



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

"THE URBAN TRANSPORTATION/INNOVATION PROBLEM: CAN NEW
CONCEPTS HELP? --- THE INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE"

By Michael Cafferty
Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Environment and Urban Systems

Boston, Massachusetts

"THE URBAN TRANSPORTATION/INNOVATION PROBLEM:
CAN NEW CONCEPTS HELP? -- THE INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE"

Michael Cafferty

Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Environment and Urban Systems

Boston, July 13, 1970

Many of the discussions of the American Society of Civil Engineers Transportation Conference, and especially those of its panel on the question, "Can New Concepts Help?" have been directed toward technological innovation and its promise as a solution, or even the solution to today's worsening urban transportation problem.

Unquestionably many of the solutions to the transportation problems which confront cities and transportation experts will come through the development and application of new systems, new technology for moving people and goods in the urban areas. There is talk of tracked air cushion vehicles, personal rapid transit systems, dual

mode vehicles, automated guideways, new propulsion systems -- the possibilities are enormous.

Technology in transportation can only be successful when it is a component of a total system, a system which incorporates economic, social and environmental factors into the end product. It is a cliché in transportation today that we can get men to the moon but in most of our metropolitan areas, we cannot move men across town with any degree of predictability, to say nothing of comfort or choice as to the way in which we do it. The situation is simply (or not so simply) that the traffic problems which one encounters between here and the moon are not like the traffic problems between downtown and the suburbs at any rush hour. And city dwellers aren't even wearing space suits.

Moon vehicles aside, on earth transportation problems are problems stemming from failures in the processes by which society and technology interact and from failures in the institutions which have been created to promote or, in some cases, to deter such interaction. And I suggest that many of our problems are subject to institutional solutions. Among areas in which institutional innovation offers promise, I should include the way transportation systems work, the way they are used and, most important, the way they are planned.

There are three important new considerations, new concepts, which affect the programs of the Department of Transportation, all institutional by nature.

--First of these is the new focus on the environment and on the national desire to preserve and enhance the quality of the environment with whatever tools we may adapt to serve that goal. This effort is supported by the Environmental Policy Act of 1969, signed by the President on January 1, 1970. It is also supported by Secretary Volpe's own concern about environmental quality and by steps which he has taken to establish within the Department of Transportation new mechanisms for coping with the need to assign a high priority to environmental factors in transportation planning, policy and programs.

--Second, the Bureau of the Budget came to the Department last year with a request that we evaluate the urban transportation planning process to see where and how it might be improved. Here again many of the improvements will probably be institutional. Here again technological solutions alone cannot serve the need completely.

--Third and finally, when Secretary Volpe came to Washington, he identified another problem area -- the need for urban systems -- which he considered subject to institutional rather than solely to technological solutions. The Department of Transportation itself was created in an effort to bring together and to rationalize into a system a collection of transportation modes, techniques, methods of funding. Nowhere was the need greater than in the Nation's urban areas which were reacting to the impact of a variety of factors including urban freeways and urban freeway revolts, Interstate highways funded 90% by the trust fund, faltering and failing municipal and private transit systems, increasing reliance on airports and increasing concern about aircraft noise, and an automobile population explosion which matched the people-population explosion.

These new considerations, these institutional innovations, have already been reflected in transportation philosophy at the Federal level. Secretary Volpe, upon his arrival in Washington, created the new Office of Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems, headed by J. D. Braman, until then Mayor of Seattle. Mayor Braman is the highest subcabinet Presidential appointee in Government whose responsibilities, by title, include environmental concerns.

Secretary Volpe established this new Office because his own experience as Governor of this State and, before that, as Commissioner of Public Works convinced him of the importance of the impact of transportation on the physical environment in which we live.

Too often in the past, transportation planners have devoted their efforts solely to considerations of balancing cost and benefit. Too often in the past such planners have given more thought to eliminating the problems of automobile congestion than they have given to the need for eliminating the effects of automotive pollution. They have given more thought to transportation efficiency in the narrow sense than they have given to transportation as an environmental consideration which might profoundly affect the quality of life.

The efforts of Secretary Volpe within the Department of Transportation have been reinforced substantially by the directives resulting from the Environmental Policy Act. In signing the Act, President Nixon said, "its literally now or never." He added "we are determined that the decade of the 70's will be known as the time when this country regained a productive harmony between man and nature..."

In the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Congress directed all Federal agencies to improve and coordinate their planning functions, programs and resources in order to:

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

With this legislation, the Congress has, for the first time, attempted to treat governmental actions and their relationship to a broad range of environmental values. The policies, regulations and public laws which Departments propose are required to give positive consideration to their impact upon the environment in which they operate. To this end all agencies of the Federal establishment are required to:

- (1) "utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision making which may have an impact on man's environment."
- (2) "identify and develop methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality established by this Act, which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision making along with economic and technical considerations."

The Council on Environmental Quality has been working with all agencies in an effort to identify and develop those methods and procedures which will make it possible to insure that what we call "unquantified environmental amenities and values" are given equal consideration in design planning equal to that given to cost benefit and technological feasibility. Further, in proposing legislation or in "other major Federal actions" which significantly affect the environment, Federal agencies must prepare and submit to the Council on Environmental Quality statements on environmental impact before they submit legislation to the Congress or before they approve or move forward on Federal programs and projects. This is called "the 102 statement" and it is designed to factor environmental considerations into the process early enough to make intelligent choice a possibility.

This "102 statement" must set forth:

- (1) the environmental impact of the proposed action;
- (2) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;
- (3) alternatives to the proposed action;
- (4) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and

- (5) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Obviously, this is pervasive legislation. Federal agencies are just now taking steps to incorporate these very specific environmental considerations into their planning and their programs. There will be cases where implementation of the Environmental Policy Act will require painful readjustments in the old ways of doing business. The Department of Transportation, under the leadership of Secretary Volpe, has been a prime mover among Federal agencies in terms of response to the Act's statutory requirements for action. Because the Department created an Office of Assistant Secretary with environmental responsibilities, it has a one year lead over other Federal departments in this very important area.

The second institutional innovation, another major effort of the Department which the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems is also directing, is an evaluation of the comprehensive urban transportation planning process. There seems to be almost common agreement about the need for something better than that which exists today.

The Department's evaluation is based on the process as outlined in Section 134 of the 1962 Highway Act which called for "a continuous coordinated comprehensive transportation planning process" for those metropolitan areas with more than 50,000 population. This evaluation is aimed at rationalizing all Departmental planning assistance programs in urban areas. It involves all elements of the Department -- not just the Office of the Secretary, but also the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, and in some cases, the Federal Railroad Administration. It is the first such effort, the first attempt, to rationalize Federal planning assistance programs for transportation. Once such urban transportation planning is rationalized, the Department of Transportation will have made a significant step toward allowing local government to establish intermodal urban systems. Further, the Department will

have made a significant response to a charge of the Congress at the time the Department of Transportation was established -- the establishment of transportation systems, rather than the transportation fragments or the transportation segments which have characterized efforts in the past.

In evaluating the urban transportation planning process, the Department has sent questionnaires to 40 Mayors, 25 Councils of Government, 50 State Highway Departments, and 250 urban transportation planning agencies and other groups as well. While focusing on structure, financing, and organization, the questionnaire also allowed for a free flow of opinion on and evaluation of the planning process based on the perspective of the respondent.

Through the study participants, the Department hopes to gain the benefit of a first-hand local perspective on urban transportation planning. We believe that responses to the questionnaire* will help the Department build a concept of an ideal urban transportation planning process. Perhaps more important, the study may lead to a melding of existing highway planning policies and procedures with other planning assistance programs in the FAA and in the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. The goal -- a metropolitan development agency with planning and programming authority for all modes of transportation in urban areas, not just streets and highways, not just airports and airport access routes, not just bus and rail rapid transit facilities, but all of them.

The Office of Environment and Urban Systems has already reached some very preliminary conclusions as a result of the early returns on its questionnaire.

The major strengths in the urban transportation planning process which has resulted from Section 134 include its serving as the first major Federal stimulation of functional planning for highway, transportation and land use planning in most urban areas. It has enabled planners to gather economic data to use in highway forecasting.

*A copy of the questionnaire is given at the end of this article.

Further, it has provided a formal structure by which State highway departments and local governments can relate to each other and cooperate on highway planning projects. In general, in spite of its shortcomings, it has provided the best highway transportation planning process which has been developed up until this time.

Preliminary findings as to weaknesses in the process have indicated that in most urban areas intermodal transportation planning as a part of area-wide planning is largely a fiction because planning is dominated by the availability of funds for highway programs. Citizens groups and committees seem to have had little impact on coordinating and guiding transportation planning in most urban areas especially in those early stages when many of the major decisions are reached. Questionnaires indicate that existing planning procedures give too little consideration to new technology and to experimentation with new transportation techniques. Further, most urban transportation study groups do no comprehensive transportation planning and give too little attention to problems relating to public transportation, airport development, transportation by water, and to parking and pedestrian problems. Responses indicate that at this time environmental factors play little part in the transportation planning process. Most urban transportation planning groups lack capability to evaluate their own programs because they have neither standards nor goals for their planning activities. And, finally, replies to the questionnaire seem to indicate that many urban transportation study groups are confused about the roles of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in financing planning and planning for transportation.

From the standpoint of the Department itself, responses to the questionnaire have made it possible to reach certain conclusions also. First, the Secretary of Transportation may well wish to consider the possibility of establishing within the Department of Transportation a single focus for administering and nurturing intermodal urban transportation planning.

A new concept of urban transportation planning, emphasizing the transportation system as an urban development and environmental

tool, is badly needed. Urban transportation planning in many areas has developed into a complex and technical process of self-fulfilling prophecies and demand forecasting techniques rather than into a process promoting new systems by which urban areas use transportation to meet other goals for land use, growth, and life-style.

The various elements of the Department are now examining alternatives, aiming at a single DOT policy statement and guidelines for all Federal-aid urban transportation planning.

Second, the Department of Transportation may also wish to consider the establishment of a single urban transportation planning assistance fund and program. The fund would have no modal identification and would be used to finance urban transportation planning by single metropolitan planning agencies with basic responsibility for comprehensive physical and social planning in their urban areas.

The central target of DOT urban transportation planning assistance should be the development of metropolitan institutions capable of dealing effectively with increasing Federal aid for airports, airport access, highways, and public transportation. Criteria for receipt of Federal-aid urban transportation planning funds may well include:

- (1) Capability within one metropolitan focus to tie transportation planning to general land-use planning, social planning, and to metropolitan and environmental goals and objectives. (Failing adequate articulation of metropolitan and environmental goals and objectives; perhaps consideration should be given to withholding approval of Federal transportation aid.)
- (2) Capability within one metropolitan institution to reflect accurately the political majorities of each participating local jurisdiction in a uniform and reasonable way and to maintain a viable metropolitan forum for bargaining and decision-making to occur.
- (3) Capability of staff to deal with intermodal urban transportation planning and systems planning and to reflect balanced staff capability to deal with performance and external characteristics of various modes and systems.

Those knowledgeable in urban transportation planning will quickly point out that few such metropolitan institutional mechanisms exist at this time. However, alternative strategies to identify and promote viable metropolitan institutions which may have the capability to meet such needs are now being developed. Federal planning aid can help to bring about this institutional response.

In any new urban transportation planning effort, the States will have a central role. Intermodal planning funds administered by the Secretary would be allocated to States on the basis of population and reallocated to metropolitan agencies based on a formula yet to be devised but relying heavily on growth, population, and other indices of transportation problems. Some method for measuring the degree of congestion would need to be a part of the process, giving the DOT a better idea of relative degrees and mixes of problems.

Current transportation planning funds appropriated to the Secretary for use by the various modal Administrations represent the source of the Department's new urban transportation Planning Program. Based on the premise that balanced, intermodal planning should occur as a regularized process at the urban level, and that there should be no modal distortion of local decisions on transportation by federal aid, it may develop that any planning fund should avoid modal identification or association.

A new impetus for urban growth through transportation and land use planning and control could be provided by this new program. Since urban form is shaped by transportation systems, each mode having its peculiar effect on land use, then metropolitan areas should have the opportunity to plan and achieve more diversity and opportunity for their people. A larger more flexible transportation planning fund, accompanied by carefully conceived federal criteria and data on the potential growth and environmental effects of various modes in each the unique situation, would give new life to the urban planning process.

In addition, the Department's 1972 National Transportation Plan now being launched will represent still another stimulus for beginning now to build truly intermodal planning at the metropolitan level. This

exercise will require a central focus for articulating metropolitan transit, airport and highway needs. Again a metropolitan planning and development authority or mechanism is necessary to deal with this problem if the sort of haphazard Federal investment in transportation which has characterized past efforts is to be avoided.

The study of Section 134 and the planning process is being tied to the other research efforts which the Office of Environment and Urban Systems has undertaken which also seek to relate the articulation of transportation goals to urban needs and desires for transportation systems. Such systems should give full consideration to the service which they provide, to the environment in which they operate and to their interrelationship with other metropolitan programs and agencies such as housing, the need for medical and hopefully facilities, and educational programs.

Among these research efforts are:

Education Package for Transportation Planning

The purpose of this project is to provide an educational package useful to DOT as a mechanism to improve communication among planners and other professionals engaged in the metropolitan planning process, and to insure that all those engaged in the planning process become aware of the implications of the Environmental Policy Act for planning.

The contractor, the American Institute of Planners, will develop an educational package for an interdisciplinary approach to urban/regional transportation planning based upon research involving the following six cities: San Jose, Denver, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Miami, and Springfield, Massachusetts. The product will include a profile on each metropolitan area, background on the metropolitan transportation planning process in each area, and information on the coordination of the input of local professionals generated by the study in each area.

DOT Policy and Procedures on Environmental Policy

The objective of this project is to analyze and report on the impact of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 on DOT, particularly with regard to its transportation assistance and grant programs. The study is designed to produce a set of alternative recommended actions which the Secretary can utilize to execute the Act. Also to be included is an evaluation of the role and appropriate structure of Office of Environment and Urban Systems, both for its functions in DOT and for its external relationships.

The contractor, Arthur D. Little Company of Boston, will conduct an analysis of the Act and other current DOT legislation, identifying basic inconsistencies and common points, and prepare a tabular comparison. He will prepare a written report discussing policy alternatives available for consideration, and a draft manual for gathering groups related to transportation, on the definition and interpretation of the Act, and prepare a list of groups to be contacted.

Environmental, Social and Aesthetic Factors in Urban Transportation Planning

The purpose of this project is to develop a recommended system of methods and procedures for fostering a representative and comprehensive transportation planning process for urban communities, incorporating consideration of presently unquantified values such as environmental, aesthetic, and social factors, and maximizing the opportunity and scope for citizen participation in the planning process.

The contractor, Real Estate Development Corporation of Chicago, will provide direct on-site study of transportation planning in four cities, to be selected by the Government from a list of 15 cities chosen by the contractor. He will prepare a manual and graphic layouts, and presentation materials summarizing pertinent experience in the four selected cities and developing systematic recommended procedures and techniques to improve the transportation planning

process and provide for informed and effective participation by citizens, groups, and local decision-makers. This should include general conclusions pertinent to other cities facing similar transportation planning situations.

Case Studies in Transit Planning

The purpose of this study is to provide case studies of the rapid transit planning process and systems design in selected North American cities that have mass transit systems in operation or in cities where city officials are considering various proposals for transit. The study shall also identify the environmental effects and the economic and physical development impacts of these systems.

The contractor will conduct a study in two parts. Part one will involve case studies of 25 cities, including the transit planning process and the actual transit system and how it relates to comprehensive planning programs of each city. This will be done in coordination with the DOT study of the effectiveness of Section 134 of the 1962 Highway Act. The second part of the study will consist of an examination of the current transit planning process in North America from a standpoint of broad applicability to numerous localities.

Transportation Planning Simulation

The objective of this project is to develop a transportation planning simulation (game) that simulates the activities, procedures, and decisions involved in transportation planning as it affects the environment of a city such as New Orleans or Cleveland.

The contractor, Applied Decision Systems Incorporated of Boston, will develop and furnish a transportation planning game, in the form of a program design. He will prepare and furnish a film of significant sessions of the game, and train three to five individuals to conduct subsequent plays of the game.

A Study to Produce a Joint Planning Process Stressing Participation for the Redesign of a Subway Station

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate joint transportation planning efforts which involve students, and to develop an advanced, yet practical, approach to transit station and related development. This will be used by DOT as an aid for planning similar facilities.

The contractor, Temple University, will perform studies and analyses of techniques appropriate to the redesign of the subway station at the intersection of Broad and Columbia in Philadelphia. With the aid of university students in appropriate disciplines, he will develop a joint planning process and a group to implement it. He will also prepare media to present to interested groups, produce a display for the subway station, and prepare a report discussing in detail the activities and procedures involved in planning.

Environmental Factors in Airport Site Selection

The purpose of this study is to identify and describe environmental factors which should be considered in connection with airport planning. This will be in the form of a handbook for airport planners that identifies and quantifies the effects on intermodal transportation planning problems, water and air pollution, noise pollution, aesthetics, community disruption, and the surrounding land-use and development.

The contractor will produce a handbook which indicates awareness of the effects on residential, community, and commercial facilities and which identifies methodology and suggests procedures that deal with the aspects of airport planning mentioned above, in addition to a description of environmental control techniques to be considered and a description of institutional participants in the airport planning process. The subject will be researched in an interdisciplinary context, using case studies where relevant.

The Department of Transportation and its Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems do not suggest that these research projects and studies will establish new urban

transportation systems in the near future but the Office of Environment and Urban Systems is confident that new factors have been brought to bear on transportation planning and on the use of transportation as a tool for urban development

Further, the Department is confident that it is closer to the development of urban transportation systems than it has been possible to be in the past.

And the Department and its leadership are confident that progress has been made toward the development of tools which will make it possible to consider environmental factors in all transportation planning and in all transportation programs.

None of these efforts is narrowly technological. All of these efforts are broadly focused on the process of the institution within which the process works. All of these considerations are very important to all those who are engaged in transportation planning at whatever level. Further, they promise to have even greater significance for those who care about the quality of life in our America's cities and its towns.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
QUESTIONNAIRE
An Evaluation of the Continuing
Comprehensive Transportation Planning
Process Required by the 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act
(please type)

I. General

A. Regional Transportation Planning Agency Name

Area population _____

Reporting Official

Name _____

Title _____

Address _____

_____ Telephone No. _____

Central City _____

Year Agency Established _____

B. Has an areawide transportation plan been publicly issued? When? YES
NO

C. Are there existing or planned arrangements for reviewing transportation improvement programs for conformity with the plan as issued? Has a process been established for such review? YES
NO

D. Does the transportation plan include priorities for improvements? YES
If so, how were the priorities developed? Briefly define priorities. NO

E. How will the transportation plan or system recommendation be reviewed and approved by each of the following?

Affected local governments _____

Metropolitan planning or development agency _____

County governments
State highway department _____

Council of Governments _____

F. Does a short-term multi-year program (up to 10 years) of areawide transportation capital improvements result from the urban transportation planning process?

YES
NO

G. Has the region or its' communities issued a statement of goals and objectives?

YES
NO

H. Is there an official areawide development plan reflective of regional goals and objectives?

YES
NO

II. Administration

A. Please indicate which of the following best describes the principle or core group responsible for conducting the operations of the transportation planning process.

- 1. Special Organization for Transportation Planning
- 2. Regional or Metropolitan Planning Commission
- 3. State Highway Department Unit
- 4. Consultant(s)
- 5. Coordinated Multi-Agency Arrangement
- 6. Council of Government
- 7. Other _____
(please specify)

B. Which of the above arrangements will be utilized for the continuing phase of the planning process (after initial transportation plan is developed)
How is the plan updated?

C. Which of the following committees have been established to provide guidance and coordination of the transportation planning process:

- Policy Committee
- Coordinating Committee
- Technical Advisory or
Coordinating Committee
- Citizens Committee
- Other Citizen's Committees
(please identify)

D. How is the study director chosen? To what group does the study director normally report study affairs and from whom does he receive direction?

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Policy Committee | State Highway Department |
| Coordinating Committee | Planning Commission |
| Technical Committee | Other |

(please specify)

III. Study Financing

A. What has the total cost been for conducting the transportation study up to the present time? _____

B. What is the estimated cost of advancing the transportation planning process through the initial plan stage? _____

C. What is the estimated annual cost for the continuing transportation planning program after the initial plan is developed? _____

D. What are the current allocations of cost among the financial participants of the transportation planning process? _____ for what period? _____

Local Government
City \$ _____
Other _____

State Government
Highway Dept. \$ _____
Other agencies _____

Federal Government
Highway Adm. \$ _____
HUD _____
Other _____

For what period are above costs cited? _____

E. If a formula is used to pro-rate the cost of the transportation study among local governments, which of the following characteristics are used to determine financial shares?

Land area

Population

Property valuation

Motor vehicle registrations

Other _____
(please specify)

IV. Organization and Approach

A. Does the transportation planning study agency also act as the areawide agency under Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966? If not, what is the Section 204 agency? _____

YES
NO

B. Describe how the following elements are incorporated into the urban transportation planning process:

1. Highways _____

2. Airports and Airport Access _____

3. Public Transportation _____

4. Water Transportation _____

5. Parking _____

6. Other _____

COUNCILS OF GOVERNMENT (CONT.)

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

GENESEE FINGER LAKES REGIONAL PLANNING BOARD
ROCHESTER, NEW YORK

PIEDMONT TRAIL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA

O-I-K REGIONAL PLANNING AUTHORITY
CINCINNATI, OHIO

MIAMI VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
DAYTON, OHIO

COLUMBIA REGION ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
PORTLAND, OREGON

DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

NORTH CENTRAL TEXAS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
ARLINGTON, TEXAS

ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

SOUTHEASTERN VIRGINIA PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA

PUGET SOUND GOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

30-DOT-70

REMARKS BY MICHAEL CAFFERTY, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FOR DELIVERY AT THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS MEETING, ON THE PANEL -'THE URBAN TRANSPORTATION/INNOVATION PROBLEM: CAN NEW CONCEPTS HELP?', BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, JULY 13, 1970

I'd like to talk to you today about new considerations in transportation and their impact on programs and on the physical environment in which they operate. Much of your discussion here has been devoted to technological considerations, technological innovations. Unquestionably in transportation many of the solutions to the problems which we face today will come through the development and application of new systems; new technology for moving people and goods in our urban areas.

Technology can only be successful when it is a component of a total system. It is a cliché in transportation today that we can get men to the moon but in most of our metropolitan areas, we cannot

move men across town with any degree of predictability, to say nothing of comfort or choice as to the way in which we do it.

It is not my intention to belittle the accomplishments of our friends and neighbors at NASA and I do not intend to cast aspersions on the vitally important role of the men who man our nation's space vehicles; however, I am sure that they will agree with me that the traffic problems which one encounters between here and the moon are not like the traffic problems between downtown and the suburbs at any rush hour. And city dwellers aren't even wearing space suits.

Aside from the moon vehicle, transportation problems are problems stemming from failures in the processes by which society and technology interact and from failures in our institutions. And I would suggest that many of our problems are subject to institutional solutions. Among these we might list the way our transportation systems work, the way they are used and, most important, the way they are planned.

There are three important new considerations which affect the programs of the Department of Transportation, all institutional. First, the new focus which is being given to the environment and to the national desire to preserve and enhance the quality of the environment with whatever tools we may adapt to serve that need. This effort is supported by the Environmental Policy Act of 1969 signed by the President on January 1, 1970. It is also supported by Secretary Volpe's own concern about environmental quality and his establishing within the Department of Transportation mechanisms for coping with the problem.

--Second, the Bureau of the Budget came to the Department last year with a request that we evaluate the urban transportation planning process to see where and how it might be improved. Here again many of the improvements will probably be institutional. Here again technological solutions alone cannot serve the need completely.

--And finally, when Secretary Volpe came to Washington, he identified a third problem area -- the need for urban systems -- which he considered subject to institutional rather than solely technological

solutions. The Department of Transportation itself was created in an effort to bring together and to rationalize into a system a collection of transportation modes, techniques, methods of funding. Nowhere was the need greater than in our urban areas which were being shaped and served by urban freeways and urban freeway revolts, by the highways funded 90% by the trust fund and by faltering and failing municipal and private transit systems, by increasing reliance on airports and increasing concern about aircraft noise, by an automobile population explosion which matched the people-population explosion.

How have these new considerations - these institutional innovations been reflected in thinking about transportation at the Federal level? Secretary Volpe, upon his arrival in Washington, created a new office, the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems, headed by J. D. Braman, who resigned as Mayor of Seattle. At the time that he came to Washington, Mayor Braman was the highest subcabinet presidential appointee in the government whose responsibilities by title, included environmental concerns. This was in the beginning of 1969 and continues to be a fact until today.

Secretary Volpe established this Office because his own experience as Governor of this State and before that as Commissioner of Public Works convinced him of the importance of the impact of transportation on the physical environment in which we live.

Too often in the past, transportation planners have devoted their efforts solely to considerations of cost benefit. Too often in the past such planners have given more thought to eliminating the problems of automobile congestion than they have given to the need for eliminating the effects of automotive pollution. They have given more thought to transportation efficiency in the narrow sense than they have given to environmental considerations which might profoundly affect the quality of life.

The efforts of the Department of Transportation have been reinforced substantially by the directives which have come to us as a result of the Environmental Policy Act. In signing that Act, President Nixon

(again, I am quoting):

- (1) "utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision making which may have an impact on man's environment."
- (2) "identify and develop methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality established by this Act, which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision making along with economic and technical considerations."

The Council on Environmental Quality has been working with all agencies in an effort to identify and develop those methods and procedures which will make it possible to insure that what we call unquantified environmental amenities and values are given equal consideration in design planning equal to that given to cost benefit and technological feasibility -- But it does not stop here, in proposing legislation or in "other major Federal actions" -- which significantly affect the environment, agencies must prepare and submit to the Council on Environmental Quality statements on environmental impact before they submit legislation to the Congress or before they approve or move forward on Federal programs and projects. This is called "the 102 statement" and it is designed to factor environmental considerations into the process early enough to make intelligent choice a possibility.

This "102 statement" must set forth:

- (1) the environmental impact of the proposed action;
- (2) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;

- (3) alternatives to the proposed action;
- (4) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and
- (5) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

As you can see this is most pervasive legislation in terms of its real and potential impact on programs such as transportation and other capital efforts. Federal agencies are just now taking steps to incorporate these very specific environmental considerations into their planning and their programs. This is a law which will require some painful readjustments in the old ways of doing business. The Department of Transportation, under the leadership of Secretary Volpe, is setting the pace. By virtue of creating an Assistant Secretary with environmental responsibilities we have a one year lead over other departments in this very important area.

The second institutional innovation, another major effort of the Department which our office is directing, is an evaluation of the comprehensive urban transportation planning process. There is almost common agreement about the need for something better than what we have now.

The Department's evaluation is based on the process as outlined in Section 134 of the 1962 Highway Act which called for "a continuous coordinated comprehensive transportation planning process" for those metropolitan areas with more than 50,000 population. This evaluation is aimed at rationalizing all Departmental planning assistance programs in urban areas. It involves all elements of the Department -- not just the Office of the Secretary, but also the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, and in some cases, the Federal Railroad Administration. It is the first such effort, the first attempt to rationalize Federal planning assistance programs for transportation. Once such urban transportation planning is rationalized, we shall have made a significant step toward allowing local government to establish intermodal urban systems. Further, we shall have

responded to a charge of the Congress at the time the Department of Transportation was established -- the establishment of transportation systems, rather than the transportation fragments or the transportation segments which have characterized such efforts in the past.

In evaluating the urban transportation planning process, the Department is working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, with 40 Mayors, with 25 Councils of Government, with 50 State Highway Departments, with 250 urban transportation planning agencies and other groups as well.

Through our contacts with the study participants we hope to gain the benefit of a first hand local perspective on urban transportation planning. Each of the participants at the State and local level has been asked to complete a questionnaire which we believe will help us build a Departmental concept of an ideal urban transportation planning process. Perhaps more important, we believe that the study will lead to a melding of existing highway planning policies and procedures with other planning assistance programs in the FAA and in the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. Our goal -- a metropolitan development agency with planning and programming authority for all modes of transportation in urban areas, not just streets and highways, not just airports and airport access routes, not just bus and rail rapid transit facilities, but all of them.

This study of Section 134 and the planning process is being tied to the other studies which we have undertaken which also seek to relate the articulation of transportation goals to urban needs and desires for transportation systems. Such systems should give full consideration to the service which they provide, to the environment in which they operate and to their interrelationship with other metropolitan programs and agencies such as housing, the need for medical and hospital facilities, and educational programs.

We are confident that we are closer to the development of urban transportation systems than it has been possible for us to be in the past.

We are confident that we are on our way to the development of tools which will make it possible for us to consider environmental factors in all transportation planning and in all transportation programs.

None of these efforts is narrowly technological. All of these efforts are broadly focused on the process of the institution within which the process works. All of these considerations are very important to those of us who are engaged in transportation planning and we believe that they have even greater significance for those who care about the quality of life in our America's cities and its towns.

108 all



DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

48-DOT-70

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY MICHAEL CAFFERTY,
ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND
URBAN SYSTEMS FOR THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS
CONFER-IN, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 18,
1970, 4:00 p. m.

Teddy Roosevelt once said that "The requisite of a good citizen is that he shall be able and willing to pull his weight." In 1970 citizens seem to have taken his words to heart. More than ever before citizens are prepared to make their views known and to become involved in planning and reorganizing our society.

The American Institute of Planners is deeply aware of the problem and of the need for citizen participation. For the past several years, the planning journals -- like those in architecture, law, and public administration -- have been crammed with articles on advocacy planning, community control, the charette process and dozens of other variations on "how to let Joe Citizen have a meaningful voice in what's being planned for him."

There is no question as to the active role which citizens have played in transportation planning. It is hardly a secret that in transportation, more than in any other public works improvement program, the impact has been felt. It is unfortunate that the citizen involvement has too often taken the form of protests, picketing and law suits. Citizen groups have taken what appeared to them to be the only way that they could effect the planning process. The irony of the situation is that the plans which have been advanced have attempted to anticipate the needs of society. In the field of transportation, plans have been developed in a serene atmosphere unattended by what some would call outside pressures. Transportation planners have sincerely felt that their concern for the environment, racial inequities, or social values could be factored in through appropriate consultant contracts.

Eventually, plans so developed are presented to those who will be affected and this is usually done at a public hearing. All too often these carefully conceived plans developed with commendable technical competence, are assailed with violent accusation alluding to all sorts of ulterior motives. Citizen complaints center about not only the dislocation that transportation projects entail, but also about the failure to adequately recognize the ancillary impact on neighborhoods and the fabric of the community. The planning process at this point can either attempt to respond to some of the issues raised, or take the position that the plan constitutes the best solution, notwithstanding the objections. In attempting to accommodate to the objections, a redo by the planners, the engineers and the administrators will attempt to accommodate what are considered to be the most forcefully heard objections. The solution usually satisfies no one, which is interpreted to mean that it is a good compromise.

In those cases where the planners choose to advance the original plan, they categorize the objections as being incapable of accommodation and not understanding of the total issues that are involved. The objector, who is not a technician, claims as his right as a citizen, the power to influence Governmental operations which impact on him. Under our present system, what other choices does the citizen have at this point? In some cases, court injunctions, in others, appeals to Congress and to Secretary Volpe. Others take a more simplistic route, they refuse to move out of their homes or, in some cases, they merely sit down in front of a bulldozer.

Again, the project also goes back to the drawing board. Sometimes the lack of public support for a specific project ends its forward impetus. This is unfortunate since, in spite of his failure to involve citizens and citizens' desires in the plan, the expert was seeking to respond to a genuine public need for mobility and for access and his response was taking the form of a well-engineered transportation project. As we all know, good engineering is no longer -- if it ever was -- the only key to effective transportation which serves the broadest community need.

Despite its simplicity and effectiveness, there are few supporters of this style of citizen participation, even among those who have employed it. But -- except in isolated cases -- no one has been able to invent a method which is much better. The reason for this -- I suggest -- is that the issues and problems of citizen participation are largely a reflection of broader institutional problems affecting the transportation planning process. I might add that this discussion applies principally to urban or metropolitan area transportation planning. Transportation planning outside metropolitan areas has its own different set of problems.

Upon his arrival in Washington 18 months ago, Secretary Volpe was quick to establish a new office, that of Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. Within that Office, one of our major responsibilities has been -- and remains -- to bring a metropolitan, a local point of view, to the Department. Our first Assistant Secretary, J. D. Braman, has recently retired. However, his influence still pervades the Office, as does the broader perspective he gained during 15 years as an elected official at the city level, first as a City-Councilman and then, for 5 years, as the strong and effective Mayor of Seattle. That local perspective guides a study which we have undertaken and with which most of you are familiar -- a study of the urban transportation planning process.

Viewed from the local perspective, urban transportation planning has a great many weaknesses, as well as some real strengths. In our study (which has been underway during the past several months) and in our urban research programs, we have identified six specific urban transportation planning issues or categories, each of which has important implications for the role of the citizen as a planner:

First, Who Should Do Metropolitan Area Transportation Planning?

We really are not sure of the answer to that question. We are, however, sure of the need for giving citizens either as individuals or as groups better access to the system by which metropolitan transportation programs are planned. A significant factor here is the question of where and how the money for such planning is controlled.

At present, more than 60% of the Federal funds available to metropolitan areas to use for transportation and land use planning are funds provided by the Federal Highway Administration to the various State Highway Departments.

Across the country, there is considerable disparity as to which local institution is charged with administering these funds. In most metropolitan areas, the Federal Highway funds for planning go to a metropolitan area transportation study group which responds to the State Highway Department. In some cases these metropolitan transportation study groups have done a bang-up job. More often, however, Mayors, City Councils, and local planning agencies have had to raise questions as to why the State Highway Department is so intimately involved in planning their local transportation system. They ask further why, as an extension of the State Highway Department's responsibility for transportation planning, there is not more coordination with the area's land use, economic development, social services and public facility programs as well. Until this question can be answered to the satisfaction of these Mayors, City Councils, and local planning agencies, any discussion regarding citizen participation in the planning process can lead to no real or meaningful results.

Second, How Should the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Agency Relate to the Elected Political Leadership of the Area?

We proceed on the assumption that the elected political leadership -- particularly the Mayor or chief executive -- should have a personal commitment to the planning process. We assume further that if he does not, it will be a meaningless exercise most of the time. One problem has been that elected officials have had no incentive to participate in the planning process. We need a process which requires that they participate and which requires that the citizens

measure the effectiveness of such participation through the electoral technique. In my view, linking development more directly to planning will go a long way to accomplish this purpose. Until it is possible to resolve the questions of how the elected leadership fits into the process, it is difficult to establish a planning role for the individual citizen or for the citizen groups.

Third, How Can Community Goals be Reflected in Transportation Planning?

Community goals should be just that, a statement of rational achievable aspirations. They should be more than the rigid methodology by which aspirations can be achieved. They should combine commitment with sufficient flexibility to allow for changing community values, tastes and desires.

The best example of this situation which occurs to me in today's world, is the current confusion about the mini and the midi. I am assured by those who know or who claim to know that this confusion should not exist, that it is a matter of personal choice and that it is a modern statement of each woman's desire -- her right -- to do her own thing, to combine a commitment to whichever style she chooses with flexibility which is, after all, what makes it interesting.

To return to the more mundane, if community goals are to be reflected in transportation planning and the transportation planning process, they must first be articulated. Setting of the community goals is the point at which the comprehensive planning process begins. A clear statement of goals can be used to establish priorities to evaluate short term program proposals and should provide the framework within which longer term goals can be considered and modified as necessary. Unfortunately, in most cities, such a statement of goals has not been set. This is an essential first step.

We believe that goal setting should precede transportation planning, that the agency which is responsible to the elected political leadership for community articulation should also be the agency which does transportation planning. Transportation planning is so basic to community goal attainment that we should not be overly restrictive in just what planning money is being used for what specific purpose.

Fourth, How Can the Conflicting Interests of the Users and Non-Users of Transportation Facilities be Reconciled?

Clearly this is a political question, in the broad sense of the word. Transportation planners have generally done a fine job of protecting and planning for the interests of transportation users. Unfortunately, users' interests have sometimes been met at a great, uncompensated cost to persons in the way of or adjacent to the highway, airport, or rapid transit facility. Non-users choose to make their voices heard or their needs recognized, by the militant and uncompromising tactics which community groups have come to adopt all too frequently in recent years.

Recently I visited ten major metropolitan areas to have a dialogue about the merits and demerits of comprehensive planning. One thing everyone seemed agreed upon was that the health and vitality of a metropolitan region depends on a totality of effort not only in the field of transportation and land use planning, but also in the fields of housing, employment and social services as well. But the transportation planning process does not now require a forum where the sometimes competing, sometimes complementary needs of city and suburb can be rationalized. Until such a forum is developed, the citizen role will largely be limited to slogans and protests.

Fifth, How Can Transportation Planning be Made Truly Intermodal?

In establishing the Department of Transportation, the Congress of the United States called for a coordinated transportation system which integrated the various modes of transportation so that each could be used in the particular situation to which it was best suited. At the metropolitan level, intermodal planning leading to transportation systems is also our objective. Nevertheless, intermodal planning has been the exception rather than the rule in metropolitan areas for a very good reason. Until this year -- until this week as a matter of fact -- there has been no dependable source of Federal financial aid to modes of transportation other than highways. Obviously, planning for intermodal transportation solutions with only one mode being funded is an exercise in frustration.

All that has changed drastically. Earlier this year, a new airport assistance program was created. On Thursday, just three days ago,

the President signed into law a mass transit assistance legislation providing \$3.1 billion in Federal aid over the next 5 years. And it seems safe to predict that the 1970 Highway Act, which is now in the final stages of Congressional deliberation, will include a broader definition as to what projects can be appropriately financed from the Highway Trust Fund.

At the same time that the Department has been working toward legislation for better funding, DOT planning and policy making is increasingly oriented toward stimulating and institutionalizing a new kind of thinking which recognizes a variety of solutions to any given transportation problem. Combination of bus, rapid transit, and highways can now be assembled in creative solutions which were not previously fundable. New transportation technology, such as tracked air cushion vehicles may also be feasible soon. But before these approaches can be effective, there will have to be an evaluation in the thinking of citizens, planners and political leaders who are now accustomed to thinking of metropolitan area transportation almost exclusively in terms of the private automobile and the limited access highway.

Sixth, How Can Transportation Planning be Kept Flexible and Responsive to Changes in Community Values?

I think I would be less than frank if I did not say that, by and large, the urban transportation planning process has ended up with plans that are surprisingly consistent with plans that most highway departments had developed twenty or so years ago, prior to the initiation of the Trust Fund.

Too often, transportation systems, once laid out on a map, assume a life of their own and become resistant to change of any kind. For example, the freeway system for the Boston area was fixed in concept in the 1940's. It took an act of great political courage for Governor Sargent of Massachusetts to say, as he did, in 1970, that the system is not responsive to the current needs of the area and that work on it should be suspended.

Similarly, a large number of transportation projects planned in the 1960's, according to the rules of the game then in effect, cannot meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. While recognizing that transportation projects have a long time, we

have to develop ways to build flexibility into them so that they reflect current community needs and values as they unfold and evolve.

With these six questions, I have offered you a statement of some of the problems which afflict transportation planning and cloud the role of the citizen as a transportation planner. It would not be unreasonable for you to expect me to be able to suggest some solutions, to clarify the citizen's role. I don't pretend to have all the answers, but I can offer some proposals which reflect the input we have been receiving from planners and political leadership all around the country. The proposals are simple. Their implementation may be something else.

First, we suggest that there should be a single metropolitan area focus for transportation planning in all modes. The independent highway, air and mass transit planners must be brought together in order to make the planning process intermodal.

Second, the single focus must be politically responsive. Transportation planning is a highly political process, which must balance many diverse interests. This can be achieved only if the elective political leadership of the metropolitan area has an effective voice in planning.

Third, the agency responsible for transportation planning must also be the agency responsible for land use planning and for comprehensive planning for the area. This will help assure that the transportation system is planned to serve the community, rather than require the community, the metropolitan area, to adjust to the demands of the transportation system.

Fourth, and perhaps more important, planning should mean something. We should be doing more than planning for planning's sake. Too often planning has not lead to implementation. It seems hardly necessary to say that one should follow the other but this is the case. Planning should be the signal that development is to follow. Planning should serve to command the attention of those who should be involved in the process and all that it promises. The fact that for the first time there will be Federal funds to implement planning should do a lot toward achieving this objective.

These proposals -- I do not presume to call them solutions -- suggest to us that the Councils of Government which now exist in almost every metropolitan area, offer the best hope of becoming the kind of effective and responsive transportation planning organizations we seek.

There may be shortcomings in the metropolitan institutions and agencies which now exist. At the same time, however, COG's represent the only organization in which elected officials come together to make decisions about the metropolitan area. We have chosen to work with the COG's in spite of the fact that some of them have not been as effective as they might have chosen to be in the past. The fact remains that they represent the political entities within the metropolitan area and they respond to the political process -- the electorate.

Perhaps we should give some thought to the ways in which we might improve the effectiveness of COGs as we know them today. We may well wish to establish a set of standards for COG's. We might find that funding from the Federal level to maintain such standards might serve as a carrot or the stick (as the case may be) for ensuring that the COG represent a truly metropolitan perspective and for ensuring that the local area recognizes the COG's truly metropolitan role. We would like to hear what you have to say about this proposal.

So much for the major institutional problems in the planning process which brings us once again to the question of the role of the private citizen and citizen groups.

Here, again, let me begin by stating my assumptions.

First, citizens and citizen groups should become involved in the comprehensive continuing planning process much earlier than they are at this time. Once they have become involved they should be expected to make a commitment of some sort to the plans which result from their participation in the process.

Secondly, citizens and citizen groups should be provided the opportunity for a positive involvement. Too often today their involvement takes a negative approach, and represents only antagonism, protest and confrontation. At the same time a more positive form of citizen involvement will serve to enlighten the

planning process. And, more important, it can provide a method for expressing the will of the people, a method which goes beyond the simple "yes" or "no" expression permitted by the ballot box.

Thirdly, we should try to get away from the idea of the planning mystique. Properly handled, the planning process is not too technical to be comprehended by the layman and the layman can make valuable substantive contributions which the professional might overlook or dismiss in the absence of citizen review.

These three assumptions are too seldom recognized in local transportation planning as we know it today.

As a result, our Office receives a constant flow of letters appealing to Secretary Volpe or to us to intervene in local transportation issues. Our experience with these letters -- especially letters objecting to transportation projects because of their adverse environmental impact -- has been that the citizen objections are generally well thought out, often well documented, and almost always deserving of serious study and comment. The unfortunate thing about these letters is that the writers feel their only appeal (short of confrontation) is to the Federal Government in Washington. State and local government which should theoretically be closer to citizen interests are inaccessible and unresponsive.

I don't think it should be the role of the Federal Government to impose upon states or municipalities any one mechanism for citizen participation. All we should do is establish some criteria to guide development of processes which are responsive to local needs and conditions.

My first criterion is access to the system in meaningful terms so that citizens can participate in and contribute to the whole planning process and so that their participation and contributions can have an impact on the final result. Too often in the past citizens have complained that they have been presented with a fait accompli for approval and that of the critical decisions were made (and were made irreversibly) before the citizens were permitted to become involved. Citizens have complained (and in many cases, validly) that their role related only to cosmetics and trivia of transportation planning.

My second criterion calls for a consideration of the citizens' view in the broadest sense by the planner. If the planner rejects a

proposal or proposals which the citizens put forth, the citizens are entitled to know why and they are entitled to know why in terms which they can understand rather than in terms which are couched in what I choose to call the planning mystique.

Abraham Lincoln said "...you can't fool all the people all the time." I think we may have come to the point where we can't fool any of the people if we think of citizen participation as a cosmetic which is applied after the fact to decisions made by others to make them look better and to make them more acceptable.

Third, citizen participation should start with the definition, the articulation, of community goals and values, and the relationship of the transportation plan to those goals. To me, this means that citizens have a right to suggest that a transportation project should be realigned or not built at all, if it conflicts with current community values.

These three criteria are very general, and they give little practical guidance on how the role of the citizen as planner should be organized and implemented. They leave unanswered such questions as:

- How are competing or conflicting citizens groups to be dealt with?
- What happens when citizens and the elected political leadership do not agree?
- How can citizen participation be financed?
- Who speaks for the community -- individuals, ad-hoc groups, or established organizations?
- How can capricious shifts of opinion by citizen groups be avoided?
- How can citizens be educated in the complexities of transportation planning?

These are tough questions, but they are questions which I believe must be answered on an ad-hoc basis, city-by-city, in the light of local conditions.

Several mechanisms for expanding the citizen role in transportation planning have been developed in recent years. Each seems to have its peculiar strengths and weaknesses.

The design team approach, adopted in Baltimore, Seattle, and a few other cities, offered promise of getting a variety of design disciplines to work on a given transportation project. Through frequent meetings with citizen groups and attempts to serve, in effect, as staff for the citizens, the design team is expected to serve as a mediator between citizens and Government agencies. A recent review of the design team process, carried out under contract to our office, has raised questions about the validity of the approach as it has been applied so far. The major criticism of the process is that it has been started too late. The design team -- again -- should be more than what one consultant has called "cosmetic designing to sell predetermined and planned controversial urban freeway projects."

That is simply not an acceptable solution. The initial step has to be establishing a clear need for a given project, which has not yet been recognized as part of the design team's job.

In center city areas, advanced planning offers an effective way to obtain the involvement of those who are isolated and without access to the power structure. To my knowledge, it has never been tried as a method of providing citizen participation on a metropolitan-area basis. Perhaps the process cannot operate on that scale. Perhaps it can.

Other techniques have been employed on an ad-hoc basis by various transportation agencies. One case in the Washington, D. C., area consisted simply of having the highway department meet regularly with established militant neighborhood organizations, explain the Department's program, and work cooperatively toward joint use proposals which satisfied the community. While this process was initiated during project planning, rather than in the system planning stage, it demonstrated that an open cooperative approach can work, even in a situation charged with potential conflict. A similar process is now underway in connection with other segments of the area's freeway system.

As one contribution to the development of more effective citizen participation in transportation planning, our Office, the Office of Environment and Urban Systems, expects to have prepared, during

the next year, a citizen's involvement manual. This manual, which we hope will have broad application, will try to explain the transportation planning process and the opportunities for citizen involvement in the process. We hope it can serve to provide citizens with one tool for making their participation in planning and especially in transportation planning more meaningful. We hope it will make clear to them the steps of the process so that they can have an impact during the discussion stage rather than being forced to rely on the confrontations as a technique for achieving their goals.

Establishing an effective role for citizens is just one of the many improvements which are needed in transportation planning. I think there is broad agreement that it is one of the most critical areas of concern, since our failures in this area are becoming a serious deterrent to our ability to provide an acceptable level of transportation services.

Obviously, we don't have final answers to these problems. We do have some general ideas on how they should be attacked, both from the Federal level and from the state, local and metropolitan levels. But we need continuing guidance and input from you -- both individually and collectively. You are on the front lines. Your experience and your view of the situation are both more current and more relevant than the picture we generally see from Washington. We solicit your advice and your support.



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

4x6 color 2200 13776 7

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

47-DOT-70

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY MICHAEL CAFFERTY, ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, FOR THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS CONFERENCE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1970

The Changing Context of Urban Transportation Planning

The professional planner in today's society is in the midst of an identity crisis. His basic problem appears to me to be an inability to define who his client is or what purpose his efforts are supposed to serve. The role to which he has all too often been relegated--and in many cases, with justification--is to defend his work as not being planning for planning's sake.

My concern and I think the concern of an ever-increasing number of AIP members is that the work that has been done by professional planners to date has not met the current test of relevance. All too often plans laboriously put together after enormous effort are overtaken by events before the acceptance process is completed. To compound the problem, the balance of the plan, which may have been significantly compromised by one or more unanticipated developments, is still advanced with a rigidity that would lead one to believe it was really the Ten Commandments we were trying to implement.

My field is transportation, and I shall endeavor to develop some of my philosophy in that context.

My initial hypothesis is this: The Federally mandated "continuous, comprehensive urban transportation planning process carried on cooperatively

between States and local communities" had little impact on urban highway plans already in existence at the time (1962) that the mandate was enacted into law. What has produced change has not been the planning "process" but a political groundswell against conventional thinking and against conventional solutions, in this case solutions to urban transportation problems. The government has reacted to the people. Where were the planners? **Accommodating** to the changed community climate, or trying to plan for available Federal funds? Did they suggest to elected officials the policy options? In their defense, were there any policy options?

There is a new opportunity in the urban development and transportation field because of lessons learned, because of some new dimensions on the planning process, and because for the first time we will shortly have a Federal financing system which offers options for elected officials. The planner has a major responsibility to anticipate this changing context of planning.

Whether we gear up to handle this new opportunity will depend to a large extent on enlightened Federal assistance, particularly in the public works areas like transportation, to stimulate a viable metropolitan process, rather than dictate a Federal solution.

Let us return to the original proposition: has the Federal mandate for the "3-C" process changed anything? We rather think that it has not. Think about that. This conclusion is based on an in-depth evaluation of the planning process which the Department of Transportation is conducting right now. Reflect for a moment on your own metropolitan areas. What was the transportation plan--particularly highways prior to 1962? What is it now that the "comprehensive transportation planning process" has been in effect? The 1962 mandate has been largely unachievable simply because financing has not until recently been "guaranteed" for all of the solutions and strategies which would normally come out of such a process as was envisioned in the 1962 Act. But what is the planner's role now that we have a developing "menu" of options, perhaps even a transportation trust fund. Will the planners continue to limit the sources of conflict between planners and other articulate interests in the metropolitan area? Will the planners simply plan projects or will they begin to fill their basic role, described by Professor Alan Altshuler of MIT as thus:

"The job of the city planner is to propose courses of action, not to execute them. The standards prescribed by elected officials for his guidance are, when they exist at all, usually contradictory or ambivalent. Even the boundaries of his concern resist definition. Although his plans deal directly with only the physical city, their professed object is always to improve the total quality of urban living. Some planners articulate this object purely in terms of physical and

aesthetic satisfaction, preferring to de-emphasize the effects of physical design on economic and social problems. But most planners conceive the potential contribution of planning to urban life in grand terms. (1)

The basic role of the planner in the transportation field has been far too oriented to what there is money for and too little oriented to the "problems" which face his elected supervisor and for which that supervisor needs solutions during his term of office.

Physical planning, if you will, is social planning. Sigfried Giedion, in his Space, Time and Architecture, illustrates the point this way:

"...Town planning is first and foremost a human issue: its problems are by no means exclusively technical and economic. It can never be carried on satisfactorily without a clear understanding of the contemporary conception of life.

"Urban planning has begun to move from two-dimensional to three-dimensional planning." (2)

I submit that transportation planning has largely avoided this transition and must now formulate its role in the urban planning process.

Let me briefly describe our evaluation of urban transportation planning and some preliminary conclusions. Many of our initial judgments about the process were confirmed in a recent ten-city schedule of briefings which I conducted with key elected officials.

The Department's evaluation is based on the process as outlined in Section 134 of the 1962 Highway Act which called for "a continuous coordinated comprehensive transportation planning process" for those metropolitan areas with more than 50,000 population. This evaluation is aimed at rationalizing all Departmental planning assistance programs in urban areas. It involved all elements of the Department--not just the Office of the Secretary, but also the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, and in some cases, the Federal Railroad Administration. It is the first such effort, the first attempt, to rationalize Federal planning

(1) Alan A. Altshuler, The City Planning Process: A Political Analysis
Page 1

(2) Sigfried Giedion, Space, Time, and Architecture, p. 825

assistance programs for transportation. Once such urban transportation planning is rationalized, the Department of Transportation will have made a significant step toward allowing local government to establish intermodal urban systems.

In evaluating the urban transportation planning process, the Department has sent questionnaires to 40 Mayors, 25 Councils of Government, 50 State Highway Departments, and 250 urban transportation planning agencies and other groups as well. While focusing on structure, financing, and organization, the questionnaire also allowed for a free flow of opinion on an evaluation of the planning process based on the perspective of the respondent.

Through the study participants, the Department is receiving the benefit of a first-hand, local perspective on urban transportation planning. We believe that responses to the questionnaire will help the Department build a concept of an ideal urban transportation planning process. Perhaps more important, the study may lead to a melding of existing highway planning policies and procedures with other planning assistance programs in the FAA and in the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. The goal--a metropolitan development agency with planning and programming authority for all modes of transportation in urban areas.

The Office of Environment and Urban Systems has already reached some very preliminary conclusions as a result of the early returns on its questionnaire.

The major strengths in the urban transportation planning process which has resulted from Section 134 include its serving as the first major Federal stimulation of functional planning for highway, transportation and land-use planning in most urban areas. It has enabled planners to gather economic data to use in highway forecasting.

Further, it has provided a formal structure by which State highway departments and local governments can relate to each other and cooperate on highway planning projects. In general, in spite of the fact that few pre-1962 urban highway plans were changed as a result of the process, it has provided the best highway transportation planning process which has been developed up until this time.

Preliminary findings as to weaknesses in the process have indicated that in most urban areas intermodal transportation planning as a part of area-wide planning is largely a fiction because planning is dominated by the availability of funds for highway programs. Citizens groups and committees seem to have had little impact on coordinating and guiding transportation planning in most urban areas especially in those early stages when many of the major decisions are reached. Questionnaires indicate that existing planning procedures give too little consideration to new technology and to experimentation with new transportation techniques. Further, most urban transportation study groups do no comprehensive transportation planning and give too little attention to problems relating to public transportation, airport development, transportation by water, and to parking and pedestrian problems. Responses indicate that at this time environmental factors play little part in the transportation planning process. Most urban transportation planning groups lack capability

to evaluate their own programs because they have neither standards nor goals for their planning activities. And, finally, replies to the questionnaire seem to indicate that many urban transportation study groups are confused about the roles of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in financing planning and planning for transportation.

From the standpoint of the Department itself, responses to the questionnaire have made it possible to reach certain conclusions also. First, the Secretary of Transportation may well wish to consider the possibility of establishing within the Department of Transportation a single focus for administering and nurturing intermodal urban transportation planning. This action would be in the best tradition of Federalism because it would, for the first time, allow the Secretary to delegate the planning process to State and local governments with one set of criteria, clearly reflecting overall Department priorities.

A new concept of urban transportation planning, emphasizing the transportation system as an urban development environmental tool is badly needed. Urban transportation planning in many areas has developed into a complex and technical process of self-fulfilling prophecies and demand forecasting techniques rather than into a process promoting new systems by which urban areas use transportation to meet other goals for land use, growth, and life-style.

The various elements of the Department are now examining alternatives, aiming at a single DOT policy statement and guidelines for all Federal-aid urban transportation planning.

Second, the Department of Transportation may also wish to consider the establishment of a single urban transportation planning assistance fund and program. The fund would have no modal identification and would be used to finance urban transportation planning by single metropolitan planning agencies with basic responsibility for comprehensive physical and social planning in their urban areas.

The central target of DOT urban transportation planning assistance should be the development of metropolitan institutions capable of dealing effectively with increasing Federal aid for airports, airport access, highways, and public transportation. Criteria for receipt of Federal-aid urban transportation planning funds may well include:

- (1) Capability within one metropolitan focus to tie transportation planning to general land-use planning, social planning, and to metropolitan and environmental goals and objectives. (Failing adequate articulation of metropolitan and environmental goals and objectives, perhaps consideration should be given to withholding approval of Federal transportation aid.)

- (2) Capability within one metropolitan institution to reflect accurately the political majorities of each participating local jurisdiction in a uniform and reasonable way and to maintain a viable metropolitan forum for bargaining and decision-making to occur.
- (3) Capability of staff to deal with intermodal urban transportation planning and systems planning and to reflect balanced staff capability to deal with performance and external characteristics of various modes and systems.

What would this mean for the professional planning community? Do we have enough planners who can "put it all together," can build different program packages, and give elected officials real choices?

Those knowledgeable in urban transportation planning will quickly point out that few such metropolitan institutional mechanisms exist at this time. However, alternative strategies to identify and promote viable metropolitan institutions which may have the capability to meet such needs are now being developed. Federal planning aid can help to bring about this institutional response.

In any new urban transportation planning effort, the States will have a central role. Intermodal planning funds administered by the Secretary would be allocated to States on the basis of population and reallocated to metropolitan agencies based on a formula yet to be devised but relying heavily on growth, population, and other indices of transportation problems. Some method for measuring the degree of congestion would need to be a part of the process, giving the DOT a better idea of relative degrees and mixes of problems.

Current transportation planning funds appropriated to the Secretary for use by the various modal Administrations represent the source of the Department's new urban transportation planning program. Based on the premise that balanced, intermodal planning should occur as a regularized process at the urban level, and that there should be no modal distortion of local decisions on transportation by Federal aid, it may develop that any planning fund should avoid modal identification or association.

A new impetus for urban growth through transportation and land use planning and control could be provided by this new program. Since urban form is shaped by transportation systems, each mode having its peculiar effect on land use, the metropolitan areas should have the opportunity to plan and achieve more diversity and opportunity for their people. A larger more flexible transportation planning fund, accompanied by carefully conceived Federal criteria and data on the potential growth and environmental effects of various modes in each the unique situation, would give new life to the urban planning process.

In addition, the Department's 1972 National Transportation Needs Study now being launched will represent still another stimulus for beginning now to build truly intermodal planning at the metropolitan level. This exercise will require a central focus for articulating metropolitan transit, airport and highway needs. Again a metropolitan planning and development authority or mechanism is necessary to deal with this problem if the sort of haphazard Federal investment in transportation which has characterized past efforts is to be avoided.

Further, the only way the new National Environmental Policy Act can really be implemented is in the planning process, thus we have a Federal mandate to change the institutional base for planning.

The study of Section 134 and the planning process is being tied to the other research efforts which the Office of Environment and Urban Systems has undertaken which also seek to relate the articulation of transportation goals to urban needs and desires for transportation systems. Such systems should give full consideration to the service which they provide, to the environment in which they operate and to their interrelationship with other metropolitan programs and agencies such as housing, the need for medical and hospital facilities, and educational programs.

Among these research efforts is one which you as planners should take special note of. We are preparing, with AIP, an "Education Package for Transportation Planning." The purpose of this project is to provide an educational package useful to DOT as a mechanism to improve communication among planners and other professionals engaged in the metropolitan planning process, and to insure that all those engaged in the planning process become aware of the implications of the Environmental Policy Act for planning.

The contractor, the American Institute of Planners, will develop an educational package for an interdisciplinary approach to urban/regional transportation planning based upon research involving the following six cities: San Jose, Denver, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Miami, and Hartford. The product will include a profile on each metropolitan area, background on the metropolitan transportation planning process in each area, and information on the coordination of the input of local professionals generated by the study in each area. But the important thing about this project is that it starts from the assumption that the planning community must open up its blinders and begin to improvise.

We challenge you here today to play that role.



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

53-DOT-70

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY MICHAEL CAFFERTY,
ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN
SYSTEMS AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION, MILLS HYATT HOUSE, CHARLESTON,
SOUTH CAROLINA, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1970 at 8:30 p.m.

PROGRESS AND PRESERVATION : TRANSPORTATION IN OUR CHANGING CITIES

It is symbolic and it is correct for the National Trust for Historic Preservation to be holding this important meeting on Preservation in our Changing Cities in Charleston, South Carolina. Charleston has long been deeply aware of the relevance, the importance of preservation in a time of change.

It is especially appropriate for us to be joining Charlestonians in their celebration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of the city. It is a pleasure for those of us, some from cities across the country, to join in marking that anniversary.

Charleston has set a national example of what can be accomplished by the dedication and devotion of individuals who work together such as you who work to further the principles of the National Trust.

Mrs. S. Henry Edmunds of the Historic Charleston Foundation has a very interesting slide show which includes a view of the skyline of Old Charleston in 1851 and another which shows the same view today. They are the same. Charlestonians have seen fit to capture and to preserve their rich architecture and historic heritage in the midst of a changing city. Charlestonians are aware that certain objects, like certain values, should not be permitted to change.

The first municipal zoning ordinance in the United States which established an historic district was adopted in Charleston in 1933.

I find it particularly appropriate that you of the National Trust for Historic Preservation should be meeting here to renew your own commitment to the purposes and principles which you serve.

The September issue of Preservation News begins its lead editorial on the government and preservation with this sentence: "The eye of the eagle is still on economics, as the United States goes its merry way of progress." I am here tonight to tell you that the eagle has turned his head and the eye is beginning to look in other directions.

There seems to be a growing spirit of appreciation for history in America. Perhaps it is born of the environmental threat and a wistful longing for the days of old. Perhaps it is simply born of the times -- times that have become characterized by technology we can't always control, a living pace we can't always adjust to, and a generation of values that often seem strange and remote. And perhaps also there is a general fear that our future has slipped off its historic foundation.

Whatever the cause, a vibrant concern exists today for preserving the best elements of our heritage.

In a 1959 article dealing in part with the impact of Colonial Williamsburg and of the many museums and historic activities that followed its example, Time magazine observed that "History is hot." Every year since then the temperature has continued to rise. Much of the credit for that rise should go to the National Trust and to related organizations in the field. In your 21 years of existence there have been many outstanding achievements: the buildings which make up the Trust, your involvement in the School Without Walls projects in Philadelphia and Chicago, your monetary grants to organizations working for historic preservation, and the leadership and guidance you have demonstrated through regional workshops and through your publications program. But most significant is the spirit of historical relevance that you have spread through the country.

Your president, James Biddle, was quoted a few weeks ago in the Washington Post as saying that preservation should "serve as a

springboard to the future. Homes and buildings within the Trust must relate to the present and help serve the development of the future. This is the tremendous challenge."

And so it is in transportation. We in transport must build systems that serve the present and the future without destroying the past.

And we have an even greater challenge in the knowledge that every major transportation project will generate unforeseen effects which will each have its own impact on the way people live. That responsibility cannot be taken lightly.

When John Volpe became Secretary of Transportation in January 1969, he was quick to create the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. To paraphrase Time Magazine, he was one of the first to recognize that "Environment is hot." But he also recognized the depth and impact of the problem. And he established our office to make environmental considerations a vital element in the Department of Transportation's concern and to channel that concern into long-term programs of action -- in other words, to keep the temperature rising.

Secretary Volpe was delighted to learn that in a discussion of Federal programs dealing with historic preservation interests, your president, Mr. Biddle, cited the Department of Transportation as a model. I would like to share with you a quote from the Secretary in a letter to Jim:

"As you know, I am deeply aware of our responsibility for seeing that every effort is made to make transportation progress and environmental quality compatible. It was with deep gratitude that I learned that the Department's efforts in this area are considered noteworthy by an organization which has demonstrated the continuing leadership such as that shown by the National Trust for Historic Preservation. I look forward to a continuing cooperative and productive relationship."

The Office of Environment and Urban Systems has been involved in a number of controversies involving progress versus preservation and conservation. We have been called "Bird and Bunny People" and "Historic Old Hens." But we have also been called by our Secretary "the conscience of the Department" which is the phrase we like to think best describes us.

The first Assistant Secretary to fill this Office was J. D. Braman, former Mayor of Seattle, Washington. Mayor Braman retired just last month to return to his native State. He left a legacy of action, of negotiation, of purpose that will serve our Department well for some time to come.

We have essentially two tools for making transportation improvements compatible with environmental and historic preservation. The first is the law which this organization struggled so earnestly to see enacted in 1966. That law provides the predicate. Our second tool is the spirit, the spirit of national concern as interpreted and implemented by leaders at the local, the State and the national level.

While response to a national concern may seem a frail and nebulous base for governmental action, it provides the very real impetus which is necessary for the successful implementation of the law.

The Congress has long been concerned about the need for providing maximum transportation efficiency and convenience and, at the same time, reflecting appropriate concern for the impact of that efficient and convenient transportation system on the physical environment. We in the Department have a similar concern. We must find ways to satisfy transportation objectives and, at the same time, must be certain that we are giving full consideration to questions relating to the preservation of the environment and the retention of historic and natural resources which give quality to that environment.

In 1966, the basic Federal Highway law was amended to require urban highway planners to go beyond traditional economic and engineering considerations in locating highways. For the first time, they were also told to consider, and I quote, "social effects of such a location, its impact on the environment, and its consistency with the goals and objectives of such urban planning as has been promulgated by the community."

The 1966 law required our highly competent highway engineers to reassess the considerations which had served as the basis for many of their decisions during the course of planning transportation facilities.

In the past, economic and engineering judgments were paramount. Cost/benefit was the god to which we paid obeisance. Today as our society adjusts to changing values we are setting new priorities and we are placing new requirements on transportation planners and on

engineers. We now are endeavoring to make sure greater weight is given to conservation of the environment, and preservation and improvement of communities and neighborhoods. There are no set or easy rules or ready guidelines explaining how to do it. The result is that we have developed a sensitivity in those responsible for constructing the projects that we will not permit transportation be a destructive force.

When the Department of Transportation was created in 1966, the Congress stated that the Secretary could not approve transportation projects which required the use of land from parks, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, or historic sites until he has determined, and the language is very specific, "unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land and that such program includes all possible planning to minimize harm to such park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge or historic site." This is the much heralded 4(f) provision.

Secretary Volpe has charged our Office to implement Section 4(f) of the law and we are trying to see that the job is done in a manner consistent with the intent of Congress. In most cases this does not mean that highways or other transportation facilities are stopped. It simply means that planners must give careful consideration to the impact of their plans on the entire community, not just that element of the community which is served by the transportation facility.

For example, a little over a year ago we withdrew Federal funds from construction of the Riverfront Expressway in New Orleans. At that time Secretary Volpe said that he, and again I am quoting, "refused to grant Federal highway funds for the proposed New Orleans Riverfront Expressway because the highway would have seriously impaired the historic quality of New Orleans' famed French Quarter, the Vieux Carre'."

Several months later when it appeared that the proposed Miami Jetport as then planned would seriously damage the ecological quality of the Everglades National Park, construction was brought to a halt. We are now working cooperatively with the Dade County Port Authority and the Department of the Interior to see whether we can find a way to build that airport without damaging the Everglades. If we cannot find a way, the airport will not be built.

You may also be familiar with another recent action taken by Secretary Volpe. He directed that an interstate highway which threatened the historic and scenic quality of the Old Man of the Mountain at Franconia Notch in New Hampshire be rerouted in order to preserve the integrity and quality of the area.

In one sense, these were significant victories. They illustrated our intent on carrying-out the law -- and our willingness to suffer some abuse in doing so. But in another sense, they were not really victories because those decisions should never have been necessary.

In each case, attention was focused on the problem by dedicated individuals and organizations who had to raise their signs of protest before the bulldozers lowered their blades. That should not be necessary. These problems should not end up on the desk of your Congressman or the Secretary of Transportation.

They should be settled locally -- and early -- early in the first stages of planning.

As the title of this conference recognizes, our cities are changing -- and doing so at a rapid pace. Obviously, some of these changes have been in the planning hoppers for years. But others are just beginning to take form.

Now is the time to insure that historic areas are listed on the Historic Register so that they are covered by the Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

Now is the time to find out what the city plans to do five or ten years from now and take your views on those plans known.

Now is the time to look around for other organizations or individuals who share your interests, and who are willing to get involved.

Our office receives a constant flow of letters appealing to Secretary Volpe to intervene in local transportation issues. Our experience with these letters -- especially those objecting to transportation projects because of their adverse environmental impact -- has been that the citizen objections are generally well thought out, often well documented, and almost always deserving of serious study and comment.

The unfortunate thing about these letters is that the writers feel their only appeal -- short of confrontation -- is to the Federal Government in Washington. State and local government which should theoretically be closer to citizen interests are often inaccessible and unresponsive.

I don't think it should be the role of the Federal Government to impose upon State or municipalities any one mechanism for citizen participation. All we should do is establish some criteria to guide development of processes which are responsive to local needs and conditions.

My first criterion is access to the system in meaningful terms. Too often citizens have been presented with a fait accompli for approval. The critical decisions were made and then the citizens were permitted to become involved.

My second criterion calls for a consideration of the citizen's view in the broadest sense by the planner. If a planner rejects a proposal which the citizens put forth, the citizens are entitled to know why in plain and simple terms. And citizen participation should be more than a cosmetic which is applied after the fact -- to make decisions appear to have community participation and support.

Third, citizen participation should start with the articulation of community goals and values, and the relationship of the transportation plan to those goals. To me, this means that citizens have a right to suggest that a transportation project should be realigned or not built at all, if it conflicts with current community values.

The National Trust, through its Office of Field Services, has made 34 grants, to consultants for advice on the development and execution of preservation projects. This program is highly commendable. It offers you an excellent opportunity to focus talented and trained experts on urban planning problems. It also provides you with the expertise to formulate alternatives to planning proposals with which you might disagree.

Providing alternatives -- suggesting positive solutions -- making historic preservation relevant to present and future needs: these are the kinds of stances that will give credibility and influence with urban decision makers. These are the kinds of attitudes that will make the spirit of preservation a living one. I have seen it happen in our own Department.

We have introduced the spirit of environmental concern to highway planners and engineers. And they have introduced some practicalities to us. We have both changed for the better. Consider some of these recent highway actions:

-- A state highway was rerouted some 300 feet to avoid disturbing an eagle's nest in the top of a 50-foot pine tree. (Incidentally, I think it's a little ironic that the fierce and proud eagle, which Preservation News uses as a symbol of government unconcern, should itself be in need of a special preservation.)

--New Jersey State Highway officials, preparing to bulldoze an ancient fire house, took it upon themselves to save the station's historic control center, complete with two-story high slate panels, switches, and electrical test meters.

--University of Alabama archeologists have been asked to salvage a long-forgotten Fort near Mobile, Alabama, which was recently uncovered by highway crews.

These are small and, perhaps, insignificant actions. But I think they illustrate that the spirit of preservation is taking hold.

Our job is to marshal that spirit in areas where it will do the most good. We must know the law and know how to use it. We must look to the future in preserving the past. The National Trust has always been a leader in all of these areas. And I am proud to have participated in your 24th annual conference.

Historian Philip Guedalla wrote in 1936 that "The true history of the United States is the history of transportation . . ." Many of you may disagree with Mr. Guedalla but we in the Department of Transportation feel that it puts us in good company and we are pleased to accept his judgment.

#####



**DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION**

Library 486 ca 9
NEWS

fm-2200

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

55-DOT-70

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY MICHAEL CAFFERTY, ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, 2:30 PM, NOVEMBER 10, 1970, THE SHAMROCK-HILTON HOTEL, HOUSTON, TEXAS

Total Transportation Financing -- Now and in the Future

The vital role that transportation plays in our life is dramatized by the many far-reaching laws passed by this Congress at a time when legislative impasses have been the rule rather than the exception.

Secretary Volpe has been successful in achieving landmark legislation in public transportation, aviation and rail. The upcoming highway legislation will be strengthened to do an even more effective job.

Before addressing myself to the subject at hand, I would like to make a special point of acknowledging the valuable counsel and guidance that I have received from my good friend, Alf Johnson. I was fortunate enough to get to know Alf when I still thought ABC stood for the first three letters of the alphabet.

"Total Transportation Financing -- Now and in the Future" is today's subject. We are at the beginning of a new era in Federal

transportation financing. 1970 represents an historic turning point in the Federal Government's role in transportation planning and programming.

With the Urban Mass Transportation legislation, Federal money is available for the first time in significant amounts to finance public transportation; Airport/Airways will enable us to get on with the job of airport development.

The Rail Passenger Act of 1970 involves the Federal Government in intercity rail passenger travel. The highway legislation presently before Congress is almost assured to be made more versatile.

Critics would suggest that all we can or want to do is build highways. What they won't admit is that there has been a steady expansion of the authority of the Act to permit the flexibility of giving the most generous relocation assistance in the Federal Government, encouraging joint development and making highway construction a force for good.

1970 is the year when environment became everyone's concern and at times it seems that they are all telling us how to do our job.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires that all Federal agencies must consider the environmental impact of their actions. We must explore alternatives to any proposed course of action which raises environmental difficulties. In view of the size of our capital program, we in the Department of Transportation and particularly the Federal Highway Administration, have really got our work cut out for us. Fortunately for us, DOT anticipated today's environmental emphasis; the 1966 Highway Act has its environmental mandate; and, in 1969, Secretary Volpe's first official act was to establish the position of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems in the Department of Transportation. DOT is now in the process of reassessing our role to determine how best we comply with the spirit of the law and at the same time get the job done.

In addition, the Department is beginning a National Transportation Needs Study. This Study expands and supplements the 1972 Highway Needs Study. We will attempt to define the needs for all transportation modes and will collect data covering the anticipated changes for the next several decades in types and use of transportation service. The 1972 Study will also include an assessment of the proposed solutions to transportation needs which will also include their social, financial, and environmental

costs. The Study will be coordinated through the Governor of each State, but we are also interested in having Mayors, cities, local planning authorities, county officials, citizen groups and private industry all play a role.

We in DOT along with AASHO, the Highway Research Board and similar organizations have significant research and development programs aimed at both reducing any adverse impacts of our programs and, of equal importance, developing approaches that will insure that transportation will always improve the quality of life in the United States.

Mayor Braman of Seattle, who was the first Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems in DOT, addressed the 1967 AASHO Conference in Salt Lake City. There he postulated three assumptions that he felt should guide urban transportation policy in the future. I would like to repeat today what he said in 1967 because in 1970 it has even more relevance in light of the tremendous legislative progress that has been made since that time.

- "1. A transportation system should be a tool to shape the growth of metropolitan areas and should have as its goal the improvement of the quality of the environment.
- "2. The particular characteristics of each urban region should determine the transportation modes most appropriate for that area.
- "3. Priority consideration should be given to the funding of a balanced transportation system for urban areas."

To this let me add my own personal philosophy regarding the role of the Federal Government in urban transportation. The Federal Government's major transportation role should be in the establishment of workable criteria and in the equitable distribution of financial support. The major decisions regarding the choice mode should be made at the appropriate level of local government with the Federal Government providing the money and attaching as few strings as possible. On the basis of a single transportation mode, the Federal/State relationship established under the Federal-Aid Highway Program serves as an example of the kind of excellent cooperation that is possible.

With this as background, let me explore in greater detail the new role of the Federal Government in transportation financing, as I see it.

In recent years the Federal Government's primary responsibility in transportation has been to oversee and promote highway construction through the distribution of the Highway Trust Fund. The Interstate System which came about as a result of this Trust Fund is the greatest public works project in the history of the world. This system linked together the metropolitan areas of this country. Unfortunately, Federal money has not been available in significant amounts to support the development of any other form of transportation except highways.

Consider these figures for a minute. Since 1961, the Federal Government has spent \$41 billion on highway construction. During the same period, \$843 million, or approximately 2% of that amount, was spent on public transit facilities. No Federal money was spent on railroads and insignificant amounts on airports and their development. The Federal transportation program was, let's face it, a highway program.

And, as successful as the Interstate System has been, it is primarily an inter-city transportation system. It is not designed to respond to the differing kinds of transportation needs that are found in our densely populated metropolitan areas. The problem of connecting metropolitan areas and the challenge of achieving mobility within such an area are quite different. The impact of an Interstate highway facility on remote land where there is little development is minimal. Such a facility serves its primary purpose, that of moving rubber-tired vehicles. We are still grappling with the problem, the question of how to cope with this problem in densely populated areas. In Germany, their solution was simple. They stopped the Autobahn at the boundary of the metropolitan area and let each area determine its own solution to its transportation problems within those boundaries.

President Nixon has said this is "The Decade of the Environment". Public concern about environmental quality has grown out of what many have considered too long a disregard for the quality of the air, the water and the landscape. While some of the feelings being expressed may be overreaction, there is certainly a degree of merit in the criticism which is leveled at transportation. Our single focus has been too narrow and as a result has not given sufficient attention to the overall social, economic, environmental, and land use implications on the area in which highways are being built. As transportation planners, we have long known what metropolitan areas are still learning, that bringing more private automobiles into already over-congested downtown areas falls short as a solution to transportation needs.

Obviously, we must take the lead in responding to the problem and to the shortcomings of the present system. It is in the best self-interest of all who are involved in highway planning and construction to take account of both the extent of the problem and the new mood of the public, and to realize that now is the time for change in our system of transportation planning.

Transportation modes should complement, not compete. A combination of highways and an efficient mass transit system, be it exclusive of bus lanes or a fixed rail system, is necessary for most metropolitan areas. An effective mass transit system not only provides transportation for those elements of society too often ignored in the past, but also benefits those who must travel by car by taking other people out of their cars and into public transportation facilities.

The Federal Highway Administration has already taken significant steps toward emphasizing the principle of modal flexibility. Through its cooperation with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration in the Urban Corridor Demonstration Program, we are working with eleven different communities to achieve a bimodal resolution of congestion in a selected corridor.

In a new policy announcement on September 2nd of this year, Secretary Volpe and Frank Turner of the Federal Highway Administration stated that it would be the official policy of the Department of Transportation to "encourage the greatest use of buses in preference to individual automobiles". This policy of moving people rather than vehicles is a recognition of the real need which exists in urban areas.

A second, and perhaps even more significant change, is seen in the new sources of financing for air and ground transportation facilities.

The Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970 authorizes \$10 billion of Federal aid over a 12-year period to aid in providing mass transportation facilities. We have been given contract authority for \$3.1 billion over the first five-year period. The Act is a recognition that there is a substantial need for Federal support for financing mass transit facilities.

Implementation of the Act has already begun and we estimate that there is a capital investment requirement of some \$28-\$34 billion in the next ten years for urban transportation facilities. The money

available under the Act can be spent for UMTA capital assistance activities, such as capital grants and loans, technical studies and relocation assistance. It cannot be used to finance, to subsidize, day-to-day operations or deficits arising out of those operations. DOT will give top priority to the revitalization of transit systems which are needed in the public interest.

Of considerable interest to you should be the fact that funds will be available to support inter-modal transportation projects such as urban corridor demonstrations, reserved bus lanes on freeways and transit links to airports. These funds will make it possible for the first time for metropolitan areas to have a real choice between highways and mass transit or a combination of both because Federal money will be available to implement a choice of the most appropriate combination of modes.

The Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 creates a designated account for user charges, a tax on tickets and fuel. The Act provides \$2.5 billion over a ten-year period for airport and airway development, authorizing 50/50 matching funds for airport expansion and construction. This money will permit expansion of airport facilities to accommodate the increased demand for fast inter-city transportation.

The recently passed Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 forms a quasi-public corporation to assume responsibility for unprofitable inter-city passenger train service. Railroads can turn over inter-city passenger routes to the corporation upon payment of a price in either cash or equipment. Federal assistance is available to attempt to help put such rail service back on a competitive operating basis. The fast rail service now available on an experimental basis is the Metroliner between New York and Washington, D.C. This hopefully will become a realistic alternative on many other short-haul inter-city routes as well.

These, coupled with the farseeing provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Bill which we hope to see enacted, will do much to guarantee flexible financing on a basis far more comprehensive than anything which has been possible in the past.

An urban system of highways for areas over 50,000 population would be created by both the House and Senate versions of the 1970 Highway Act. The responsible public officials of such urban areas would have a voice in making selections for the urban system, using the planning process required by Section 134 of the 1962 Highway Act.

Both the House and Senate versions of the bill allow for the construction and acquisition of replacement housing as a part of the cost of highway construction. The Senate version provides for compensation for displaced persons whose financing costs go up and extends relocation assistance to those outside the right-of-way who are injured by the highway.

The final bill may make it possible for the first time to consider as "construction costs" those costs of reducing adverse social and environmental impacts caused by highway projects. Noise level standards and air quality standards are required to be issued and met.

It is clear that there will be numerous changes from present authority. The emphasis on meeting urban transportation needs, on greater flexibility for inter-modal cooperation, and on minimizing the environmental and social impacts of highways are significant. They are of equal significance to all of us who are charged with designing transportation programs which go beyond providing simply an efficient transportation system and include a response to social and human needs as well.

These developments represent a significant departure from the financial imbalance in support for the various modes which has determined transportation planning in recent years, but this is just a start -- imbalance still remains.

Five billion dollars a year is available for highway purposes through the highway trust fund; less than one-sixth of that, \$80 million, is available for FY 1971 for mass transit facilities. The Federal share of interstate highway facilities is 90 percent of their cost; the Federal share of UMTA grants is never more than $66\frac{2}{3}$ percent. Imbalances remain in the source of the local share for highway and mass transit projects. The local share for highways generally comes from a State highway trust fund, and is never subject to repudiation at the ballot box. The local share for mass transit facilities generally must be voted as an addition to the general tax of the locality. The choice must be a conscious one. The tax is an add-on to the tax burden of an already heavily taxed citizen. So, true local choice between modes is biased by the financial imbalance of the options which exist.

The Federal Government has a significant role in financing transportation planning, as well as in financing specific transportation projects. States are required to use $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent of their yearly trust fund allocations and they may use an additional $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent for highway planning, research and development. The Airport and Airway Development

Act provides \$15 million a year for airport planning, and the Urban Transportation Act will make significant funds available for mass transportation planning. The Department's role is significant since, of all the Federal money used for planning by local areas, over 60 percent comes from the DOT.

At the direction of the Office of Management and Budget in the White House and of Secretary Volpe, my Office is conducting a study of the urban transportation planning process which is required under Section 134 of the 1962 Highway Act. We have met with many of you during the conduct of that study. We have also sent questionnaires and have made personal visits to State highway departments, State departments of transportation, Councils of Government, Mayors, and 250 transportation planning agencies throughout the country.

As a result of this study, we are considering changes in the urban transportation planning process and in the way DOT planning money is spent. When he has reviewed that study, the Secretary may wish to consider the establishment within DOT of a single focus for administering all planning money, and for nurturing inter-modal urban transportation planning. Further, the Secretary may also wish to consider a single urban transportation planning fund. Such a fund might be designed to have no modal identification and to be used to finance urban transportation planning by single metropolitan planning agency which might also have basic responsibility for comprehensive physical and social planning in their urban areas. Departmental thinking is still in the preliminary stages, but we look to changes in the planning process as one way to achieve a broader consideration of transportation implications and alternatives than has heretofore been possible. Further, it seems to be one of the major areas where intermodal solutions to transportation needs must be found. Our recommendations will obviously take into account the planning expertise which has already been developed particularly in the highway field. Not to take full advantage of this reservoir of talent would be folly of the first order.

The Department may eventually move on to what many consider a logical next step: the establishment of a single transportation trust fund. Secretary Volpe has discussed such a possibility a number of times. Such a trust fund would provide transportation funds to solve transportation problems as they are viewed and resolved by local authorities on the basis of local priorities. There would be no modal bias to the options available. There should, however, be assurances that all modes will be treated fairly -- these safeguards should be incorporated into any formula advanced. There would be a real opportunity for flexibility, innovation

and a combination of transportation modes to provide a comprehensive integrated transportation response to a need.

It seems to me that the best system of transportation financing is the most flexible system. With the Interstate System nearing completion, it is incumbent upon us to find such flexibility as we move into the next stage of transportation development.

In conclusion, let me state that I am optimistic about the future and believe that the legislation which has been adopted and that which we expect to be adopted shortly will allow the creation of a more rational, more balanced, better transportation system.

In some circles, it has become popular to blame highways and highway engineers for some of our urban society's ills. Such criticism is both inaccurate and unfair since many of the faults that are found with highways are faults or shortcomings in the Federal role in transportation financing which has forced an emphasis on highways to the near exclusion of all other modes. With the correction of the financial imbalances of the past, and availability of Federal financial resources, the States and local areas can begin to develop a truly balanced and truly intermodal transportation system.

We are in what many consider a revolutionary period in this country. As Charles Reich says in his new book, "The Greening of America", "...organization and bureaucracy, which are an application of technology to social institutions, increasingly dictate how we should live our lives, with a logic^{of} organization taking precedence over any other values." Translated into simple terms, every large organization has a tendency to avoid change, particularly change brought about from the values foreign to it and developed by popular acclaim. You find yourselves now in a different "ball game" in which the likelihood is that there will be a financing system for all transportation improvements based on a common Federal matching ratio and giving much more flexibility to the local governments for choice.

We challenge you today to develop your own concept of the role of the highway in meeting tomorrow's human needs. "Need" cannot any longer be defined in lane miles; solutions no longer in terms of constructing them. The highest calling of the engineer is not simply to build something, but rather to manage artfully the use of technology and machines. It is conceivable that Secretary Volpe will be looking to you in the next

year for guidance on multi-modal financing. It is my feeling that you should take up the banner and produce the best of your thinking.

We in the Department of Transportation feel that our greatest contribution will be to provide flexible tools to be used by the States and metropolitan areas to make real choices which they define as real responses to their needs.

To a large extent, the success of this Nation's transportation system in the next decade hinges on the quality of work during this decade by people like you in the States and those in metropolitan areas involved in the planning and implementing process. Public officials must work with private citizens in metropolitan areas to identify carefully the land use and social goals and to assess all of the transportation needs and options available to implement those goals. This is a critical component in the system.

We can bring to bear on the problem new financing for intermodal transportation systems, the experience, ingenuity and cooperation of competent and conscientious experts such as you, and a new dedication to quality in both the physical and the social environment of our increasingly urban society. These can serve as tools. With them I am confident that tomorrow's transportation will be even better than the system which we have today. It will be more innovative in terms of technology, more creative in its use of institutions for articulating goals and achieving objectives, and more responsive to the public need and to the public concern.



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Volpe 4x6 2 10
NEWS
Room - 2208

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY **WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590**

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY
MICHAEL CAFFERTY, ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR
ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS FOR THE GRADUATING
CLASS OF OFFICERS CANDIDATE/GENERAL SERVICE SCHOOL,
YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA, JANUARY 22, 1971

Captain Kincaid, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. It is my great pleasure to join you of the Coast Guard and the distinguished foreign visitors who have come to join you here in your graduation from the Officers Candidate School at Yorktown.

I am here as a representative of Secretary John A. Volpe and the U. S. Department of Transportation, our Nation's newest Cabinet agency which is proud to claim the Coast Guard as a vital element and its largest single component.

During the short four years since the Department was established, Secretary Volpe has created two new Assistant Secretaryships to respond to what he considers to be the most pressing transportation issues of the day. Both of these new offices are of vital concern to the United States Coast Guard.

I represent the first of these, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems, now two years old. The second, the Office of Safety and Consumer Affairs was created just last year and has as its Assistant Secretary, the distinguished former Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Willard Smith.

As you go from Yorktown today to duty stations, both shore and at sea, you will have the opportunity to become deeply responsive to environmental issues and problems. Environmental quality is a vital issue of millions of your fellow Americans and to concerned individuals in all parts of the world. You and the Coast Guard of tomorrow will become deeply involved in considering the impact of your actions both as individuals and as a service upon the quality of the environment in which we live.

The Department of Transportation was the first Federal agency to have had set forth in its enabling legislation, a requirement that its projects give consideration to their impact upon the environment in which they are located or in which they operate. Within the Office of the Secretary we know there is much still to be done but we feel that we have made a good beginning and we feel that we are headed in the right direction.

We are concerned with air and water pollution. We are concerned with transportation's impact on the quality of life. We are concerned with noise from transportation sources. We are concerned that transportation facilities -- highways, rapid transit, airports -- are so located as to give the greatest consideration to their effect upon their physical surroundings.

The Department's concern is but one part of a greater Federal concern. Let me tell you what this Administration has done.

In 1969, President Nixon established an Environmental Quality Council, now the Cabinet Committee on the Environment, within the Office of the President. In 1970, he established the Council on Environmental Quality which reports directly to him. Under new legislation adopted in the last Congress in 1971 we shall have an Environmental Protection Agency which brings together many of the programs relating to air and water pollution which were previously spread through a variety of Government agencies and which lacked the single focus and objective

which they have now acquired as a result of this recent Congressional action. Within the Department of Commerce, there has been established NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, which is also concerned with environmental quality. As you know, some of its programs had their origin within the Coast Guard.

The Council on Environmental Quality was created by a most important piece of Federal legislation and was signed into law on January 1, 1970. In signing that legislation, the National Environmental Policy Act, President Nixon called on Americans to take part in what he called "the decade of the environment." He added, "it is now or never." The National Environmental Policy Act has enormous significance for all Federal agencies and will affect both your day-to-day operations and your long range planning activities as you take up your new role as officers in the United States Coast Guard.

Let me read you the purposes of this Act:

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

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

- to fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;
- to assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
- to attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;

- to preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;
- to achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and
- to enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

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

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

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

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

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

Secretary Volpe established the Office of Environment and Urban Systems as evidence of his own deep concern about the impact of transportation on the quality of the environment in which it operates. Too often transportation has been considered only as a means to move people and goods rather than as a useful tool to shape communities in which people may live in harmony with their surroundings.

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

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

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

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

In all planning, the goal must be to make transportation a contributor to the quality of the environment rather than an overriding element to which we must reconcile our demands and our values.

We believe that transportation programs, destruction of environmental quality in the past, can be contributors to such quality. We are trying to see that this is done. The problem is one of education. It is hard to convince every public official and every taxpayer that the cheapest way is not always the best way, even though those of us who are concerned about the quality of life are convinced that this is the case. Incorporating consideration for the environment into our thinking, into our planning, and, most important perhaps, into our budget process is not easy. I hope that you share my view that it must be done even though our

objective will not be reached fully this year or even next no matter how great our concern may be.

As we work to implement the various Presidential and Congressional mandates to direct and achieve environmental quality, it has been our pleasure to have the support of the Coast Guard.

I should like to report to you on some of the ways in which the Coast Guard has worked to enhance and protect that quality and especially the quality of maritime environment. As you know, the Coast Guard has been concerned with maritime pollution control efforts for many years as a result of its responsibility for enforcing various Federal laws on both the high seas and in U.S. waters. As many of you know, the Congress in 1970 enacted comprehensive legislation to deal with many aspects of water pollution. As part of this legislation Congress directed that two studies, one dealing with water pollution resulting from disposal or spills of hazardous materials and the other dealing with spills of oil and petroleum products be undertaken. Both of these tasks were assigned to the Department of Transportation and have been conducted by the Coast Guard. These studies are now almost completed and are being reviewed in the Department and also by CEQ and other interested agencies. The Coast Guard's leadership in the conduct of these studies is, in my opinion, outstanding. My Office has participated with the Coast Guard in view of these efforts and we are very pleased with the results and recommendations that we have seen.

Coast Guard activities have included measures aimed at prevention of oil spills from vessels and spills from grounded and otherwise damaged tankers. The Coast Guard has also established programs to prevent pollution by Coast Guard shore facilities, to enforce regulation of vessel sewage and to deal with the problems of waste disposal on the high seas. In its oceanographic ocean stations and polar scientific operations program, Coast Guard programs incorporate pollution research and monitoring. The Coast Guard deals with the problem of air pollution from vessels, a program which falls under the general direction of the new Environmental Protection Agency.

Five years ago, the Torrey Canyon disaster resulted in spills of millions of gallons of black oil on England's southwestern coast and the destruction of thousands of waterfowl and other wildlife species. As a result of it, the Coast Guard took the initiative toward amending the 1960 Convention of Safety of Life at Sea to apply the lessons which maritime authorities had learned from this disaster.

The Coast Guard has assumed U. S. leadership in preparing for the Conference on Marine Pollution which has been scheduled for 1973 by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, IMCO, a United Nations special agency.

But the Coast Guard has a role relating to environmental quality on land as well as at sea. The Bridge Administration program insures the safe and unencumbered passage of marine traffic on the Nation's waterways. In this capacity the Coast Guard has recently become involved in the consideration of a number of proposed bridges which might have an environmental impact going beyond the more immediate question of the transportation service which each bridge is designed to provide.

The enabling legislation which established the Department of Transportation said:

"It is hereby declared to be the national policy that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites..." And, the law continues "...the Secretary shall not approve any program or project which requires the use of any publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, State, or local significance as determined by the Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction thereof, or any land from an historic site of national, State, or local significance as so determined by such officials unless (1) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land, and (2) such program includes all possible planning to minimize harm to such park, recreational area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from such use."

Because of this requirement, it develops that some bridges which are proposed, while safe and adequate insofar as navigational matters are concerned, will have -- or might have -- an adverse impact upon the lands which the bridge and its approaches will traverse. In some cases, these lands might well be (in the language of the DOT Act) "recreational or park area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge or an historic site." In such cases, it is the responsibility of the Coast Guard in granting the bridge permit to assure the Secretary that there is neither "prudent nor feasible alternatives to the taking of such land" or that "all possible planning has been done to minimize harm" as a result of such taking.

The Coast Guard has responded to this charge with great sensitivity and has, at the same time, shown real awareness of both the political and environmental issues which are involved.

Unlikely as it may seem, there are those who have suggested that the Coast Guard's Bridge Branch is a place where only brave men dare to serve.

In another environmental problem area the Coast Guard has given major support to the Smithsonian Institution, where through the use of its icebreakers and deep ocean fleet, the Coast Guard has made it possible for Smithsonian scientists to collect valuable scientific data from both polar regions as well as from the mid latitudes. The data resulting from these missions represents a vital contribution to the scientific knowledge which is essential background for a variety of critical environmental problems.

This particular phase of this program is new but the Coast Guard has been involved in oceanographic research activity since 1859. I doubt that anyone else can match that record.

On a smaller scale Coast Guard buoys and smaller ships in the inshore environment have made significant contributions to other Smithsonian research efforts. It is possible that the Coast Guard, working with the Smithsonian, will be able to develop techniques which may serve as early indicators of pollution, for example, the existence of specific marine organisms or processes.

President Nixon's Office of Science and Technology has undertaken the International Hydrological Decade in which the Coast Guard has provided significant support to other Federal programs. The U. S. Government, in cooperation with the Government of Canada, has participated in a project under the direction of the Arctic Institute of North America. In this study which deals with a large area of reduced ice concentration near Thule, Greenland, a decommissioned Coast Guard icebreaker, the Eastwind, is serving as a semi-mobile platform. The Eastwind will be the first ship to winter over deliberately in the Arctic icepack since the Fridtjof Nansen Expedition in the last century. The results of this investigation may have significant bearing on forecasting sea and ice conditions which I am told has critical environmental and commercial importance.

In a new role the Coast Guard has been assigned Departmental responsibility for coordination of a number of activities relating to water resources and land resource planning.

Both the Congress and the Federal Government have come to realize that cleaning up the damage which has already been done to the environment is not enough. It is essential that long range planning be undertaken so that in the future we will not repeat the mistakes which we are trying to correct today. The Department's concern, and by delegation, that of the Coast Guard, will go beyond the navigational features of whatever water resource projects are under consideration and will extend to a consideration of the way these water resources relate to other developmental programs for both land and water resources.

You begin your careers in the Coast Guard at a challenging time in the history of its operations. You will be serving in the only civil maritime agency which has the significant capability for conducting large scale or widespread water-borne operations. The Coast Guard today, with its programs which go beyond safety and which affect significantly not only the marine environment but the human environment offers, promise to the Nation and challenge to you.

I am confident that you and the Coast Guard will meet that challenge in a manner which reflects both the responsibility and the dedication which your service has demonstrated for almost 200 years in time of peace and in time of war.

#####



**DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION**

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

2-DOT-71

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY MICHAEL CAFFERTY, ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FOR DELIVERY AT THE NORTHWEST ROADS AND STREETS CONFERENCE LUNCHEON, HOLIDAY INN, BELLEVUE, WASHINGTON, 12 O'CLOCK, FEBRUARY 9, 1971

**URBAN GOALS AND PRIORITIES: THE INCREASING
ROLE OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

Transportation planners have an opportunity, a challenge and a responsibility for seeing that transportation plays a vital and a positive role in shaping the form and the quality of urban areas. Their problem is complicated by increasing funding requirements for meeting present and future needs, by a need for financial commitment which goes far beyond anything which has ever been available in the past or is available today. And so, transportation decisions become one element of other decisions involving the need for examining and determining goals and priorities -- a problem which is especially difficult in the Nation's urban areas.

There are three important areas which I should like to cover today. First, I want to outline steps the Department is taking to set the stage for improved urban transportation all across the Nation. Secondly, I want to concentrate on an evaluation of the current urban transportation planning process which the Department now has underway. Third and finally, I'd like to touch on the relationship between the evaluation and the National Transportation Needs Study now underway in all States at the request of the Department.

First, some new developments that reinforce the importance of sound urban transportation planning.

There is now a strong recognition, on the part of Secretary Volpe and the Department, that society -- or much of it -- has changed its view of what transportation can and should be doing to determine and improve the quality of daily life. Slowly, but surely, the citizen is learning to make society and its system work for him, learning to make Government and its plans and programs responsive to his needs and desires. The stopping of a freeway, an airport, a transit station, or a housing development is no longer an impossible accomplishment for citizens. In fact, it is becoming a common occurrence. At the same time these citizens are clearly expressing, and rightly so, their desire and their need to be involved in all stages of project decision-making, particularly the planning and design phases. As technicians, we must respond to this concern.

We must recognize the failures in the present methods by which society and Government relate. In remedying the situation we must remember that both community desires and technical considerations must be present to ensure this interaction. In this respect, I fear that in recent years we have devoted most of our attention to the technical process. We have not given citizens the kind of access to the process that would have helped solve the problem.

There is now a national desire to preserve and enhance the quality of the environment, and we in DOT have a mandate from Secretary Volpe to do our part toward the achievement of that goal. Perhaps I should point out that environment is defined in the broadest sense of the word to mean where or how we live, in combination with the quality of life which is possible there.

When Secretary Volpe came to Washington, he identified another problem area -- the need for urban systems -- which he considered subject to institutional rather than solely to technological solutions. This need is being met in part by new and expanded planning and capital grant authority for airports and airways and for public transportation. It is also being met by an improved Federal response to railroad problems. Of particular significance to you today is the fact that, for the first time, system planning funds will be available, on a matching basis, from the Federal Government for the three major modes: highways, airports, and public transit systems. Particularly important is the fact that with the capital funds now available we can take steps to improve the relationship between transportation planning and community desires.

These new considerations, these institutional innovations, are already reflected in transportation philosophy at the Federal level. Secretary Volpe, upon his arrival in Washington, created the new Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems, headed by J. D. Braman, until then Mayor of Seattle. Mayor Braman was the highest sub-cabinet Presidential appointee whose title underscored his environmental responsibilities. He has left Washington to return to the Pacific Northwest but the program he has established, the new thinking he has brought to the Department, will be carried forward.

Secretary Volpe established this Office because his own experience as Governor of the State of Massachusetts and, before that, as Commissioner of Public Works of that State, convinced him of the importance of the impact of transportation on people and on the physical environment in which they live, and because of his conviction that transportation must be responsive to the full needs of our society and not solely to the need for the efficient movement of people and goods.

Because you are deeply concerned with transportation, you should be aware of the implications of these major actions. They promise to affect the job you are trying to do and its priorities and to affect them profoundly.

The Executive Office of the President of the United States, through its Office of Management and Budget, has requested that the Department of Transportation evaluate existing urban transportation planning mechanisms and make recommendations for improving these mechanisms,

if necessary. This is an outgrowth of Section 134 of the 1962 Federal Aid Highway Act which required that every urban area of over 50,000 in population have a comprehensive coordinated continuing transportation plan.

In the past studies such as this have focused on the problem from the Federal level and have primarily involved highway transportation interests. Our study, however, is different. It has taken a non-Federal perspective, has involved other Federal agencies, such as HUD and the Office of Management and Budget, and it has crossed modal transportation lines to include all forms of transportation. As part of the study, questionnaires were sent to 40 key mayors across the country; to 25 councils of government (such as the Puget sound Governmental Conference), to the 50 State highway departments; and to over 200 urban transportation planning agencies; 96 percent of the 200 responded and provided a remarkable body of opinion on the urban transportation planning process as we know it.

In addition to the questionnaire, I personally visited 10 major metropolitan areas including Seattle to discuss the study, the evaluation with elected officials, with professional staff and with public-interest groups. We sponsored, along with the American Institute of Planners, six three-day conferences in other major metropolitan areas. Each State Department of Transportation now operating has been brought up to date on our efforts. We have discussed the study with the U.S. Conference of Mayors, with the National League of Cities, the National Governors Conference, the National Service to Regional Councils, with groups similar to these, and with professional associations of highway engineers, of planners, of architects, and of public administrators. In short, we have attempted to make our recommendations on the basis of the broadest possible frame of reference.

In addition to the foregoing, our office has sponsored a comprehensive series of research projects expressly aimed at providing further insight into existing urban transportation planning and with a view toward improving that planning process. Our research program -- which incidentally was carried out by nationally recognized consultants -- was likewise oriented toward State and local officials. It, too, involved countless discussions with governors, mayors, and legislators all over the country. One of our projects involved the State of Washington.

The object of this effort was to produce information relating to the design concept team approach for interdisciplinary urban transportation planning promoted from the State level. As a result of this study we hope to be able to help States other than Washington in their efforts to use teams to resolve a variety of transportation planning issues. During the course of this study the State directed design team and its consultants, headed by Ed Devine, visited eight cities in order to interview design teams which have or are being utilized in planning for specific highway facilities.

The team considered how citizens can and should participate, when design teams should get involved and who should administer them, how the planning process works or does not work in each area, recommendations as to how the process can be improved and how transportation can be related to broad community goals and to the urban environment as a whole.

Ed Devine will tell you about some of the team's findings when he talks to you about "People, Politics, and Planning" this afternoon.

Our other projects are concerned with developing an improved urban transportation planning process, which would reflect the impact of the National Environmental Policy Act, and with improved citizen and political participation in transportation planning.

All of these sources of data and opinion are reflected in our study of the urban transportation planning process. We have found that urban transportation planning, as required under the 1962 Highway Act, has performed well as the first major Federal effort to stimulate joint State/local planning for land use, transportation and highways.

Further, it has functioned -- to some degree -- at least, in each of the Nation's 233 urbanized areas.

The "3C Process" as it is called -- Comprehensive, Coordinated, Continuing -- has been the primary stimulus for the development of improved planning techniques and procedures. It has been the means by which data have been acquired for transportation planning decisions. In many instances, it has been effective in strengthening relationships among the individual communities in urbanized areas and between these areas and State Governments.

Further, the process has provided a constant and fairly adequate source of Federal funds for planning at the State and local levels. In fact, over 60 percent of all Federal funds spent for transportation and land use planning at these levels comes from the Department of Transportation as part of this process.

At the same time, I think I would be less than frank if I did not say that, by and large, the urban transportation planning process -- as we know it -- has generated plans that are mere reaffirmations of plans that most highway departments have developed 20 or so years ago, long prior to the initiation of the 1962 Highway Act planning requirement. This suggests to me that the question of need for, and impact of the transportation plan has probably not been as thoroughly re-examined as called for in the 1962 Highway Act.

Few of the transportation plans which resulted from this process contained significant provisions for public transportation; even fewer, for service to planned new airports, for consideration of railroad facilities, for local street improvements, for parking or for the like. This was largely due to the lack of implementation funds and to a concentration on regional transportation needs -- as opposed to total transportation needs -- but, nevertheless, the problem remains the same.

To extend this thought, the limitation on funding sources has also tended to minimize consideration of innovative transportation solutions particularly as they might relate to new technology and joint development with other urban improvements.

In another area, while the comprehensive transportation planning process did establish elaborate committee structures of elected officials, technicians, and citizens, the conduct of the process itself was largely in response to the interests of the highway technicians. There is no evidence that either elected officials or private citizens have influenced the process significantly. An opportunity was there, but I find little evidence that the plans which came forward reflected anything more than a highway -- rather than a transportation -- solution.

The urban transportation planning process, to date, has not made significant progress toward comprehending, much less analyzing

the physical, social, and environmental impact of transportation plans on urban areas. The results of the urban planning process -- as we know it -- continue to be influenced largely by traffic considerations.

In this respect, we could all probably agree that little exists in the way of information or planning techniques, pertaining to the environment and its interrelationship with transportation and other physical facilities. Too little research has been done to determine how transportation and other physical improvements can be assessed objectively in light of their social, environmental and aesthetic impacts.

Then too, there is the problem of defining the term "environment" and of measuring the trade-off between environmental and economic and technical considerations.

Consider these six additional points:

- Although no one knows for sure, we think that about \$200 million has been spent on urban transportation planning since 1958 or so. An expensive process and what have we gotten for our money?
- Most urban transportation studies take talented researchers from three to six years to develop recommendations. It behooves us to shorten the process if we can.
- There is a semantic problem. Requirements for Federal planning, even the definitions used in transportation planning, differ among Federal agencies. This is another source of confusion and inefficiency.
- For too long urban transportation planners have not focused on the analysis of existing plans and programs. They should. The fact that a transit or highway agency has programmed a project for 10 or 15 years need not mean that it should not be re-examined. The opposite may well be true, that all transportation plans should be re-examined critically and on a continuing basis and in light of prevailing knowledge, particularly as community goals and values may change. As a matter of fact, the longer a plan is on the books without being implemented, the more I am inclined to suspect its viability.

Let me cite an example. The transportation system -- both freeways and transit routes -- for a large Eastern metropolitan area were fixed in concept in the 1940's. In spite of the fact that there was general agreement that community goals had changed over the years, it took an act of political courage by the Governor of that State to say -- as he did, in 1970 -- that the system didn't satisfy the current needs of the area. He recommended that work toward the system be suspended; it should not have been necessary for him to make such recommendations. The transportation planning process should be designed so as to accommodate and meet changing goals.

- Finally, urban transportation planning has never been linked very closely with project planning. By and large, current urban transportation planning has little to do with when or where a particular transportation improvement will be made. It has even less to do with the broader elements of the design of such a project. We must correct this.
- In recent years, urban transportation planning has concentrated almost exclusively on problems at the regional level. Such problems certainly need to be addressed but not to the exclusion of local transport problems.

In short, urban transportation planning today is a complex technical process of traffic demand forecasting. It should be a process leading to action, to total transportation and to urban improvement. Some of you may say I've been ~~to~~ critical of the process. If so, it is because I believe in its importance. I also believe that it is absolutely necessary for those who are involved in the process to continually appraise its usefulness and its relevance.

This evaluation of Section 134 study has suggested that the urban transportation planning process is a viable one which, improved, could do much not only toward solving our Nation's urban transportation problems, but also toward improving the quality of life in urban areas.

I would say that five major conclusions emerge as the basis for improvement in the "3C" process. These conclusions, roughly in their order of importance, follow:

First, institutionally we have long maintained that transportation must be planned on a metropolitan basis as one integral part of regional development planning. Even so only marginal progress has been made in providing, within our constitutional system, a mechanism for doing this and for giving all elements of society equitable access to this mechanism.

Second, technically, through the urban transportation planning process has evolved into the most sophisticated of all urban planning processes, there are areas where improvement can and should be made.

- We must consider local as well as regional transportation needs for all modes,
- We must assess environmental, social, and aesthetic factors, as well as economic and traffic factors as they relate to transportation facilities,
- We must determine the degree to which planned transportation facilities further other defined goals and objectives.

Third, Federal definitions for urban transportation planning must be modified in both institutional and technical terms to recognize emerging planning frameworks. For several years, urban transportation planning has consisted of two levels of planning -- regional system planning and detailed project planning -- with most significant decisions made at the project scale. The emergence and success of the "Design Concept Team" has suggested the desirability of a third, a middle planning level. Official recognition of this concept as part of the planning framework could stimulate effective urban transportation planning:

- by providing a focus for citizen participation,
- for joint development planning,
- for an improved response to the Environmental Policy Act, and
- for the use of multidisciplinary design talents.

Fourth, an institutional approach, the urban transportation planning process must be tied more closely to transportation program decision-making. We must heighten existing efforts to insure that planning leads to action.

Fifth, and finally, we must face a problem which emerges from improved Federal planning, capital funding for public transit and airports, and the development of State DOT's. The Federal DOT must develop a focal point within its structure for urban transportation planning to include the technical and financial aspects of such planning.

Where do we go from here? Given the mandates of Federally funded transportation programs, how do we improve urban transportation planning?

Given transportation as an urban function which can disrupt community life as well as shape community form and structure, how can we make it a positive force?

I think our studies have identified three goals. Improvements in urban transportation planning must:

- enhance and strengthen State and local governmental institutions so that they can respond to the expressed needs and desires of all elements of society;
- be conducive to the implementation of a fully coordinated intermodal transportation system; and
- provide transportation the maximum opportunity for serving as the catalyst for better urban development and a higher quality of urban life.

Lofty goals? Yes. Practical objectives? Yes, again. On the basis of these findings, we are considering a series of recommendations to the Secretary which would suggest:

1. A time-phased DOT policy that urban transportation planning funds from each modal Administration be channeled into a single focus planning agency at the metropolitan level to:

- A. Conduct transportation system and related planning studies for all modes and set priorities for transportation improvements in the area on an area-wide basis;
- B. Have an official relationship with the area's officially established comprehensive planning agency;
- C. Be responsible to local elected officials who must be represented according to acceptable and population-related criteria;
- D. Provide a forum which encourages meaningful citizen participation in the decision-making process;
- E. Provide guidelines for transportation corridor planning studies;
- F. Be adequately staffed and financed to carry out its functions; and
- G. Have a clearly enunciated relationship with transportation implementation agencies.

DOT's annual investment of more dollars for urban area planning than that of any other Federal organization suggests that DOT should take the lead in developing the proper mechanisms for responding to metropolitan problems. At the same time, we should not lose sight of the real world and its problems. It is hard to believe that any two metropolitan areas will ever respond with exactly the same kind of organizational mechanism or within exactly the same time frame. That is an ideal 90 percent toward which we must direct our efforts; this is the real challenge to State and local governments; and it is also a challenge to DOT's commitment to aid and abet but not to dictate the resolution of metropolitan problems.

2. The Secretary of Transportation should coordinate the Department's various urban transportation planning assistance programs. Such coordination would include review authority over both existing administrative rules and regulations relating to urban transportation planning programs and a biennial certification of such programs across the Nation. Federal transportation planning funds would be contingent upon satisfactory certification.

3. The Secretary of Transportation should issue a Departmental order to serve as a framework for revising the various existing DOT-administered planning assistance programs. This order should recognize and define three levels of planning to include system planning, sub-area planning, and project planning.
4. The Secretary of Transportation should brief the President's Domestic Affairs Council on the far-reaching impact of Departmental programs on urban areas. His briefing should include recommendations as to the coordination of the various Federal programs, both in planning and in committing capital funds. This might be our most far-reaching recommendation.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems believes that progress has been made. We must continue our efforts on urban transportation planning to guarantee metropolitan areas a real capability for making their own choices, to be masters of their own destiny, if you will. This requires a strong, cooperative effort by Federal, State, and local authorities.

I do want to spend just a moment talking about the Department's cooperative efforts with State and local governments to develop a national transportation needs programs.

This program will be used as a basis for legislative and expenditure recommendations to the President and the Congress early in calendar Year 1972. It will be the first study in a continuing biennial assessment of the Nation's transportation system.

The assistance of States and local areas is essential to the 1972 National Transportation Needs program. In fact, this study offers States and local governments an opportunity to inform the Federal Government of transportation needs and priorities for all modes of transportation. Further, it will give them an opportunity to air their views as to how the Federal Government should respond to these needs and priorities both in terms of policy and funding.

Basic responsibilities for carrying out this study have been assigned to the Governor's office in each State. He has been encouraged to call upon metropolitan transportation planning groups and the Department for assistance.

It is important that both of these efforts are designed to lead to change -- change in the way we look at our problems and change in the way we seek their resolution. That's not just change, I think that's progress.



18/00

**DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION**

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

6-DOT-71

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY MICHAEL CAFFERTY, ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT'S CONFERENCE ON TRANSPORTATION CURRICULM DEVELOPMENT, FEBRUARY 23, 1971.

I am extremely pleased to be here today and to have the opportunity to address this conference on "Transportation Curriculum Development." I view this conference as the first important step in bridging the current gap between the needs of the transportation industry for well educated and trained personnel who can do an effective job in planning, designing and building transportation facilities in this day and age, and the present transportation curricula in most of our nation's schools.

Transportation industry needs have changed tremendously in recent years, and I fear that our colleges and universities have not kept pace. Witness the following:

1. The Department of Transportation was created in 1966 to bring together the various modes of transportation in a concerted and balanced attack on the nation's transportation problems. We are now intermodal and we need intermodal approaches to solving problems.

2. Enactment of the National Environmental Policy Act in 1970 which helps to focus the country's attention upon the effect of major public actions on human activity, including the destruction and pollution of the ecological environment, both physical and human. The Act requires that the environmental impact of all Federally funded activities be clearly spelled out before final decisions are made. This is rather important, as you can see, because a large part of the Federal civilian tax dollar is spent on transportation every year and these expenditures certainly have an impact on every man, woman, and child in the nation. The challenge which this presents to DOT will require new insights and a new way of doing business.
3. The 1970 Airport and Airways Development Act, which provides for the expenditure of five billion dollars for airport investments through 1980, is a landmark piece of legislation because it helps DOT provide a balanced transportation system. Yet to integrate the provision of airport facilities with highway and transit access facilities, and with surrounding urban development provides a distinct new challenge to us.
4. The 1970 Urban Mass Transportation Act promises \$10 billion over the next twelve years to rejuvenate the long neglected public and private mass transit systems in our cities. To be certain that these facilities complement all other modes and promotes sound land development patterns is a must.
5. RAILPAX (Railroad Passenger Act of 1970) establishes a profit-making corporation to run the intercity passenger transit of the nation. To make this a profitable enterprise and to ensure that the service this system provides complements air and intercity highway facilities will require new expertise.
6. The Highway Trust Fund last year was continued through 1976. New uses of highway funds for reserved bus lanes, fringe parking facilities, safety, bridges, relocation, environment and "just compensation" provide even more challenges for transportation personnel.

Over and above these, you are not unaware of the fact that society, or much of it -- has changed its view of what transportation can and should be doing to determine and improve the quality of daily life. Slowly, but surely, the citizen is learning to make society and its system work for him; learning to make Government and its plans and policies responsive to his needs and desires. The stopping of a freeway, an airport, a transit station, or a housing project is no longer an impossible accomplishment for citizens, in fact, it is becoming a common occurrence.

The point is that the needs of the nation are changing, and therefore the manner by which transportation serves the public is changing. Transportation education has not responded to these changes. This gives you a small idea of the challenges facing us. Vast new sums of money will be spent and we must be up to the challenge.

Transportation can no longer be conducted on a "business as usual" approach. New funding provides the opportunity to achieve a balanced transportation system, capable of extracting the best from each mode in relation to the other modes, and capable of influencing the growth patterns and environment of our nation.

But to spend the money properly, so that the public good is truly served as Congress intends, we need personnel capable of administering the transportation activities. You today can have a major impact in determining the future of American transportation. By helping to establish an education program which conveys the message of the transportation influence upon the American economy, the lives of all citizens, and the environment, we can face up squarely to these changes.

We should also not underestimate the value of an effective transportation education program in the colleges and universities. More and more students will come into association with transportation ideas and needs. They may not necessarily be graduates of the programs, but they will most certainly be better informed as a result. There is no doubt that the country must comprehend the value of transportation systems and this is the first step meeting the information problem head-on, by reaching the leaders of tomorrow. But we must keep in mind that the type of program you are developing at this conference must eventually be extended to the full spectrum of our educational system.

I want to stress again the importance of this conference. The graduates of the programs you might establish will have large influence on the nature and extent of transportation systems for many years to come. They will be literally snapped up by Federal, State, regional,

local and private agencies because the demand for well-trained people is growing tremendously. These graduates will be enlightened implementers of a balanced, intermodal transportation policy sensitive to human and ecological requirements. With such inputs, the country will understand better the importance of transportation to our future.

I wish you every success in your endeavors.

Thank you.

* * * *



18132 1800 13
**DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION**

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

8-DOT-71

REMARKS BY MICHAEL CAFFERTY, ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AT THE 5th ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE TO REGIONAL COUNCILS, NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA, MARCH 11, 1971.

METROPOLITAN CHALLENGES FOR 1971

I am delighted to be here representing Secretary Volpe at the Fifth Annual Conference of your young and growing association of regional councils. I have two messages this morning. First, 1971 will be a year of unprecedented challenges to metropolitan organizations. Second, you have a friend in the Department of Transportation to help you meet these challenges. The challenges I speak of include Federal revenue sharing, responding to the National Environmental Policy Act within the context of the A-95 process, and organizing for effective land-use and urban transportation planning. The friend I speak of is the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. This office is devoted expressly to strengthening local government and

to building a metropolitan approach to problem solving, including those dealing with the environment, land-use and transportation.

In meeting with you this morning, I want to discuss four major recent developments at the Federal level which have grave implications for the metropolitan organizations which this group represents.

First, let me discuss President Nixon's Revenue Sharing Plan and Secretary Volpe's recent work in defining the "transportation" part of that plan. As you know, the President's revenue sharing plan is aimed at strengthening State and local government and at moving the focus for decision-making out of Washington to local levels. The President's General Revenue Sharing Plan provides -- in 1972, if enacted -- a full year allocation of \$5 billion to States and localities, while six broad Special Revenue Sharing plans will provide \$11 billion of shared revenues for: (1) Rural Community Development; (2) Urban Community Development; (3) Education; (4) Manpower Training; (5) Law Enforcement; and (6) Transportation. I would like to comment briefly on the transportation portion of that plan and particularly on how urban areas can benefit from it.

Under Special Revenue Sharing, \$2.6 billion would be available to develop balanced transportation systems serving local urban and rural areas. Special provision for passing Federal funds through the States are yet to be worked out. I suggest that your organization may well be one to lead the support for including generous "pass through" provision. "Pass through" will assure that local governments receive an equitable share of this fund and that they will be provided with the tools it needs to solve its own problem. Federal funding for the Interstate Highway System will be maintained separate from other transportation funds until completion of the system.

You might well ask what this development has to do with the future of regional councils. I suggest to you today that it places upon local elected officials, local government, and regional agencies a new and heavy burden. That burden will be the job of building institutions and of coordinating the planning and decision process, without direct Federal strings and incentives for guaranteeing that this is done. It seems to me that this must be done even if Revenue Sharing is not given immediate Congressional approval.

Secondly, agencies such as yours face a new challenge in regard to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. All of you are somewhat

familiar with this landmark legislation I'm sure, but just let me make a few comments on it.

With this legislation, the Congress has, for the first time, attempted to treat government actions and a broad range of environmental values. The policies, plans, regulations and public laws which agencies propose are required to give positive consideration of their impact upon the environment in which they operate. To this end, all agencies of the Federal establishment and their state and local constituent agencies are required to:

- (1) "utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision making which may have an impact on man's environment."
- (2) "identify and develop methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality established by this Act, which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision making along with economic and technical considerations."

The Council on Environmental Quality has been working with all agencies in an effort to identify and develop those methods and procedures which will make it possible to insure that what we call "unquantified environmental amenities and values" are given equal consideration in design planning equal to that given to cost benefit and technological feasibility. Further, in proposing legislation or in "other major Federal actions" which significantly affect the environment, Federal agencies must prepare and submit to the Council on Environmental Quality statements on environmental impact before they submit legislation to the Congress or before they approve or move forward on Federal programs and projects. This is called "the 102 Statement" and it is designed to factor environmental considerations into the process early enough to make intelligent choice a possibility.

This "102 Statement" must set forth:

- (1) the environmental impact of the proposed action;
- (2) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;

- (3) alternatives to the proposed action;
- (4) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and
- (5) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Obviously, this is pervasive legislation. There have already been cases where implementation of the Environmental Policy Act has required painful readjustments in the old ways of doing business.

Until now, project sponsors have circulated their "102 Statements" to local, State and Federal agencies having an interest or jurisdiction over some phase of the project. Effective April 1, 1971, Revised OMB Circular A-95 authorizes and encourages the use of A-95 agencies as the appropriate vehicle for recurring State and local inputs to their statements.

Agencies such as yours will be provided with the opportunity to coordinate the comments on the environmental impact of Federal and Federally funded projects from the viewpoint of State and local concerns.

This is a powerful new tool which has significant long range implications to you and your staff. We in the Department of Transportation view this as a significant step forward in providing local and metropolitan officials with the tools they need to control the destiny of their areas.

Your participation and your consideration of environmental issues will be required at an early stage in the planning of projects which may have -- in either the short or the long term -- an environmental impact. The Department is proud of the record which it is establishing in this area. We seek your support and your guidance in maintaining that record. We offer you ours as you enter this new arena of action.

The third topic that I want to discuss relates to my second, and reorganizes the fact that environmental issues are really issues of proper land-use planning.

Nationally, there has been considerable interest and activity this year in the area of land-use planning. President Nixon included a Land Use Policy Act as part of his new broad program of environmental legislation.

Three weeks ago, in his annual report on the state of the Nation's environment, President Nixon stated that:

"The use of our land not only affects the natural environment but shapes the pattern of our daily lives. Unfortunately, the use of our land is often thwarted by the inability of the many competing and overlapping local units of government to control land use decisions which have regional significance."

The Administration's Land Use Legislation would establish a National Land Use Policy to encourage the States, in cooperation with local governments, to plan for and regulate development affecting growth and the use of critical land areas. Further, the Bill would encourage State governments to find ways to protect lands of critical environmental concern, to control large-scale development, and to improve the use of lands around key facilities and new communities.

During the last session of the Congress, Senator Jackson, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, introduced a National Land Use Policy Act which differs slightly in emphasis from the Administration Bill. Senator Jackson would require States to develop State-wide land use plans but would not require actual State control of or regulation of land. Senator Jackson's Bill moved forward but was not passed. Both of these Bills will be considered by Congress during the current session and there seems to be a good possibility that a National Land Use Policy will be enacted this year.

We in the Department of Transportation are enthusiastic in our support of this strong emphasis on land use planning. We have long maintained that there should be a closer integration of land use and transportation. Transportation systems should be used to further and to promote land use decisions made at both the State and metropolitan level. This would facilitate transportation planning and it might eliminate many of the conflicts which have arisen in the past between particular transportation projects and their land use implications.

My fourth and final topic relates to urban transportation planning, a subject with which most of you are involved daily.

Last year, the Executive Office of the President requested the Department of Transportation to evaluate the existing urban transportation planning process, and to make recommendations for improvement, if necessary.

This is an outgrowth of Section 134 of the 1962 Federal Aid Highway Act which required that every urban area of over 50,000 in population have a comprehensive coordinated continuing transportation plan.

In the past studies such as this have focused on the problem from the Federal level and have primarily involved highway transportation interests. Our study, however, is different. It has taken a non-Federal perspective, has involved other Federal agencies, such as HUD and the Office of Management and Budget, and it has crossed modal transportation lines to include all forms of transportation. As part of the study, questionnaires were sent to 40 key mayors across the country, to 25 councils of government; to the 50 State Highway Directors; and to over 233 urban transportation planning agencies; 96 percent of the 233 responded and provided a remarkable body of opinion on the urban transportation planning process as we know it.

In addition to the questionnaire, I personally visited 10 major metropolitan areas to discuss the study, the evaluation with elected officials, with professional staff and with public-interested groups. We sponsored, along with the American Institute of Planners, six three-day conferences in other major metropolitan areas. Each State Department of Transportation now operating has been brought up-to-date on our efforts. We have discussed the study with the U. S. Conference of Mayors, with the National League of Cities, the National Governors Conference, the National Service to Regional Councils, with groups similar to these, and with professional associations of highway engineers, of planners, of architects, and of public administrators. In short, we have attempted to make our recommendations on the basis of the broadest possible frame of reference.

In addition to the foregoing, our office has sponsored a comprehensive series of research projects expressly aimed at providing further insight into existing urban transportation planning and with a view toward improving that planning process. Our research program -- which incidentally was carried out by nationally recognized consultants -- was likewise oriented toward State and local officials. It, too, involved countless discussions with governors, mayors, and legislators all over the country.

Our projects were concerned with developing an improved urban transportation planning process, which would reflect the impact of the

National Environmental Policy Act, and with improved citizen and political participation in transportation planning.

All of these sources of data and opinion are reflected in our study of the urban transportation planning process. We have found that urban transportation planning, as required under the 1962 Highway Act, has performed well as the first major Federal effort to stimulate joint State/local planning for land use, transportation and highways. Further, it has functioned -- to some degree -- at least, in each of the Nation's 233 urbanized areas.

The "3C Process" as it is called -- Comprehensive, Coordinated, Continuing -- has been the primary stimulus for the development of improved planning techniques and procedures. It has been the means by which data have been acquired for transportation planning decisions. In many instances, it has been effective in strengthening relationships among the individual communities in urbanized areas and between these areas and State governments.

Further, the process has provided a constant and fairly adequate source of Federal funds for planning at the State and local levels. In fact, over 60 percent of all Federal funds spent for transportation and land use planning at these levels comes from the Department of Transportation as part of this process.

At the same time, I think I would be less than frank if I did not say that, by and large, the urban transportation planning process -- as we know it -- has generated plans that are mere reaffirmations of plans that most highway departments have developed 20 or so years ago, long prior to the initiation of the 1962 Highway Act planning requirement. This suggests to me that the question of need for, and impact of the transportation plan has probably not been as thoroughly re-examined as called for in the 1962 Highway Act.

Few of the transportation plans which resulted from this process contained significant provisions for public transportation; even fewer, for service to planned new airports, for consideration of railroad facilities, for local street improvements, for parking or for the like. This was largely due to the lack of implementation funds and to a concentration on regional transportation needs -- as opposed to total transportation needs -- but, nevertheless, the problem remains the same.

To extend this thought, the limitation on funding sources has also tended to minimize consideration of innovative transportation solutions particularly as they might relate to new technology and joint development with other urban improvements.

In another area, while the comprehensive transportation planning process did establish elaborate committee structures of elected officials, technicians, and citizens, the conduct of the process itself was largely in response to the interests of the highway technicians. There is no evidence that either elected officials or private citizens have influenced the process significantly. An opportunity was there, but I find little evidence that the plans which came forward reflected anything more than a highway -- rather than a transportation -- solution.

The urban transportation planning process, to date, has not made significant progress toward comprehending, much less analyzing the physical, social, and environmental impact of transportation plans on urban areas. The results of the urban planning process -- as we know it -- continue to be influenced largely by traffic considerations.

In this respect, we could all probably agree that little exists in the way of information or planning techniques, pertaining to the environment and its interrelationship with transportation and other physical facilities. Too little research has been done to determine how transportation and other physical improvements can be assessed objectively in light of their social, environmental and aesthetic impacts.

Then, too, there is the problem of defining the term "environment" and of measuring the trade-off between environmental and economic and technical considerations.

Consider these six additional points:

- Although no one knows for sure, we think that about \$200 million has been spent on urban transportation planning since 1958 or so. An expensive process and what have we gotten for our money?

- Most urban transportation studies take talented researchers from three to six years to develop recommendations. It behooves us to shorten the process if we can.

- There is a semantic problem. Requirements for Federal planning, even the definitions used in transportation planning, differ among Federal agencies. This is another source of confusion and inefficiency.

- For too long urban transportation planners have not focused on the analysis of existing plans and programs. They should. The fact that a transit or highway agency has programmed a project for 10 or 15 years need not mean that it should not be re-examined. The opposite may well be true, that all transportation plans should be re-examined critically and on a continuing basis and in light of prevailing knowledge, particularly as community goals and values may change. As a matter of fact, the longer a plan is on the books without being implemented the more I am inclined to suspect its viability.

Let me cite an example. The transportation system -- both freeways and transit routes -- for a large Eastern metropolitan area were fixed in concept in the 1940's. In spite of the fact there was general agreement that community goals had changed over the years, it took an act of political courage by the Governor of the State to say -- as he did, in 1970 -- that the system didn't satisfy the current needs of the area. He recommended that work toward the system be suspended; it should not have been necessary for him to make such recommendations. The transportation planning process should be designed so as to accommodate and meet changing goals.

- Finally, urban transportation planning has never been linked very closely with project planning. By and large, current urban transportation planning has little to do with when or where a particular transportation improvement will be made. It has even less to do with the broader elements of the design of such a project. We must correct this.

- In recent years, urban transportation planning has concentrated almost exclusively on problems at the regional level. Such problems certainly need to be addressed but not to the exclusion of local transport problems.

In short, urban transportation planning today is a complex technical process of traffic demand forecasting. It should be a process leading to action, to total transportation and to urban improvement. Some of you

may say I've been too critical of the process. If so, it is because I believe in its importance. I also believe that it is absolutely necessary for those who are involved in the process to continually appraise its usefulness and its relevance.

This evaluation of Section 134 study has suggested that the urban transportation planning process is a viable one which improved, could do much not only toward solving our Nation's urban transportation problems, but also toward improving the quality of life in urban areas.

I would say that five major conclusions emerge as the basis for improvement in the "3C" process. These conclusions, roughly in their order of importance, follow:

First, institutionally we have long maintained that transportation must be planned on a metropolitan basis as one integral part of regional development planning. Even so only marginal progress has been made in providing, within our constitutional system, a mechanism for doing this and for giving all elements of government and society equitable access to this mechanism.

Second, technically, through the urban transportation planning process has evolved into the most sophisticated of all urban planning processes, there are areas where improvement can and should be made.

- We must consider local as well as regional transportation needs for all modes.

- We must assess environmental, social, and aesthetic factors, as well as economic and traffic factors as they relate to transportation facilities.

- We must determine the degree to which planned transportation facilities further other defined goals and objectives.

Third, Federal definitions for urban transportation planning must be modified in both institutional and technical terms to recognize emerging planning frameworks. For several years, urban transportation planning has consisted of two levels of planning -- regional system planning and detailed project planning -- with most significant decisions made at the project scale. The emergence and success of the "Design Concept Team" has suggested the desirability of a third, a middle planning level. Official recognition of this concept as part of the planning framework

could stimulate effective urban transportation planning:

- by providing a focus for citizen participation,
- for joint development planning,
- for an improved response to the Environmental Policy Act, and
- for the use of multidisciplinary design talents.

Fourth, an institutional approach, the urban transportation planning process must be tied more closely to transportation program decision-making. We must heighten existing efforts to insure that planning leads to action.

Fifth, and finally, we must face a problem which emerges from improved Federal planning, capital funding for public transit and airports, and the development of State DOT's. The Federal DOT must develop a focal point within its structure for urban transportation planning to include the technical and financial aspects of such planning.

Where do we go from here? Given the mandates of Federally funded transportation programs, how do we improve urban transportation planning.

Given transportation as an urban function which can disrupt community life as well as shape community form and structure, how can we make it a positive force?

I think our studies have identified three goals. Improvements in urban transportation planning must:

- enhance and strengthen State and local governmental institutions so that they can respond to the expressed needs and desires of all elements of society;
- be conducive to the implementation of a fully coordinated intermodal transportation system; and
- provide transportation the maximum opportunity for serving as the catalyst for better urban development and a higher quality of urban life.

Lofty goals? Yes. Practical objectives? Yes, again. On the basis of these findings, we are now in the final process of preparing our specific recommendations to the Secretary.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems believes that progress has been made. We must continue our efforts on urban transportation planning to guarantee metropolitan areas a real capability for making their own choices, to be masters of their own destiny, if you will. This requires a strong, cooperative effort by Federal, State and local authorities. We welcome your views.

It is important that each of these four areas which I have discussed are designed to lead to change -- change in the way we look at our problems and change in the way we seek their resolution. That's not just change, I think that's progress.

#####