DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

43-DOT-71

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION HERBERT F. DeSIMONE AT THE 19TH ANNUAL HIGHWAY CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION ON OCTOBER 4, 1971 AT THE ST. PAUL HILTON HOTEL, ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

Recently I heard a presentation on the new Disney World in Florida. From the point of view of environmental protection, transportation, and ingenuity in general, Disney World seems to be just about unbeatable. There will be separate traffic levels for trucks, pedestrians, and rapid rail transit. Trucks, in fact, will deliver goods in underground tunnels which also accomodate the sewage, garbage, water, heating, telephone, and electrical systems - so there will never be a need to dig up streets. Treated sewage will be used to water golf courses and farms. Waste heat from the power plant will aid in a chemical process to chill water for the air conditioning system. Sludge from sewage and ashes from incinerators will provide soil conditioners and land fill.

You may be asking yourselves why I bother talking about a privately owned recreation site whose chief purpose is to create a fantasy-world and take people away from the daily realities. One reason is that it forms a sharp contrast to the less manageable and very real problems we face in developing transportation systems and yet maintaining a healthy and pleasant environment throughout our nation.

When you start out fresh and in complete control of the situation and when a whole site is subject to just one manager - planning and getting things done in general, goes pretty well.

I recently saw this accomplished in another manner. I spent two weeks in the Soviet Union this summer, leading a U.S. environmental impact and urban systems delegation. In Russia, it quickly became obvious that - in environmental protection and urban transportation - there is only one manager, one planner, one boss. Everything is the "fist" of the State.

In America, we reject this kind of management, this kind of government. In the Department of Transportation and in State and local government, we don't have just one manager, and we don't have just one source of money either. Sometimes, though, we do have an overview. For example, my office follows the expenditure of Federal funds throughout the Department and makes sure that these funds are spent with proper attention to the environment. The Federal Government spends a great deal of public money. Naturally, we want all our expenditures to reflect good values and respect for the environment. This is what Congress had in mind in passing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

It is difficult to control environmental quality. I have a great deal of sympathy for road builders who are charged with building highways and take the blame for everything from dislocation of families to urban sprawl and air pollution.

Obviously, in my position I am greatly concerned about how transportation affects the environment throughout our country. But I am most committed to improving the environment in our cities because that is where the great majority of our people live. The human environment - how people perceive their surroundings - is the key to the quality of life in our cities.

The urban environment will be increasingly important to road builders as the Federal-aid urban system authorized by the 1970 Federal-aid Highway Act is developed.

In the last ten years, road building has become a much more complicated business. In a speech he made last March, Frank Turner, the Federal Highway Administrator, reflected on how policies have changed in the past ten years. This is what he said about the 1970 Highway Act: "It is concerned with the social responsibilities of the highway program - with safety, with the environment, and with other human values. It is particularly responsive to the problems arising from the continuing urbanization of our country."

These added complexities include the whole bag of planning assistance, urban mass transit funds, relocation assistance, funds for bus passenger shelters, parking, billboard and junkyard control. Today these are not frills, they are essential toward assuring a high quality environment.

The Federal Highway Administration is also broadening the concerns of State Highway Departments. For example, some 23 points which relate to the social, economic and environmental impacts must be considered during public hearings on Federal-aid highway projects. The Highway Administration has just issued guidelines assuring that economic, social and environmental effects of Federally funded highways receive full attention at project decisions.

All these requirements, guidelines, and funding really open up new worlds for highway engineers, designers and builders to exercise imagination and social consciousness in all their building efforts. In the last few years, I think we Americans have thought a little less about quantity and rightfully turned our attention to quality. It is certainly appropriate that much attention be given to the quality of life in urban areas where a small parcel of excess land can make a pleasant park, or where a new exclusive busway can add an hour of free time to the commuter's day.

I want to turn now to a subject that must be disheartening to road builders because you find yourselves taking the blame for something completely beyond your control. I mean the development that explodes around urban freeways. Frequently, it is unplanned and unattractive. This situation emphasizes that transportation planning and land use must go hand-in-hand in order to get the kind of urban development our citizens want and need today in America. We are continuously trying to encourage metropolitan areas to have a single planning agency for transportation and

land use -- for the controls that are necessary to insure a pleasant urban environment. In the Federal Government we are also continuously trying to eliminate red tape that accompanies Federal grants--whether for waste-water treatment, highway projects, model cities, or airport planning. We have been working toward a single kind of application for Federal grants. This is one way to cut down the confusion in metropolitan governments that results from having too many separate and different Federal requirements. Putting the planning and the implementation together at the Federal and local level is certainly very important.

There are other new directions as well. Reference my office, I want to reflect upon the importance which I give to urban areas and to planning. In the area of urban systems, we want to integrate transportation plans and programs with community goals and objectives. The important thing, in other words, is the kind of cities people want -- the kind of cities that we must have to meet the needs of a growing country. In the area of transportation planning assistance, I want my office to work with State, metropolitan, and local planning officials to integrate many kinds of planning--land use, social, environmental and economic.

I think that these directions will go far toward seeing that obstacles become opportunities and that problems become solutions.

I believe in the power of positive thinking. When I first arrived in Washington, it was evident that the role my office was playing was re-active and negative. I feel that the best way to make transportation compatible with a better environment is to make the controversies obvious a bit earlier in the planning. I really believe that if we simplify and facilitate communications among all interested parties, then we can improve both transportation and the quality of life in our cities.

We are, for example, developing an early warning system in highway development. We want to find out as early as possible where highways are being planned and where they will go. Why should we wait until everything is completed and then look for the environmental impacts? That's silly. We should be there when the ball is kicked-off. Then we won't be reacting ... we'll be helping.

We'll be helping - not only to avoid problems later on down the road - but by immediately assuring that the environmental aspects of the particular project will be enhanced. This is what we want to do ... and will do.

/8501 600 59

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

STATEMENT OF HERBERT F. DeSIMONE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT RESEARCH, U.S. SENATE, REGARDING LONG ISLAND SOUND, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1971.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to testify today with regard to the Department's efforts to preserve and protect Long Island Sound and its environs. On my right is Ronald Pulling, Deputy Associate Administrator for Plans for the Federal Aviation Administration and on my left is Captain Sidney Wallace, Chief of the Marine Environmental Protection Division of the Coast Guard.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Transportation is keenly sensitive to the problems of environment and has been ever since our creation. Indeed, the Act which established our Department declared it to be "the national policy that special efforts should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public parks and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites." I can assure you that we have taken this mandate very seriously, and that is why Secretary Volpe established the Assistant Secretaryship which I now hold, that for the Environment and Urban Systems.

While the Department's concern is for the entire country, I must admit that I have a personal interest in Long Island Sound. As you know, Senator Ribicoff, I am a Rhode Islander. And, as I am sure you know, Long Island Sound flows into Block Island Sound and then into Rhode Island Sound. What happens to Long Island Sound is of great importance, not only to those States

which front on it, but also to States such as mine because of the ecological continuity of our coastal waters. Pollution and environmental degradation do not respect state boundaries. It is the problem of all of us, and a problem which must be solved by a concerted and unified effort. It is the great fortune of the northeastern states to have the Sound available to us as a natural and recreational resource. It is the great responsibility of us all to protect that resource for this and future generations.

The key to the Department's efforts to preserve and protect Long Island Sound is threefold: sensitivity to the problem, an ever-increasing knowledge of the Sound and what is happening to it, and, finally, cooperation and coordination among the involved agencies and jurisdictions.

I have already stated, Mr. Chairman, how the Department of Transportation Act mandates sensitivity to environmental problems and how my office, that of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems, works with the Marine Environmental Protection Division of the Coast Guard and the FAA Office of Environmental Quality to ensure consideration of the environmental problems concerning the Sound.

Just to give you a quick idea of the kind of data we have on the Sound, I'd like to rapidly show you several of the charts and maps of the Sound used by the Coast Guard and FAA.

As you also know, Mr. Chairman, before the Department takes any action which might affect the Sound, we conduct a thorough and comprehensive analysis

of precisely what effect that action will have. For example, the FAA has been conducting several feasibility studies to determine possible sites for a new jet port to serve New York. Included in these studies is one considering possible sites in the waters around New York City. One of those possibilities was a site located on Long Island Sound. We have been advised by the consultant making the study, the first phase of which will be submitted to the Department on December 1, 1971, that he has reached the conclusion that the environmental effects of the jet port could adversely affect the Sound, and that he is now exploring other locations. In this regard, these thorough studies are necessary because they uncover alternatives, reach conclusions of fact rather than conjecture, form a basis for future actions, and, quite frankly, we believe that this is what we as a government owe to the people.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we come to the area of coordination among the agencies and jurisdictions with responsibility for the Sound, a subject which I know is of great importance to the Committee. As you know, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires that we prepare an environmental statement on actions which significantly affect the environment. This report is circulated to all interested parties on the Federal, state, and local levels. Thus, any major affirmative decision or action affecting the Sound by, for example, the FAA would not be made before there had been a review by all interested parties.

In the protection of the Sound, the Coast Guard also coordinates its activities with other involved agencies such as the Corps of Engineers

and the Environmental Protection Agency. Just to give you an idea of the degree of coordination, I'd like to submit for the record the Multi-agency Oil and Hazardous Materials Pollution Contingency Plan for the New England Coast. This plan deals only with one narrow area, the action to be taken in the event of an oil spill. While the pages aren't numbered serially, I'd say there were close to 500 pages of coordinating instructions involved. I might also say at this point that the Coast Guard is agressively reacting to those who would pollute Long Island Sound.

I know time is short, Mr. Chairman, and that you would like to hear other preliminary statements before you begin asking questions. I'd like to end my prepared statement at this point, therefore, but I, Captain Wallace and Mr. Pulling stand ready to answer any questions you might have.

TAS-493

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

44-DOT-71

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION HERBERT F. DeSIMONE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PENNSYLVANIA PLANNING ASSOCIATION, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1971, HERSHEY, PENNSYLVANIA

Recently I heard a presentation on the new Disney World in Florida. From the point of view of environmental protection, transportation, and ingenuity in general, Disney World is just about unbeatable. There are separate traffic levels for trucks, pedestrians, and rapid rail transit. Trucks, in fact, deliver goods in underground tunnels which also accommodate the sewage, garbage, water, heating, telephone, and electrical systems - so there will never be a need to dig up streets. Treated sewage is used to water golf courses and farms. Waste heat from the power plant aids in a chemical process to chill water for the air conditioning system. Sludge from sewage and ashes from incinerators provide soil conditioners and land fill.

You may be asking yourselves why I bother talking about a privately owned recreation site whose chief purpose is to create a fantasy-world and take people from the daily realities. One reason is that it forms a sharp contrast to the less manageable and very real problems we face in developing transportation systems and yet maintaining a healthy and pleasant environment throughout our nation.

When you start out fresh and in complete control of the situation and when a whole site is subject to just one manager - planning and getting things done in general, goes pretty well.

I recently saw this accomplished in another manner. I spent two weeks in the Soviet Union this summer, leading a U.S. environmental impact and urban systems delegation. In Russia, it quickly became obvious that - in environmental protection and urban transportation - there is only one manager, one planner, one boss. Everything is the "Fist" of the State.

In America, we reject this kind of management, this kind of government. Our planning is fragmented and resource allocation is highly varied. There are all kinds of investments here private and public, large and small, and they are not all coordinated with each other. We Americans have in the past considered public planning too inflexible and too constraining on our private enterprise approach. In transportation we have concentrated on transportation projects as engineering projects, the sole end being "mobility"; and relieving traffic congestion.

Now we are recognizing that we have to look at transportation, particularly urban transportation, as part of a larger system which includes housing, employment, recreation and open space, and public utilities. So we are shifting to a new framework for action. Everywhere we are trying to enlarge the scope of responsibility of the institutions which make the investment decisions to respond with comprehensive solutions. We want to get from local decisions to regional, and metropolitan decisions, so that our urban areas will take on a sensible shape. And transportation is the prime shaper of urban form. If you doubt it, think about the development that grows up around an urban freeway. Frequently its unattractive -- and not only unattractive but unexpected. The highway builders are blamed ... But I think those really at fault are the local planning commissions who have changed their master plan and rezoned the land for diverse uses thereby making the freeway obsolete for its original purpose.

I think we are in universal agreement that the tinkering-and-patchwork approach to the transportation problem no longer will do. This approach originated at the time when we believed that transportation consisted of simply relieving congestion and adding more roads and more lanes. We realize today that transportation is the infra structure that makes the community work. Therefore, the leverage provided by transportation is especially critical in how we address ourselves to this total city.

Let us look for an example at the three primary objectives sought by the American people in the realm of transportation. These include spaciousness and mobility in our residential areas, a wide choice of shopping and employement locations, plus easy accessibility to all activities in the urban area. If you think about these for a moment, you will realize that they are mutually incompatible. It is easy to obtain any one or even two, but not all of them without serious and intelligent planning. That is, we can't have a compact city and a spacious one. We can't have maximum accessibility and unlimited space. And so the problem of transportation planning becomes essentially that of achieving tradeoffs among these diverse objectives.

That is what we face in transportation planning. It will not be an easy choice in any metropolitan area, but if we can clarify these alternatives and make our respective constituencies face up to the implications of each, we will have gone a considerable distance in resolving our own objectives. Remember, transportation must follow goals and objectives, not precede them.

What I have been saying points up the fact that the rate and magnitude and pervasiveness of both social change and technological change have given us a world in which everything affects everything else, and fast!

In the past we have not dealt well with this fact. We have, for the sake of convenience and presumed efficiency, fragmented the big picture. Where we have needed a bigger sewage system, we built one; when we needed a new school, we built one; where we have needed a new bridge or highway, we have built one. This has always seemed the most reliable way to operate. If cars jammed upon a roadway, enlarge it. The fact is this has been most inefficient - because without control of land use and development facilities grown obsolete - we must rebuild.

We are leaving the age in which separate fragmentary programs have been their own justification and we are entering a period of recognizing the interrelationships of programs.

It's about time. The very creation of the Department of Transportation recognized that transportation programs should be considered together -- that autonomous agencies for aviation and for highways and for rails ought to be subject to some overview. To an extent this has occurred. On the other hand, mere federal recognition that transportation affects land use, or that highways and air pollution are related does not do much good.

Institutions at all levels -- Federal, State, regional and local -- must be encouraged and equipped to plan and implement all the various factors which affect urban development. It may be necessary to devise a whole array of new tools to accomplish this objective. It may even be necessary to consider making far-reaching institutional changes within the governmental structure.

We have found in studying urban transportation planning, that with few exceptions, planning for highways, airports, and transit has not been coordinated. Part of the blame is with the mixed bag of federal assistance programs which are based on different criteria and are therefore inconsistent with each other. I believe that a properly designed program of federal assistance could provide the right incentives to the development of single area-wide planning agencies; and this, in my judgment is the first step toward good urban development.

The second major change required is to incorporate into this area-wide planning process the means by which priorities can be established and a true responsiveness to a local constituency to ensure implementation.

I would like to devote a minute to this word planning. For years I have heard people dismiss planning, saying it had no connection with reality. Well I am a lawyer by training. Last week I was chatting with one of my staff members who also happened to be a lawyer. He commented on the difference between planners and lawyers, and he made the observation that with planners, the plan is the product; that once a plan is completed, the planner pretty much drops out. With the lawyer, it's a different story - a deed or a lease - has to be practical; it has to survive a practical moment of truth.

But the fault is not the planner's. The problem is that the planner may come up with a beautiful metropolitan transportation plan or a metropolitan recreation plan -- there's no metropolitan government to receive it, work with it, say yes or no to it and adopt it as law. The reason is that urban areas are not well defined legal and financial entities. They are instead collections of local jurisdictions each of which has limited legal and financial powers. These local jurisdications belong to larger entities -- states -- with greater power to set laws and to tax. Over the states is the federal government with its even greater powers to legislate and to tax. The challenge then is to tie them all together through policies, and institutional areas of responsibilities.

Transportation plans should be acceptable to both the elected officials of the metropolitan area and to the local citizens who will adopt the necessary policies, including support of any necessary legislation and funding. In addition, plans should be responsive to changing political attitudes, economic conditions, technology and changes in urban form. But before all these things, urban transportation planning should create a forum for developing a regional consensus on needs, problems, and priorities.

I personally believe that the Federal government's urban transportation planning assistance should aim to develop metropolitan institutions which are capable of dealing effectively both with regional development problems and with increasing Federal-aid for transportation and other metropolitan development. These institutions should have the following abilities:

(1) The ability to tie physical planning to transportation planning, social planning, and to metropolitan and environmental goals and objectives.

(2) The ability to reflect the wishes of each participating local jurisdiction in a uniform and reasonable way.

(3) Finally, the staff should have the ability to deal with intermodal urban transportation planning without the context of all regional development goals.

Thus, regional planning agencies must be metropolitan in scale -- they must provide a place for local governments to come together to make regional decisions. They must be broad in terms of power -- they must be empowered to set priorities for implementation. They must be interdisciplinary so that decisions which appear to meet one kind of goal do not endanger other goals. That is, plans for transportation including airports must take into consideration plans for water and sewers, energy, as well as schools, housing, recreation, etc.

Only an interdisciplinary approach will give us the ability to anticipate the consequences of decisions, and balance those decisions in an informed manner. Only an inter disciplinary approach will really let us design the future of our urban areas, the places where most of us live.

This interdisciplinary approach is what President Nixon means when he proposes reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal government. He wants the Executive Branch to ge "goal oriented" rather than "purpose oriented". Thus, he would bring the various agencies of the government having a common purpose together in one department. The Department of Transportation, for example, would be split and merged into the proposed new Department of Community Development and the proposed new Department of Economic Affairs. Such "goal oriented" reorganization would enable the government to achieve the larger purpose for which it was established: to promote the general welfare.

If we all agree on the need for an interdisciplinary approach in regional transportation planning, what can we do about it? Let's face it ... It's easy to agree on the concept but much more difficult to agree on a course of action.

I would like to offer a few thoughts which should be considered not only in Washington but at the State and local levels as well.

First, we should free up Federal, State and local funds for transportation planning and project development. The time has come when the bias of earmarked funds for one transportation mode or another simply distorts the end product. We already have planning grants for highways, airports and mass transit.

Now, I think we need to turn these into "choosing" grants. Certainly the simple existence of highway funds should not be grounds for building roads in Harrisburg if airport development would benefit the citizen most. I think government decision-makers must be able to choose among modal transportation alternatives if they are to make the decisions which best suit community goals and objectives.

Yes, this kind of thinking may lead to a single transportation trust fund which I believe is completely consistent with the President's program of revenue sharing.

Second, we should unify our public transportation planning and integrate it with land use and planning policies. We should recognize that transportation is not an end in itself, but a tool for shaping our local and metropolitan areas.

For example, I think we're all disheartened about the development that explodes around urban freeways. It is unplanned and unattractive. This emphasizes that transportation planning and land use must go hand-in-hand. We are continuously trying to encourage metropolitan areas to have a single planning agency for the controls that are necessary to insure a pleasant urban environment.

Third, I believe in reform in the area of mass transit assistance. Let's face it, right now we can help cities buy up existing public transit systems ... we can help them buy new transit equipment ... but we really cannot help keep old systems in operation with up-to-date service.

Despite the Federal government's capital grant program, many mass transit operations have continued their vicious cycle of decreasing ridership, increasing fares, and deteriorating services. Clearly, it does little good for us to help urban areas purchase shiny new buses if those buses ply the streetcar routes set down in the 1920's when -- during the intervening half century -- the people and their jobs have moved to 1970 locations.

What is needed is a systematic and flexible approach to transit today to make it relevant to the land-use patterns of the present, and to the desired patterns of the future.

In addition, we must stress the fact that a transit system is -- in most cities -- a positive good in spite of deficits or its operating costs. Our calculations must consider transit's social and environmental benefits as compared to those of automobiles. To digress for a moment, I think that we should recognize through public policy that the automobile which uses public right-a-way and facilities made possible by public action is indeed public transportation. There is nothing private except ownership of the vehicle which is useless without the whole range of public facilities and services.

We must recognize that highways are for people -- not vehicles -- and develop fringe parking lots, bus lanes, busways and other policies which will make it possible for the highway to serve the greatest number with the greatest efficiency -- whatever the transportation mode.

To review this point, I'm asking you tonight to start doing something to bring our transportation planning, spending and thinking into a more reasonable focus to cope with the problems of the '70s.

Whether the end results might be a single transportation planning agency, a single transportation trust fund, and maybe even operating subsidies for mass transit ... I just don't know.

But, I think that we can all agree that we must think boldly - yet wisely - if we are to receive our transportation systems to make them compatible with the needs and desires of the people in America today.

I do predict, however, that the Federal government's role will begin to shift away from the detailed review of local projects to one of measuring performance as a condition of Federal funding. This puts the burden of proof on you at the local level.

46-DOT-71

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION HERBERT F. DeSIMONE AT THE FALL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION, NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1971

It's a pleasure to be here with the New England chapter of the American Public Works Association. I know that your membership has a complex makeup -- everything from public administrators, heavy equipment manufacturers, and electronics and engineering firms, to cement manufacturers. And that your interests are as varied as your membership -- water, sewage, transportation, and incineration. The inference I draw from all of this, is that your understanding of public policy issues, and of public investment, is quite sophisticated.

I also know that your Public Works Congress met in Philadelphia last month and I want to congratulate you on the theme you chose -- "Improvement of the Urban Environment." In my judgment that is one of the greatest challenges we have to face in our country today.

Before I talk about how public agencies can maintain environmental quality, I'd like to build on the theme of your Congress and discuss transportation and the urban environment and how difficult the decision-making process in these cases becomes.

You know before Americans became so conscious of the ecology of our planet, these issues were a lot clearer. It was a whole lot easier to make decisions. In roadbuilding, for example, the idea used to be to get the most road for the least cost. Life was simple: the cost of the road was simply the cost of the road -- nothing else. Now we are operating in a different frame of reference and the cost of the highway project includes a lot of other costs as well -- for parks, beautification, relocation housing, wide rights of way to ease noise impact, pedestrian overpasses, equestrian and bicycle trails in the right of way. Our philosophy is that the dollars that pay for the road should also pay for whatever will make the road a good neighbor. This has made it possible for Federally funded agencies to have a strong role in maintaining environmental quality. This philosophy causes us to weigh the transportation benefits against the environmental harm of a proposed project. And oftentimes we find that the environmental harm of a proposed project say, a new runway and increased noise may outweigh the cost of the runway itself. It is at this point that we must begin to look for alternatives, new ways of moving about in metropolitan areas.

In many cases, transportation improvements can be in direct conflict with today's urban environment. The alternative to the urban airport noise problem might well be to improve rail service--and the alternative to the private transit service, supported only by the fare box, might well be publicly owned and partially subsidized mass transit. But it's very difficult to get these alternatives into practice unless public agencies are organized to do it. And sometimes public agencies may not recognize the connections between various parts of the urban system, and the urban environment. And if they can't recognize them, they surely can't solve them.

Many people though are trying. For example, I recently heard the Public Works Commissioner of a large city say that in his city they are thinking of restricting the building of public parking garages, taxing existing parking spaces, and giving bonuses to businesses that don't provide off street parking.

For years most of us, I would guess, have believed fervently that new construction in downtown areas should include plenty of room for parking. We have many reasons for thinking this. We like the freedom given to us by our cars. We don't have good public transportation. We don't like to stand at the bus stop.

Well, what are we to think of this proposal? Is it going to drive people and businesses out of the city? Or is this going to be the first city to successfully cut automobile congestion, improve its transit, maybe even its air quality, and become a downtown that people like to visit and work in?

The point I am making with this example is that transit, parking, taxes, public safety, and automobiles are all part of the urban system.

On another front dealing with urban systems, I want you to know that I am very excited by our Department's Northeast Corridor report, whose recommendations focus on the improvement of rail transportation right here in the Boston to Washington corridor. In addition to improved rail service are concrete recommendations dealing with highways. The point is basic: we must improve transportation among all the cities in between -- from Boston all the way to Washington. I certainly hope that the recommendations will be carried out speedily. The trains already run through the centers of our cities. This is a transportation project, or a series of transportation projects that will benefit the core areas of our cities as well as the entire region.

And I, for one, feel that we must concentrate on keeping, or making our old cities lively and pleasant. After all, as a major builder said recently, "We've got the streets, the sewers, the lighting, the stores, the firemen, the policemen, the schools, the hospitals, the institutions--functioning now, this minute -- not planned for some time in the distant future. Our Problem is revitalizing. We don't have to run away from the city." When thinking about our cities, we can't afford to just throw up our hands and say "Impossible". We have to bring our cities back to life -- We have to recycle them."

I hope you don't mind having me elaborate on the theme of your Philadelphia Congress, but the subject happens to be the issue most important to me in my job. Because the question of transportation and the urban environment always boils down to people -- their tolerance for noise, their demands for safety and convenience, their demands for speed, and their demands for a pleasant environment. It's people that hold cities together.

Now as to how public agencies can maintain environmental quality. I've already given a couple of examples -- one is the Federal philosophy and policy that permits, for example, a highway project to pay for environmental improvements. Another is for public agencies to have flexibility and be able to decide on alternative courses of action. Here again I am thinking of the Northeast Corridor Report whose recommendations center on upgrading and improving the use of existing rail and highway facilities. The report might have suggested more airports and air travel, but I need scarcely remind you how long, for example, New York has been searching -- and searching unsuccessfully -- for a site for a fourth jetport. Just last week, as a matter of fact, I announced that the Department would not allow an off-shore jetport to be constructed in Long Island Sound because of environmental considerations.

Two weeks ago I was speaking to the American Road Builders and offered them my sympathy on the unfortunate and undeserved criticism they take for the ugly development that often explodes around highways. It isn't their fault -- but it is the fault of our public agencies -- namely those that control land use -- they can and must do a better job. There is room at all levels of public agencies -- from Federal to local, in making sure that we preserve and protect our environment, whether in the wilderness or in the metropolitan areas where most of us live.

In the area of urban systems, we are integrating transportation plans and programs with community goals and objectives. The important thing, in other words, is the kind of cities people want -- the kind of cities that we must have to meet the needs of a growing country. In the area of transportation planning assistance, my office works with State, metropolitan, and local planning officials to integrate many kinds of planning -- land use, social, environmental and economic.

In our research program, we are studying how alternative transportation modes can change a city's air pollution and we are now completing a handbook on environmental factors in airport site selection....we are writing a handbook which will set forth the environmental factors to be taken into account in airport development.

My office is also directing the Urban Corridor Demonstration Programs. These are going on in eleven cities across the country. Here in New England, New Haven is the site of one of these projects. We are tackling the problems of urban congestion by combining the resources of the Federal Highway Administration and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. Corridor projects are concerned with work trips -- from home to office and back again, and, hopefully, will result in more free time for the commuter.

Congestion in the 11 cities will be lessened by all sorts of improvements from fringe parking areas near transit facilities to exclusive bus lanes and electronic traffic control. Each of the cities is working out solutions to the unique situations in its own closed corridor. The projects have a double interest for us -- we are looking for solutions to congestion, of course, but are also looking at the kind of planning that makes it possible to attack congestion in a sensible way.

In talking about the Northeast Corridor Report and about these Urban Corridor Demonstration Projects, I have emphasized transportation improvements -- or transportation solutions -- for existing urban systems. But there is another important side to solving congestion and other problems in urban areas, namely, planning for the future. The key to the planning that can solve our urban problems lies in institutional arrangements that guide our planning. We need to revamp these arrangements at both the Federal and at the Local level. Planning for schools, water and transportation must be coordinated.

Only an interdisciplinary approach will give us the ability to anticipate the consequences of decisions, and balance those decisions in an informed manner. Only an interdisciplinary approach will really let us design the future of our urban areas, the places where most of us live.

This interdisciplinary approach is what President Nixon means when he proposes reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal government. He wants the Executive Branch to be "goal oriented" rather than "purpose oriented". Thus, he would bring the various agencies of the government having a common puspose together in one department. The Department of Transportation, for example, would be split and merged into the proposed new Department of Community Development and the proposed new Department of Economic Affairs. Such "goal oriented" reorganization would enable the government to achieve the larger purpose for which it was established: to promote the general welfare.

If we all agree on the need for an interdisciplinary approach in regional transportation planning, what can we do about it? Let's face it... it's easy to agree on the concept but much more difficult to agree on a course of action.

I would like to offer a few thoughts which should be considered not only in Washington but at the State and local levels as well.

First, we should free up Federal, State and local funds for transportation planning and project development. The time has come when the bias of earmarked funds for one transportation mode or another simply distorts the end product. We already have planning grants for highways, airports and mass transit.

Now I think we need to turn these into "choosing" grants. I think government decision-makers must be able to choose among modal transportation alternatives if they are to make the decisions which best suit community goals and objectives.

Yes, this kind of thinking may lead to a single transportation trust fund which I believe is completely consistent with the President's program of revenue sharing.

Second, we should unify our public transportation planning and integrate it with land use and planning policies. We should recognize that transportation is not an end in itself, but a tool for shaping our local and metropolitan areas. For example, I think we're all disheartened about the development that explodes around urban freeways. It is unplanned and unattractive. This emphasizes that transportation planning and land use must go hand-in-hand. We are continuously trying to encourage metropolitan areas to have a single planning agency for the controls that are necessary to insure a pleasant urban environment.

Third, I believe in reform in the area of mass transit assistance. Let's face it, right now we can help cities buy up existing public transit systems... we can help them buy new transit equipment... but we really cannot help keep old systems in operation with up-to-date service.

Despite the Federal government's capital grant program, many mass transit operations have continued their vicious cycle of decreasing ridership, increasing fares, and deteriorating services. Cleraly, it does little good for us to help urban areas purchase shiny new buses if those buses ply the streetcar routes set down in the 1920's when -- during the intervening half century -- the people and their jobs have moved to 1970 locations.

What is needed is a systematic and flexible approach to transit today to make it relevant to the land-use patterns of the present, and to the desired patterns of the future.

In addition, we must stress the fact that a transit system is -- in most cities -- a positive good in spite of deficits or its operating costs. Our calculations must consider transit's social and environmental benefits as compared to those of automobiles. To digress for a moment, I think that we should recognize through public policy that the automobile which uses public right-a-way and facilities made possible by public action is indeed public transportation. There is nothing private except ownership of the vehicle which is useless without the whole range of public facilities and services.

We must recognize that highways are for people -- not vehicles -- and develop fringe parking lots, bus lanes, busways and other policies which will make it possible for the highway to serve the greatest number with the greatest efficiency -- whatever the transportation mode.

To review this point, I'm asking this afternoon, that together, we start doing something to bring our transportation planning, spending and thinking into a more reasonable focus to cope with the problems of the '70s. Whether the end results might be a single transportation planning agency, a single transportation trust fund, and maybe even operating subsidies for mass transit... are approaches we must consider.

But, I think that we can all agree that we must think boldly, yet wisely - if we are to revive our transportation systems to make them compatible with the needs and desires of the people in America today.

I do predict, however, that the Federal government's role will begin to be decentralized, to shift away from the detailed review of local projects to one of measuring performance as a condition of Federal funding. This puts the burden of proof on you at the local level.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

47-DOT-71

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION HERBERT F. DE SIMONE AT DINNER FOR ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL MEDICAL STAFF, PROVIDENCE, R. I., OCTOBER 20, 1971

Let me first say what a great pleasure it is for me to be here with you tonight. I say this not only because I am home and, believe me, it's the greatest feeling in the world to come home, but I say this because I have nothing but the highest respect for the medical profession ... and especially, the Rhode Island medical profession. You are the most concerned, the most capable, most community-oriented group I've ever had the privilege of knowing and working with ... both as former Attorney General of Rhode Island and as a private citizen of our State.

As Attorney General, I saw firsthand the many good things you have accomplished ... quietly and effectively and I applaud you for it.

I'm happy to say that this fine relationship with the medical profession is continuing for me in Washington. Just last week, for example, I accepted an invitation from the American Medical Association to meet with its Council on Environmental and Public Health to discuss what we are doing in the Department of Transportation in the environmental area. I've had meetings with AMA staff people in my office who have been of great assistance to me in areas of my work which deal in great respect to the health profession.

It might surprise you, as a matter of fact, that the Department of Transportation relates to the medical profession in a number of ways and functions ... some are direct, others indirect.

I thought it might be interesting to you tonight to hear how we do relate. The most obvious, of course, is in the area of environmental protection, and, not only in the readily evident areas of air or noise pollution but in human and social terms as well.

Simply speaking, I mean that my office - which monitors all Federally-funded transportation projects in the nation to insure that the environment is protected - looks first to see that these roads, these airports, these bridges ... do not destroy neighborhoods, that they provide appropriate relocation, and that they show concern for our elderly and our disabled.

We do this because we believe that one of the most serious problems facing transportation today is the displacement of housing and the destruction of neighborhood units --- and I'm sure you know better than I --- that this can cause severe emotional and material hardship. This, to us, is protection of the human environment ... and I think it important that those in the medical profession as yourselves, should influence our local policies to help all concerned avoid these kinds of mental hardships.

Continuing on the "human" environment, I'd like to tell you what we are doing concerning the particular needs of the nation's senior citizens.

Statistically, the elderly have fewer means, yet transportation is their third largest expense. They tend to be among the 25 percent of our population who do not drive. Many are city residents, dependent upon public transportation.

The elderly account for a disproportionate number of pedestrian fatalities --- 28 percent to be exact. Thirteen percent of those over 65 have impaired hearing, as you well know. In addition, too many of our elderly suffer afflictions which makes it virtually impossible for them to utilize conventional transportation facilities.

Because of this, we have developed specific programs for our Senior Citizens.

For example: air terminals are being designed to minimize the distances passengers must walk; guidelines have been developed for State and local highway planners aimed at reducing the susceptibility of the elderly to pedestrian accidents; the dial-a-ride demonstration project in Haddonfield, New Jersey sends a bus to the traveler's door; and the new Bay Area Rapid Transit System (BART) serving San Francisco makes extensive use of loudspeakers, super visible signs, special gates and fare collection procedures for the elderly --- plus many other such ideas.

Now focusing on the more evident aspects of the environment and health, I think it's safe to assume that air pollution is the country's biggest environmental health problem today.

The cost of air pollution in terms of both dollars and disease is truly staggering. The President's Council on Environmental Quality feels that even low concentrations of pollutants can, over a period of time, damage health severely and even cause premature death. Major illnesses linked in varying degrees to air pollution, I scarcely need to tell you, include emphysema, bronchitis, asthma and lung cancer.

Some estimates of the health costs of air pollution have been made. We believe that if we can reduce urban air pollution by 50 percent --- cut it in half --- such a reduction would lower the costs of damage to health by 2 billion dollars in a single year!

It goes without saying that most of our air pollution comes from the conventional, internal combustion engine -- from the automobile that is so basic to our transportation system in America. We are working to reduce air pollution in two principal ways -- one, by lowering reliance on private automobiles by providing better and more efficient public transportation -- and the second, by conducting extensive research on non-conventional engines.

We are experimenting with special exclusive bus lanes in Washington, Seattle, New York and New Jersey for rush hour commuting. These

buses alone divert people from their cars and help give the commuter an extra hour of free time, thus improving the quality of life. In addition, many of the buses utilized in these demonstration projects are equipped with what we call Environmental Improvement Kits which greatly reduce harmful emissions.

Legislation enacted last year makes money available for urban mass transit and special projects like the exclusive bus lanes, and many other things which would decrease our dependence on the automobile in our center cities and thus reduce harmful emissions. We are determined, as well, to use new funds for urban highways, for mass transit and for airports in a complementary way. Then, hopefully, we will not be so reliant on automobiles and we will have achieved not only a balanced transportation system but a more healthy one as well.

In addition, I can assure you that we are conducting extensive research on non-conventional engines. The automobile is due for redesigning from top to bottom. We must develop an efficient, low-emission power plant if we are ever to get clean air in the cities ... simply because the internal combustion engine now produces up to 85 percent of all air pollution in our cities and 60 percent nationwide. In addition, we also need a safe car that will permit people to survive head-on crashes at 50 mph and roll-overs at 70 mph without significant injury -- and I'm pleased to say we have extensive research going on right now in our Department on this very kind of car.

Besides conducting extensive hardware research, we are currently involved in a research study in Washington, D.C. to help predict the consequences of various traffic patterns upon the air we breathe. We are looking to this study to help Washington make plans to meet the 1976 Federal Air Quality Standards.

We are also vitally concerned with emissions from aircraft engines, although this type of smoke is responsible for but a very small percentage of air pollution. Our Federal Aviation Administration has joined with the airline industry to reduce jet engine smoke emissions through a retrofit program. This effort, aimed at the intermediate jet fleet, is over 20 percent complete now and should be substantially finished by the end of next year.

I think it can be said that the pollution problems associated with conventional cars and even aircraft are well known. What is not so commonly understood is that various modes of transportation like autos, trucks and aircraft are principal causes of the noise epidemic that has swept industrial nations in recent years. Noise is a word of dubious origin, but two claimants to paternity are the Latin nausea (sickness) and noxa (harm) --

both, I think, convey the condition of cities and suburbs today.

City dwellers start to show a hearing loss at 25, whereas primitive tribes do not show one until 70. And well-informed scientists figure that if noise continues to rise at its present rate of increase, one decibel a year, city residents could be stone -- or at least tone -- deaf by the year 2 thousand.

The Surgeon General has recently announced that between six and sixteen million Americans are also exposed to possible hearing damage from occupational noise. In the last 30 years, overall noise levels have increased 3 thousand percent.

We are now conducting extensive studies concerned with total community noise levels as well as basic airplane and truck noise. Hopefully, these studies will lead to standards to control noise as well as to help the designers of aircraft, motor vehicles and even highways fight noise pollution.

Our Department also has other health-oriented programs which I think will interest you.

We are vitally concerned, for example, with emergency medical care -- and we are working with several agencies of government on this problem. This past summer, Secretary Volpe announced an inter-departmental program using military helicopters and paramedical personnel to augment civilian capabilities in responding to civilian medical emergencies.

Known as MAST, Military Assistance to Safety and Traffic, this program is now a demonstration project. Operating within a range of one-hour flying time from five Army and Air Force Bases in the West, military helicopters with medical personnel aboard can reach areas inaccessible by ground transportation. Victims are rushed to hospitals after receiving on-the-spot emergency treatment.

If this demonstration is successful, we may be able to recommend similar projects in other areas...perhaps even in highly congested urban areas where emergency services are presently inadequate.

Another program of medical interest is aimed at the drunk driver which we call the Alcohol Safety Action Program. We have noted that problem drinkers cause at least two-thirds of the deaths on the highway. We now have programs to help identify problem drinker-drivers, decide appropriate courses of action regarding their driving privileges and then carry out these actions. Of course, these programs for drinker-drivers

also have many medical aspects ... but none more important than the fact that in controlling drunken drivers, there will be a reduction in road deaths and injuries.

Now I would like to move to some of the more general problems of health care and review some of the proposals that are under study.

Our knowledge in the U.S. about health is remarkable, and research adds every day to our understanding of medicine, biology, of psychology and even ecology. But there is some knowledge which we have not begun to use properly and here our failure is not so much in the use of science and technology as it is in social commitment. We know that there are grave shortcomings, but still many are ambivalent. They say "yes, but": they seek excuses instead of action.

They admit that the cost of care is too high, but say that we must not impose any controls.

They recognize that millions have no access to health services, but say health professionals won't work where they don't want to live.

They say that present delivery systems and financing plans are inefficient and wasteful, but say they can't be changed without causing the collapse of the health system.

"Yes, but." This is the language of the cautious, and the rallying cry of the reactionary.

Two years ago, President Nixon warned that our health delivery system was facing a "massive crisis".

Medical costs are rising sharply; the financial distress of medical schools and hospitals has become more acute; and access to necessary health care -- especially for the poor -- has become more difficult and more frustrating.

When the President proposed his health strategy on February 18, he expressed a philosophy fundamental to his whole approach to government.

He said, "We can build an effective national health strategy only if we remember the central truth that the only way to serve our people well is to better serve each person."

The proposed national health strategy incorporates four basic principles.

First, it assures equal access to health care.

Second, it balances supply and demand.

Third, it encourages efficiency.

And fourth, it builds upon the strengths of the present American health system.

The proposals include not only the plans I will outline for you tonight, but also the Medicare-Medicaid reforms proposed last year, and proposals for regulation of the insurance industry which are now being developed.

There is the National Health Insurance Partnership Act -- which deals with the shortcomings of present insurance. This reform will assure that every family in this country has access to at least a basic level of insurance coverage.

Traditionally, employers have provided minimum wage disability and retirement benefits and a basic level of occupational health and safety. It makes sense now to require a basic level of health insurance protection. Employers will be required to bear a lion's share of the expenses for their employees.

The standard plan will include benefits on both an inpatient and outpatient basis. These benefits will shift the focus of insurance protection from expensive in-hospital care to less expensive, more efficient preventive services, health maintenance, and out-patient care. The act also offers catastrophic illness protection of at least 50 thousand dollars per person and the option of obtaining services through either traditional providers or prepaid Health Maintenance Organizations.

At the same time private insurance pools would be established to offer protection at group rates to others outside this plan.

There will also be an insurance program for low income families. This will be fully financed and administered by the Federal Government and will provide health insurance to all families with children whose income is below 5 thousand dollars. For our poorest families, this program would make no charges and would pay for basic medical costs. As the family's income increased, the family itself would begin contributing.

These programs, when combined with Medicare for the aged, and the Medicaid program for the aged, blind, and disabled will cover all

American families by assuring them a basic level of health insurance.

It is intended to accomplish this without destroying existing private programs. This program does not preclude private health plans for those who can afford them. But for those who can't, the Federal government must and will step in and fill the gaps. It is proposed that improvements be made within the framework of the health insurance industry as it exists today. Here the aged would no longer have to pay premiums out of their retirement incomes. Elimination of the premium would in effect increase Social Security benefits by about 5 percent. In fiscal year 1972, savings to older people in premiums and reduced payments by states on their behalf would be almost one and a half billion dollars.

These changes in Medicare, when combined with the National Health Insurance Partnership Act, will significantly change the financing of health care for various segments of our population. They will improve the scope and the focus of health insurance without completely discarding the present system. Those who are adequately covered today will retain adequate coverage. Those who are not, will be covered.

Now let me move to the area of health manpower, and let us recognize that the manpower problem is not simply one of too few doctors. It is also the distribution of the health personnel we already have. There are just too few in the ghettoes, and in the rural areas.

Any strategy dealing with manpower must do 3 things:

First, it must improve the use of the manpower -- not only of doctors, but nurses and allied health manpower as well.

Second, it must make it possible to train health manpower.

Third, it must recognize the fact that many licensing laws and other legal restrictions serve as barriers to the most effective utilization of allied health manpower.

To deal with these problems the proposal would, first, improve the financial situation confronting our health professional schools by increasing aid to medical schools through 118 million dollars in "capitation grants." The President has recommended a grant of 6 thousand dollars per graduate.

These grants per student would encourage schools to increase their enrollments and improve curricula.

The Health Professions Scholarship Program would provide up to $3,000

per year for low income and minority students in the first two years of their training. A guaranteed loan program would be used during the last two years of training. Loan forgiveness would be available for debts incurred by low income students who fail to complete their medical education. In addition, this expanded loan program would provide forgiveness for graduates who agree to practice in areas with small populations. A total of 545 million dollars is being made available in this fiscal year for medical education -- an increase of 93 million dollars over last year.

There is also an immediate need for health manpower. For this reason, the Emergency Health Personnel Act of 1970 will be implemented to permit the assignment of Public Health Service employees to areas with critical manpower and health service deficits. The President has authorized 12 and a half million dollars for support of more than 600 professionals.

Taken together, these proposals should greatly improve our health manpower situation, both in the short and the long term.

I also want to mention some of the proposals in health research and disease prevention. First, the President has requested an additional 337 million dollars for cancer research in the next fiscal year and increased budgets for research, and the testing and treatment of sickle cell anemia. Sickle cell anemia, as you know, is an inherited blood disease found almost exclusively in our Black population. It occurs in one out of 500 Black births. If increased efforts to solve the mysteries of cancer and sickle cell anemia are successful, we will have reduced untold suffering for a great number of our citizens.

The President has established a private Health Education Foundation to make every citizen aware of the importance of maintaining good health and giving him the know-how and motivation to do so, and is pushing proposals to further research and development studies into the treatment, rehabilitation, and prevention of alcoholism and drug abuse; and to increase the effectiveness of occupational health and safety programs.

These proposals address the weaknesses of the present system. Taken together, they will help assure that no financial barriers to health care will exist for any American citizen; and the promise of good health care and the expectation that the system can provide good health care will be met. This country -- and the American people deserve no less.

TAD-492

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

51-DOT-71

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION HERBERT F. DE SIMONE BEFORE COMBINED MEETING OF NEW ENGLAND SECTION, INSTITUTE OF TRAFFIC ENGINEERS - AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS - AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS - AND BOSTON SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1971 AT PIER 4 RESTAURANT, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

I was delighted to find out that today's program concerns Transportation and the Environment. When groups of engineers, planners and architects converge to talk about the environment, I know the word is getting home ... and this is good.

President Nixon in his message on the environment in February challenged all of us when he said:

> "I call upon all Americans to dedicate themselves during the decade of the 70's to the goal of restoring the environment and reclaiming the earth for ourselves and our posterity. And I invite all peoples everywhere to join us in this great endeavor. Together, we hold this good earth in trust. We must -- and together we can -- prove ourselves worthy of that trust."

Ladies and Gentlemen, if there is one idea that characterizes policy thinking in Washington today it is that in a world of rapidly increasing population, explosive technological advance, and urban growth, we can no longer view the activities of man in isolation from each other. We can't make a better world without treating housing, education, urban design, recreation, pollution control, population planning, and conservation as parts of the same problem.

We are living on a planet, so we must begin to think in terms of the whole earth and its human and material resources. We must never forget that the balance of nature is always delicate and that we tamper with it only at great risk. And, that means a complete break with some cherished habits.

We must practice a new <u>form</u> of earth management -- to control pollution, recycle wastes, monitor toxic metals, and limit the widespread use of untested compounds. We must develop systematic programs to replant forests, restore the topsoil, and counter the effects of strip mining. We must set aside reserves for future park use and enlarge wildlife enclaves. We must control suburban leapfrogging and put a stop to the random development of urban land resources.

Furthermore, over the next few years, I'm certain there will be vast changes in the way we plan, deploy, and use our transportation investments.

One look at the growth which has occurred wherever major highways or airports have been built will tell you that transportation is a great shaper of our urban areas. How good a shaper it is depends entirely on whether we put it to work for us or whether we let it enslave us.

A new urban system was authorized by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 -- Federal-aid construction monies for highways are now available for fringe area parking and for exclusive buslanes -- this is something new. It's something which can help relieve some of the congestion which automobiles cause in downtown areas.

Along with new legislation, we must also develop new thinking. For example, we all know that federal monies for transportation have long favored highway construction. Experts estimate that with the opening of each new eight-lane urban highway, 15,000 additional inner-city parking spaces are required downtown. This increases pollution and consumes valuable land. Today, as much as 60 percent of many central business districts is devoted to automobile-related services -- parking lots, garages, cloverleafs, streets, and so on.

Thus, reliance on highways and automobiles exclusively has promoted the deterioration of our central cities. It has caused the relocation of families, businesses and in many cases paved over with concrete, invaluable green acres. In fact, this single-mode mania has caused public transit to decline as urban highways were built. We are determined to change that.

Legislation enacted last year makes monies available for urban mass transit, and for exclusive bus lanes as earlier noted, and many other things which would decrease our dependence on the automobile in our central cities. We are determined to use new funds for urban highways, for mass transit and for airports in a complimentary way. Then, we will not be so reliant on automobiles and we will have achieved balanced transportation.

This I believe is absolutely essential if we are to move people and protect our physical and social environment as well.

Within a few years, rapid rail to our airports must be the rule, not the exception. People-movers will make their appearance in shopping centers, airport terminals, and business districts. The Tracked Air Cushion Vehicle -- or, as we call it, TAC-VEE -- will dominate the inter-city movement of passengers on trips of between 50 and 300 miles. We will see new subway systems as in San Francisco and in Washington, D. C., where BART and the METRO are underway. The automobile will become a choice -- not a necessity for inner-city travel.

The safety and pollution problems associated with conventional cars are well known. What is not so commonly understood is that cars and trucks are principal causes of the noise epidemic that has swept industrial nations in recent years.

We are studying plane, truck and car noise through our Federal Aviation Administration and Federal Highway Administration. These studies will lead to standards to control noise.

Water pollution is another serious environmental disorder and here, too, transportation must share the blame. The more than eight million watercraft (both commercial and recreational) that navigate U.S. waters discharge a variety of pollutants, including sanitary wastes, litter, bilge waters, and oil.

Although not necessarily the most damaging of the water pollutants, oil is certainly the most dramatic and indicates the magnitude of the problem. Not only is our oil consumption increasing dramatically (from 11 million gallons daily to 14.1 million in the past five years), but more and more of it is being spilled along coastal and inland waters. The damage already runs into billions of dollars a year and that figure may increase as our oil requirements grow and supertankers become common.

In our Department, the Coast Guard is placing great emphasis in this important fight against oil spillage. Through strict enforcement, guidelines for supertanker construction, and new legislation like the Administration's Ports and Waterways Safety bill - which I have testified in favor of before both the Senate and the House, we hope to curb the awesome environmental problems caused by oil on our waters.

Yes, our great challenge now is to discover ways for us to have our cake and eat it, too. We must expand our productivity and at the same time protect life on earth.

We can't ask the rest of the world to postpone its entry into the industrial age in order to suit our convenience. Our highly technological society has made today's environmental problems; now we must show the world how to keep the advantages of our technology without sacrificing our human environment.

We have a good example of what I mean in the new Disney World in Florida. From the point of view of environmental protection, transportation, and ingenuity in general, Disney World is just about unbeatable. There are separate traffic levels for trucks, pedestrians, and rapid rail transit. Trucks, in fact, deliver goods in underground tunnels which also accomodate the sewage, garbage, water, heating, telephone, and electrical systems - so there will never be a need to dig up streets. Treated sewage is used to water golf courses and farms. Waste heat from the power plant aids in a chemical process to chill water for the air conditioning system. Sludge from sewage and ashes from incinerators provide soil conditioners and land fill.

Despite the fact that Disney World is a privately owned recreation site whose chief purpose is to create a fantasy world and take people away from their daily realities, I think we in transportation can learn much from it.

We must recognize that we have to look at transportation, particularly urban transportation, as part of a larger system. So we are shifting to a new framework for action. Everywhere we are trying to enlarge the scope of responsibility of the institutions which make the investment decisions. We want to get from local decisions to regional, and metropolitan decisions, so that our urban areas will take on a sensible shape.

I think we are in universal agreement that the tinkering-and-patchwork approach to the transportation problem no longer will do. This approach originated at the same time when we believed that transportation consisted of simply relieving congestion and adding more roads and more lanes. We realize today that transportation is the infra structure that makes the community work. Therefore, the leverage provided by transportation is especially critical in how we address ourselves to this total city.

Institutions at all levels -- Federal, State, regional and local -- must be encouraged and equipped to plan and implement all the various factors which affect urban development. It may be necessary to devise a whole array of new tools to accomplish this objective. It may even be necessary to consider making far-reaching institutional changes within the governmental structure.

I'd like to offer a few thoughts which should be considered not only in Washington but at the State and local levels as well.

First, we should free up Federal, State and local funds for transportation planning and project development. The time has come when the bias of earmarked funds for one transportation mode or another simply distorts the end product. We already have planning grants for highways, airports and mass transit.

Now, I think we need to turn these into "choosing" grants. Certainly the simple existence of highway funds should not be grounds for building roads in a particular area if mass transit or airport development would benefit the citizens most. I think government decision-makers must be able to choose among modal transportation alternatives if they are to make the decisions which best suit community goals and objectives.

And, yes, this kind of thinking may lead to a single transportation trust fund.

Second, we should unify our public transportation planning and integrate it with land use and planning policies. We should recognize that transportation is not an end in itself, but a tool for shaping our local and metropolitan areas.

Third, I believe in reform in the area of mass transit assistance. Let's face it, right now we can help cities buy up existing public transit systems ... we can help them buy new transit equipment ... but we really can't help keep old systems in operation with up-to-date service.

Despite the Federal government's capital grant program, many mass transit operations have continued their vicious cycle of decreasing ridership, increasing fares, and deteriorating services. Clearly, it does little good for us to help urban areas purchase shiny new buses if those buses ply the streetcar routes set down in the 1920's when -- during the intervening half century -- the people and their jobs have moved to 1970 locations.

What is needed is a systematic and flexible approach to transit today to make it relevant to the land use patterns of the present, and to the desired patterns of the future.

In addition, we must stress the fact that a transit system is -- in most cities -- a positive good in spite of deficits or its operating costs. Our calculations must consider transit's social and environmental benefits as compared to those of automobiles.

We must recognize that highways are for people -- not vehicles -- and develop fringe parking lots, bus lanes, busways and other policies which will make it possible for the highway to serve the greatest number with the greatest efficiency -- whatever the transportation mode.

We must think boldly - yet wisely - if we are to receive our transportation systems to make them compatible with the needs and desires of the people in America today.

I do predict, however, that the Federal government's role will begin to shift away from the detailed review of local projects to one of measuring performance as a condition of Federal funding. This will put the burden of proof on you at the local level.

Following on this thought, let me say that I feel very strongly that the very fact that our states and urban areas across the nation are not alike in terms of their needs and objectives should lend great support to President Nixon's idea of revenue sharing. I am deeply committed to this principle to assure local and state governments the flexibility they so desperately need to get their houses in order, and do the job they were elected to do.

In my judgement, President Nixon's revenue sharing will give our communities a much-needed lift. That revenue sharing will re-invigorate the American spirit and restore confidence in government ... at all levels. I believe that revenue sharing is a revolutionary advance that we should all stand up and fight for.

TAD-493

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

56-DOT-71

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION HERBERT F. DE SIMONE TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE GREATER NEW ORLEANS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ROOSEVELT HOTEL, NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA, DECEMBER 13, 1971.

I'm just delighted to be here with you in your very beautiful and historic city of New Orleans. You are obviously proud to live here and work hard at contributing to your community. This spirit of community betterment in the New Orleans area to fight problems at home where they are most understood is greatly admired not only in the Department of Transportation, but throughout Washington. Without a doubt, the New Orleans area has an unusually high degree of citizen participation and this, in my judgement, is the key to good growth.

This very spirit of yours emphasizes, I think, the need in our country today to develop a better America in the framework of new priorities. . . priorities which favor broad goals such as better urban life, rather than narrow goals that are single project oriented.

And, really, there is nowhere in the country today where this attitude is more prevalent than right here in New Orleans.

Frankly, that's why I'm pleased to be here with you tonight. My own background is first in State and local government. I have I believe an understanding of local problems. . . and I must admire the way you are attacking your transportation and planning problems here in New Orleans. . . and with organizations such as your fine Chamber helping in the effort.

Sometimes, I'm sorry to admit, we in Washington get lost in the Federal Superstructure and lose sight of the fact that the people in State and local government -- really know what's the best solution to their problems.

The States and urban areas across the nation aren't alike in terms of their needs and objectives. We must face up to this fact and I believe President Nixon is doing just that with his flexible, innovative program of Revenue Sharing.

He, like you, realizes that the problems of Louisiana are different from say those of my home State of Rhode Island. The same holds true of cities. Philadelphia's diverse needs bear little or no relation to those of New Orleans.

Not only will revenue sharing loosen and provide more money for localities to spend as they see fit, but I believe it also will generate more zest, confidence and energy among local participants to achieve results.

The President, with this proposal has provided a new concept of what the Federal role should be -- that Federal dollars should flow to the States and cities so that they can determine their own needs and priorities and then spend Federal monies where they choose. In short, we in Washington should develop policy of national scope and fund <u>local solutions</u> to local problems.

Look at what's happening. We've been spending more and more money in our cities in the past decade. In fact, the number of categorical grant programs increased during the sixties from 44 to 480. And I think we can all agree at this stage of the game that we must have a new approach, that the old approach simply hasn't worked. . that it's time for new management of all this money - and by new management I mean local management, not Federal management. We cant' have our cities strung up like marionettes by Federal puppetteers.

Yes, I'm deeply committed to the principal of revenue sharing -- to assure local and State governments the flexibility they so desperately need to get their houses in order, and do the job they were elected to do.

You may be curious about how much money Louisiana and the New Orleans area would receive under revenue sharing. I think you would be pleasantly surprised. First, I should state in a very general way the principles on which revenue sharing will be based. With general revenue sharing - and this is five billion dollars that will be turned over to the States - a State's share is based on its population. Louisiana would receive somewhat more than $101 million dollars. Of this nearly a third would pass through directly to local governments. The city of New Orleans, for example, would receive almost $10 million dollars. I think its most important that we all understand that this is new money - fresh money - that the Federal Government under revenue sharing will turn over to the State of Louisiana and to its cities to help solve their problems as <u>they</u> best see fit.

There is another kind of revenue sharing - called special revenue sharing. It will replace current categorical grants in six special areas: education, manpower, law enforcement, rural community development, urban community development and, of course transportation. In each of these areas, each State will receive as much or more money as it now does or is entitled to under the existing grant system. And, very importantly I might add, free of red tape.

Under the proposed transportation special revenue sharing, for example, there will be a transportation fund amounting to more than 2 and a half billion dollars a year allocated to State and local governments -- or regional authorities - for transportation projects of their own choosing.

Of this total fund, Louisiana will receive almost $36 million dollars and the New Orleans Metropolitan area will receive just over

$7 million dollars. For all our States and cities it would mean an end to red tape involved in the grant application process and a guarantee of Federal dollars with no matching requirement.

In my judgement, the President's program of revenue sharing will give our communities a much needed lift. It will re-invigorate the American spirit and restore confidence in government. . . at all levels. I believe that revenue sharing is a revolutionary advance that all Americans should stand up and fight for.

Only in this way can we concentrate on keeping, or making our cities lively and pleasant. We have to bring our cities back to life - we have to recycle them.

And as I said earlier, I believe this spirit can be seen right here in New Orleans. And frankly, I'm excited because of my urban responsibilities at what is being developed here. Through the Governor's leadership, a framework and organizational structure is being established for the New Orleans Metropolitan area to undertake a comprehensive, multimodal planning study which will address not only all the transportation alternatives for this area but will study as well the social, economic and environmental impacts.

We in the Department believe that only through this kind of study can we have orderly community growth and development with a transportation system that fulfills transportation needs as well as community goals and objectives.

I am delighted to tell you tonight -- on behalf of Secretary Volpe -- that the Department of Transportation will participate in funding this program and in providing professional expertise to help accomplish your objectives -- a sound, efficient and balanced transportation system for New Orleans.

Yes, there is a new spirit in government. But in a way, it's a return to the days where everyone pulled together to build communities from the land. And I think this is great.

Government, in all candor, is getting out of hand -- it's losing basic flexibility. We are growing so big that, since 1950, government has developed it's own kind of traffic jams as it spiraled to incomprehensible proportions.

Let me cite just a few examples:

- The budget has risen from $42 billion dollars to $229 billion
- Federal employees have grown from 2 million to almost 3 million
- Cabinet Departments have increased from 9 to 12
- Independent agencies have jumped from 27 to 41
- Domestic programs have increased over ten fold to almost 1,400
- 9 agencies are concerned with drup problems, 4 departments and 4 agencies handle community development projects

...and I'm sure you can offer other examples.

From the local perspective, I think this situation is even worse.

Our States and cities must conform their priorities to those of the bureaucracy that has been created at the Federal level. They must organize their governments according to criteria which this bureaucracy has laid down.

They must live with uncoordinated action at the Federal level. They must live with conflicting Federally-sponsored projects competing with the same piece of land locally or for the same local dollar.

This is why The President has proposed the re-organization of the Federal Government. He wants government to be more efficient, to be more responsive to the people.

The President, like you and I, is tired of the tremendous duplication of effort in Washington where it takes 10 cents of every tax dollar just to spend that tax dollar.

A major problem with our current situation is that our domestic departments are organized around particular constituencies. Often, several agencies are working on the same problem at the same time. But, under the re-organization program, you'll find, for example, a Department of Community Development under which you'll have similar elements of the Departments of Transportation, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development working together.

Simply speaking, this means that at the same time that housing for the elderly is built there will be proper transportation for them. This means that when people are relocated because of highway construction, the very same agency will provide adequate housing.

In sum, the tools needed to solve urban problems will be found in one department.

In his State of the Union Address early this year, President Nixon said. . ."If we put more power in more places, we can make government more creative in more places." This is one of his goals for a greater America and government reorganization epitomizes this statement.

I think we can all understand this. The proposed new departments of Community Development, Economic Affairs, Human Resources and Natural Resources will put an end to conflicts among departments, prevent duplication of effort, stop overlapping, save money and talent and time. I believe as we - all of us - search for ways to solve the old and the new problems of the 70's we must have a new streamlined government. In my judgement, revenue sharing and government reorganization are important steps forward in helping to make a better America.

###