changing times or to respond to competition by other transportation modes.

This lack of adaptation was due partly to short-sighted management decisions and partly to the regulatory restraints imposed on the railroads. These conditions have left the railroads behind in competing with other modes of transportation. The railroads simply have not been able to respond to competition in the classic free enterprise way - by cutting prices or abandoning unprofitable markets.

Largely, because the railroads have been discouraged or even prevented from adjusting their operations to meet changing economic conditions, over half the rail systems of the Northeast are in bankruptcy. While outmoded regulatory policy can't take all the blame for this situation, certainly the lion's share is attributable to the outmoded provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, and its implementation by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

We believe the mistakes of the past can be rectified without taking the railroads out of the private sector of our economy. The intense demand for

rail service - the scrambling for rail cars throughout the system, and the grain-fertilizer-lumber car shortage are current examples which demonstrate quite conclusively that the railroad is still a most important part of our transportation system.

We began our reconstruction plans on the premise that a Federal bail-out by itself would not save the patient but merely prolong the agony. Nationalization would solve few problems. Moreover it is not needed. The overall freight total in the Northeast area is quite large and strong enough to support one or more new privately owned rail systems. These new systems can be extracted from the resources of the six bankrupt carriers. We believe, moreover, there is a growing need for a broad-based freight and passenger rail service in the Northeast, and demand enough to support profit making operations in both. As Secretary Brinegar puts it, there is a healthy rail system trying to crawl out of the Northeastern wreck. The building blocks are there. We simply need to do a better assembly job, based on present-day realities - not tattered tradition.

We are, as you know, seeking legislation that will permit us to streamline railroad operations in the Northeast area. We would begin by using freight and passenger traffic forecasts to identify a core rail service for the Northeast area.

We would also set up a new profit making corporation whose board of directors would select from the bankrupt carriers the needed assets. Those services not included in the core system would be terminated. Communities and other railroads, however, would be given the opportunity to continue these services and to pay compensation for them.

The new corporation would design one or more independent rail systems based on the core system of services. The Directors would acquire the facilities and equipment of the six bankrupt railroads by giving them stock in the new corporation. We are convinced these assets, collected together in a going concern, would have more value than they would under liquidation.

We believe, finally, that this new railroad company -- unencumbered by claims -- can be financed by the private sector -- and that this financing will ultimately show profit for its investors.

The urgency of the situation generally has been pagged to the July 2nd court date for the Penn Central. At that time, if no acceptable solution to the Penn Central's problems has been reached, the railroad will be subject to reorganization or liquidation. But rail operations, as such, will continue while either

of these courses of action is carried out.

As you know, the Penn Central lacks sufficient capital to make the extensive and long-needed improvements that would bring it to peak efficiency; however, the railroad does generate enough revenue to pay its operating costs. Its operating ratio last year - the percentage of revenue spent on operations - actually improved several points to 84 percent. This does not leave sufficient margin for large capital investments or debt reduction needed to pull the system out of the red, but it does suggest the prospect for recovery and the clear potential for profit in a new railroad.

In any case, we do not feel that the Penn Central, or any of the bankrupt rail systems in the Northeast are ready for last rites. However, this is not to say that we favor nationalization to solve the problems. Rail nationalization would only hide the basic problems under the bed of the Federal budget . . . reassign the mortgage to the taxpayers. Experiences in other countries show that nationalization invokes heavy subsidies. The largely state-owned rail systems in Japan, Britain, Germany, France and Italy report losses that together exceed \$2 billion a year. We believe rail efficiency is possible under the private enterprise system -- we have moneymaking railroads operating in this country to support our belief. The Federal role today is not to provide money in support of an archaic way of doing business, but rather to revise the regulatory machinery that keeps rail operations in the harness of a bygone era. We want to assist the railroad industry where feasible, in the transfer of science and technology from government sponsored research and development into the private sector in order to modernize and improve our rail system.

The core railroad system solution we are recommending for the Northeast area would come to little good unless the new railroad company is born free -- free of the outmoded regulatory procedures which contributed to the crisis in the first place. These restraints are bedeviling the railroad industry everywhere in the country. We must change them. We must, first of all, liberalize the procedures for rail abandonments. We must permit increased flexibility in rate making. We must eliminate the special freight rates enjoyed by Federal, state and local governments. We must modify the antitrust immunity of rail rate bureaus.

We must simplify mergers and encourage the acquisition of common facilities. And, finally, we must allow the easier entry of motor and water carriers to fill gaps resulting from rail abandonments. The facts on regulation speak for themselves. Only 10 percent of domestic water borne ton miles are regulated. Only 40 percent of trucking ton miles are regulated. But in the

case of the railroads and aviation -- all are regulated. One hundred percent of rail and air ton miles are regulated.

The different degrees of regulation are bad enough, but when we realize that the economic theory behind most of these regulations has its roots in the era of the 1890's, when rail had little or no competition, it's little wonder that they have created problems.

The merit of the traditional "common carrier" concept also bears reassessment in the light of today's world. In the sense of the term as it has usually been interpreted, everyone has equal rights to rail service. Which is like saying that the manufacturer who moves an entire plant's production to distribution points throughout the region by truck should receive the same service as the jobber who occasionally wants a single parcel delivered across town. Moreover, the common carrier concept inhibits the ability of the railroad industry to respond to emergency situations by allocating service on a priority basis - witness the current freight car shortage.

Let me turn now to another matter which, like the Northeast rail situation, affects all of us in the field of transportation.

We have entered a period of energy shortages, and transportation -- as one of the major users of liquid fuel -- must adapt to a new, more conservative attitude toward fuel resources. In this atmosphere, efficiency will compete with convenience, and rising prices will demand that speed defer on occasion to cost. Logic dictates that public transport begin a return to its former prominence. In this connection, we are working to insure that the Nation's new highway bill will permit cities to use Federal funds in ways that will best meet their local transportation needs. Currently, the Senate bill would fund urban grants from the Highway Trust Fund, while the House bill calls for them to be financed from the general treasury. We believe the Highway Trust Fund is an ample and appropriate source of revenue to sustain our rural and Interstate highway programs, and at the same time relieve the strain on our city streets and expressways by enabling cities to build busways, buy buses, or install people-movers -- if that will reduce congestion, move traffic, and save fuel.

Certainly this audience is well aware of the need, and more than sympathetic to the problem. Urban traffic congestion needs no advertising to a New York audience. But its vast economic loss needs telling. Estimates put the cost to truckers of New York congestion -- truckers alone -- at more than \$100 million a year. A study of one square mile area in Brooklyn revealed that

trucks were being used effectively only about four hours a day. The rest of the time they were bogged down in traffic or bottled up at dispatch points. With gasoline prices increasing and with gasoline stocks in short supply, we will not be able to tolerate these losses from traffic congestion. The first answer is, of course, a more judicious use of the private automobile combined with increased use of public transit. We are prepared for this switch. As I noted, our highway bill will provide our cities with funds that they may use at their discretion. In addition, we are asking the Congress for \$1 billion to support our urban mass transit capital grant program. Under this program we made 133 separate grants to 61 urban areas last year. Our major support has been in bus purchases. Nearly 85 percent of all buses manufactured last year were bought with Federal urban mass transit funds.

We have not yet recommended going back to horses, but I understand that the dray horse and wagon is making a comeback on London streets. Unlike a bus, truck or car, a horse can "idle" in traffic for hours, if need be, at little if any added fuel costs. A wholesale substituting of horses for trucks, of course, would not solve the current pollution problem, but it might replace it with one more easily handled by less expensive methods.

This idea brings to mind a second urgency for the revitalization of public transit. Environmental demands in most of our metropolitan areas will require new transportation strategies. We must reduce pollutants. Yet the number of motor vehicles on our highways increases by 12,000 vehicles a day -- every day of the year. The horse may help, but clearly something has to give. Mass transit is clearly the answer.

Air pollution is not our only environmental concern. As you know, we now require all transportation activities to be examined in terms of their detrimental effects on the environment. We are working on quieter aircraft engines. We are helping to develop quieter trucks. We have set noise standards for highways and our U. S. Coast Guard is developing new techniques to handle oil spills. All our transportation construction projects must also meet environmental standards. Last year we received some 1,800 environmental impact statements for review -- more than any other government agency.

There is, again, another criterion that must be considered in our transportation decisions. We can never be too safety conscious. We can only reduce the dollar and personal costs of accidents by achieving a proper mix of enhanced human understanding and concern and the use of technology to prevent accidents. And here again we have been moving in new directions. We feel our anti-hijacking program is working. There has been not a single hijacking attempt since our new surveillance and security standards were put into effect. We are,

in addition, asking the Congress for more than a quarter of a billion dollars in airport grants that will permit our local airport authorities to expand and modernize airports and make them safer. We are seeking to hire some 2,700 air traffic controllers which will give us an increase of more than 1,000 new controllers. We are bending new energy to the challenges of highway safety. For the first time, we are also establishing and enforcing new safety standards for railroad equipment and operations. The requirement here is to protect railroad personnel certainly, but there is also a need to protect communities adjoining railroad rights of way. Because of the increasing volume of hazardous material being carried, a railroad accident today could mean potential neighborhood catastrophe. In one railroad accident in Crescent City, Illinois, a tank car exploded creating a crater 18 feet wide, 47 feet long and five feet deep. The burning car then rocketed 50 feet into the air and flew 600 feet before coming to earth -- still on fire.

I have been dwelling on these transportation problems not in despair but in confidence that they can be conquered. The transportation industry has always known difficulty -- but it seems to thrive on it. As an old sailor wrote -- "the storms of adversity, like those of the ocean, rouse the faculties, and excite the invention, prudence, skill and fortitude of the voyager."

I have been at the Department of Transportation but a short time. Admittedly, I have encountered more problems than solutions.

Nonetheless, I have also seen more than 100,000 civilian and military people of the Department go to work every day, and often stay on into the night, to help bring to pass President Nixon's promise of a balanced transportation system.

The real yeoman's work, of course, is being done - as it always has been done - by the people on the firing line . . . in the transportation business.

So when I go out from Washington, to New York or wherever, I see hundreds of thousands of people at work on transportation problems. I'm convinced we all want the same thing, that is, to get ourselves and our goods from here to there on a better, cheaper, more reliable and safer transportation system.

Our greatest challenge is to put aside our special interests in favor of truly national goals and national objectives. We may all have to accept some

compromises in terms of the transportation policies we favor and consider first what serves the country best. If we do that willingly now, we may not have to do it reluctantly later.

The transportation challenges that confront us have been a long time in the making. They won't be resolved quickly or easily. But with patience, partnership and perseverance, we can prevail -- we can structure a coordinated transportation system that serves our needs and does honor to our national values and objectives.

I'm sure we can count on the support of the Traffic Club in that cause.

Thank you for inviting me to join you today.

#####

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

Official Business

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
DOT 518

FIRST CLASS





DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

TAD-494.

NEWS

122.31

34-DOT-73

REMARKS FOR DELIVERY BY DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY
THEODORE C. LUTZ TO THE MOUNTAIN STATES
ASSOCIATION, ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
June 5, 1973

It's a pleasure to be here and a privilege to have a part in your spring meeting. One of the benefits of having a job in Washington is the opportunity to get out of Washington on occasion -- to meet with groups such as yours, concerned about our Nation's transportation needs and what's being done to meet those needs.

Since your first meeting, 35 years ago, the Federal highway program has been a subject of perennial interest to the members of the Mountain States Association. I trust that this year is no different. So despite the variety of transportation topics listed for this hour in your program, I will focus my remarks on the future of the highway in America.

The considerable contributions highways have made to the growth, the economy, and the mobility of our country speak for themselves. The Interstate system is the largest public works project in the history of the world. And while it is possible to count its costs -- which admittedly are large -- it is almost impossible to tabulate its benefits, which are even larger.

73-01338 S

Driving on Interstate highways reduces starts and stops, slowdowns and speed-ups -- and therefore reduces operation and maintenance costs, especially for truckers.

Interstate miles are safer highway miles -- up to 50 percent safer than the roadways they replace. Studies suggest that the completed Interstate system will save 8,000 lives a year.

Interstate highways also save time. The 2900-mile trip from New York to Los Angeles, that took 80 driving hours in 1956 can be made in 60 hours today, at established speed limits, by using Interstate routes. This means the average motorist can save two days' driving time on a cross-country trip; or -- more importantly for your interests and your region -- the tourist today has more leisure time to enjoy the scenic grandeur and the friendly hospitality of the Mountain states. Most of the 30 million travelers who visited the 66 National Park service areas in the Mountain states in 1972 came by car, camper or motor home, over the Interstate network.

Our highways are clearly among our nation's greatest assets, and our highway construction -- and reconstruction -- work is far from done. Our 1973 Highway Bill proposes that 16.75 billion dollars (yes, that's billions, not millions) be allocated for Interstate highway construction through fiscal year 1980. Additionally, we would fund the rural road program at a billion dollars a year over the next three years, and -- to make it easier on those states with extensive rural mileage -- we would lower the matching requirement for Federal-aid rural funds from today's 50/50 to a 70/30 Federal/state ratio.

The Administration's highway bill also contains provisions authorizing Federal cost-sharing in the acquisition or construction of bicycle paths,

pedestrian walkways, and horse trails; and provides funds for the purchase of buses to be used for shuttle service in our National parks.

These and other liberal provisions of what we consider to be a well-balanced and progressive highway bill have been overshadowed to a large degree by the lively debate, in Congress and elsewhere, over another feature of our bill: the recommendation that urban areas be free to choose how they will spend the 20 percent or so of the Highway Trust Fund revenues apportioned to them. Under that provision, cities could build conventional highways if highways were best suited to the community's needs and clearly the preference of the citizens. But the cities would be at liberty to buy buses or build busways, or invest in any capital project designed to facilitate the urban traffic flow.

The Senate approved this proposal. The House did not. A Conference Committee is still wrestling with a compromise. At the moment we are not sure what will emerge, or when. But regardless of the final disposition of the bill, I think there is a growing awareness today, not only in Congress but throughout the country, of the need to make the best use of our transportation resources by permitting State and local officials to use their highway funds in the most flexible fashion.

At the turn of this century, there were fewer than 8,000 horseless carriages in the entire United States, and a grand total of 141 miles of paved road. Today we have 92 million automobiles, 20 million trucks and buses, and nearly three million miles of improved highways.

The purposes of our Federal highway program, when it all began in 1916, were to "connect our cities" and "get the farmers out of the mud."

The virtues of the motor car were its ability to provide a unique measure of personal mobility and, along with the highway, make every nook and corner of our country accessible to the individual traveler.

Both the highway and the car have fulfilled their purposes, beyond anyone's wildest imagination. They have vastly expanded and diversified our economy. They have put more people in reach of a wider range of jobs, over a spreading radius of opportunity. They have put us in touch with the recreation areas of our country. They have tied the Nation together and instilled in us a new sense of unity ... a greater freedom of mobility.

If anything, the private automobile on the modern public highway has been too successful a team. In our love affair with the automobile, we have tried to make the motor vehicle mistress to all our transportation needs. Today we are experiencing the after-effects of that unbalanced transportation policy. And despite our affinity for the motor car, we are going to have to learn to take it in modernization, use it where it is efficient and effective, and accept substitutes for it where it is not.

What started in 1916 as a modest Federal assistance program became large enough and financially strong enough to produce the most magnificent system of roads the world has ever known. Now the winds of change are blowing again, and the weather-vane of public necessity is pointing our highway program in new directions. Unless we heed the signals and act as architects of change, we shall surely be its victims.

Because, when I suggest that our transportation system is "unbalanced," I offer that as a statement of fact, not an indictment of the automobile. My boss, Transportation Secretary Claude Brinegar, went into the automobile capital of the West -- Los Angeles -- a week or so ago and told members of the Chamber of Commerce there that "our long-term concentration on highways and automobiles is no longer appropriate."

Transportation statistics support that conclusion.

Last year, for example, we spent -- as a people -- about \$200 billion for transportation and transportation services. Well over 80 percent of that total went directly or indirectly for highways and highway-related transportation.

Ninety-four percent of all intercity travel today is by motor vehicle. Eighty-six percent of all travelers use automobiles. Eighty-two percent of those who commute to work depend on the car to get them there.

You may be quick to say that the car is the most satisfactory way -- and oftentimes the only way -- to get from one place to another. And you would be right. But that is also to say that we have come to depend too heavily, almost exclusively, on the motor vehicle. We have not devoted proper attention, or resources, at the Federal level -- or in research and development -- to the establishment and patronage of acceptable alternatives to the private car. Now the priority demands of the 1970's and '80's -- led by the problems of urban congestion, an energy shortage, and air pollution -- compel a shift away from over-reliance on automobile transportation, especially in our urban areas.

There are few cities today free of the distress associated with automotive indigestion. Even here in the Mountain states -- with 4-1/2 percent of the U.S. population on 24 percent of the land (and with not quite six million automobiles in all eight states) -- cities like Denver, Phoenix, Salt Lake, Las Vegas -- yes, and Albuquerque -- are struggling to accommodate an ever-increasing influx of motor vehicles. Even in a land as spacious as the West, the care and feeding of the car in the urban environment has become a chronic civic problem.

Some of you here who remember highway discussions of earlier years will recall that one of the difficult decisions relating to the Interstate system was whether it should go through cities or around them. As it turns out, it hardly matters. The Interstate, like any urban by-pass, creates its own "city." The urban environment -- the shopping centers, motels, industrial parks, even whole new communities -- follows wherever the motorcar leads.

Harvard historian Frank Friedel commented recently that "the American nation was born in the country and has moved to the city. Yet our thinking, to a very considerable degree, has remained rural thinking."

Today 70 percent of the American people live in the urban centers that collectively occupy only about three percent of our land. Sixty-six percent of all the automobiles registered in the United States are also in the major cities of our country -- an average of one car for every 2.1 persons in cities of 200,000 or larger.

Yet for all this mobility, street traffic in most cities still moves at the horse-and-buggy speeds of a century ago -- sometimes even slower during the "rush hours."

It would be folly for us to continue to attempt to apply old, inflexible solutions to modern urban transportation problems. It would be unwise for us at the Federal level to continue to make the construction of highways far more attractive to state and local officials than the construction of alternate modes of transportation within our city limits. Yet that is the situation today when we offer ten-cent dollars for highways, on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

In short, we need a more versatile surface transportation system, recognizing the unique needs of the various sections of our country. That's why we believe that increased flexibility in the use of highway-generated funds is essential to the survival of the highway system.

The Highway Trust Fund was established to provide benefits for the motoring public. We have found, however, that those benefits do not increase in direct proportion to the amounts of money invested. In fact, we have reached the point in many places where additional miles of highways only encourage the additional use of motor vehicles -- and it's in those places we must encourage the development of alternative means of transportation. We are doing that through our Urban Mass Transportation Administration capital grant program and other Federal initiatives. But we must do more.

There are other reasons why we must take a more rational approach to surface transportation developments today. Let me comment just briefly on three of these.

First: 56,300 traffic deaths, two million injuries, and economic losses running to an estimated 18 billion dollars represent too steep a price to pay for personal mobility. Statistically, we have made some progress: given the annual increases in total vehicle miles, auto crashes would have taken 75,000 more lives over the last six years, if measures taken to improve the safety of cars, highways and drivers had not succeeded in lowering the fatality rate significantly. Nevertheless, we face the prospect of 100,000 highway deaths a year within a decade unless we can continue to compress the accident rate. This is one of our most intensive programs at the Department of Transportation. Through our highway safety initiatives, our experimental safety vehicle program, and our growing emphasis on driver education and training, we are making headway toward greater safety and safety-consciousness.

I might just mention that one of our most successful activities is our alcohol countermeasures program, which is aimed directly at controlling the slim seven percent of the drivers -- the problem drinkers-- who cause two-thirds of the 27,000 deaths and 800,000 crashes in which alcohol is a factor; and the drunk drivers in general who figure in an astounding one-half of all fatal highway accidents. The concept of the Alcohol Safety Action Project, a Federally-aided community venture designed to get the drunk driver off the road and into rehabilitation, was pioneered in Phoenix. There are now 35 ASAP projects around the country, all working on the premise that "if you drink, that's your business; but if you drink and then drive, that's society's business."

So we're going all-out to make transportation safer.

Second: we realize we must build highways today with a careful eye out for their environmental effects. In fact, we you well know, the environmental impact statement can often weigh more significantly in the construction of a highway than the engineer's report. Working together, we have demonstrated now that we can build modern roadways that do not deface nature, disgrace national parklands, or disfigure the landscape. And we give awards every year to highway projects that preserve or enhance the areas they touch.

A larger environmental issue relating to road transportation is the problem of air pollution. City planners in many of our country's major

metropolitan centers have found to their dismay that the only feasible way to achieve the standards prescribed by the Clean Air Act is to drastically curtail motor vehicle trips -- and that's a complex problem that has no simple solution. I suspect that we will ultimately achieve our clean air objectives through a coalition of measures, but I also suspect that those who look for some major relaxation in those standards are destined for disappointment.

Then, third: we are confronted today with an energy shortage that is already causing some families to reconsider their vacation plans. Motorists are being advised, for example, to take shorter trips this summer, or to wait -- if possible -- until Fall.

Such tactical measures should not and would not be necessary if motorists would simply modify daily driving habits that are wasteful of fuel. There would be no shortage if everyone would save one gallon of gas a week, make one less trip a day, or drive 10 mph slower.

Motor fuel consumption in the United States reached 107 billion gallons in 1972, a 5.5 percent increase over 1971. Consumption this year is running at a six to seven percent rate of increase, and our refineries simply can't keep pace. Two of the nation's largest refineries have announced expansion plans and others will undoubtedly do the same -- but entirely new refineries take up to five years to build from scratch, and even the expansion of existing facilities takes 18 months to two years.

There are a variety of alternatives available to us to cope with the present gasoline shortage. The least desired and certainly the most unlikely alternative is gas rationing. What we are recommending, and what the oil companies themselves are advocating, is a program of voluntary restraint on the part of the public in the use of gasoline.

One suggestion is that the national speed limit (actually, there is no "national" speed limit as such, since limits are set and controlled by the states) be lowered to 50 mph. An individual car, operating at 50 rather than 70 miles per hour, uses approximately 20 percent less fuel. But since not everyone drives at top highway speeds, our computations indicate that a 50 mph limit on the highways would translate into a 2-1/2 percent fuel savings for the nation. We would do almost as well -- we could realize a 1-1/2 to 2 percent savings -- that "gallon a week" -- by simply enforcing the speed limits we already have. And our highways would be safer as a bonus.

As a people we are not very responsive to voluntary programs, especially ones that call for some measure of restraint on our mobility -- although I did note last week that the city employees in Scottsdale, Arizona, are riding bikes on city errands, in the interests of saving fuel. Let's make no mistake about it: the energy shortage, while not severe, is real -- and it will take real effort on the part of everyone to avoid hardship on anyone.

For the time being, at least, there's not enough gasoline to satisfy increased demand, and it's up to each of us to make the small adjustments in our own driving habits that individually will cause little if any inconvenience, but collectively could stave off a more serious situation. As one wit has suggested, "in an energy crisis, you can't fuel all the people all the time."

Well ... I appreciate this time you have given me this morning. You who live in these Mountain states and tell others of their virtues are fortunate indeed. In many ways, our Rocky Mountain states represent the last frontier of America, where people can still enjoy the rugged beauty, the pristine splendor, the scenic wonders of our majestic land.

You, too, have a priceless opportunity -- the opportunity to profit by the mistakes other regions, other cities, other state and community leaders have made in failing to be far-sighted enough in their planning and in their development. In Los Angeles, the city the car and climate built, people are now leaving -- a hundred thousand a year -- largely because the car has congested the city and tarnished the climate. No one deliberately plans such consequences; but it takes deliberate vigilance to forestall them.

You do not have to say "no" to growth. You do not have to settle for a zero rate of development, in order to sustain the dignity of your cities ... to keep this state the land of enchantment and this region a preserve for the ponderosa pine, the meadowlark, and the saguaro.

Just as an uncoordinated transportation policy has contributed to uncharted growth in the past, so can President Nixon's comprehensive program for coordinated, balanced transportation contribute to the orderly development of our states and communities, the preservation of our environment, the conservation of our resources, and the realization of our highest ideals. The American highway of the future will be part of that program, and one of its proudest products.

Thank you. It has been my genuine pleasure to be here.