



DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

NEWS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

9-DOT-72

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
HERBERT F. DeSIMONE TO THE METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING
COUNCIL, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, JANUARY 28, 1972.

It's a pleasure to have this opportunity to speak on metropolitan issues that are of mutual concern to the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. We all agree, I'm sure, that our perception of urban areas is changing rapidly. I think that our perceptions are beginning to line up with reality. Secretary Romney, whose phrase, the "real city" gives this Conference its title, would, I believe, agree with this. There is simply no way to separate the various components of the urban area and to deal with them separately. Housing, transportation, employment, public safety -- these things must be considered together.



U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORTATION EXPOSITION
DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT * MAY 27-JUNE 4, 1972

The same is true of the various towns and cities that make up a metropolitan area. Let's admit it, there aren't any walls at city limits. And contiguous local jurisdictions must begin to regard themselves as one. Geographically, they are one. The real city is a complex of things that require the benefit of large scale planning, thinking, and action.

We must develop an acceptance of responsibility by those who live off the amenities of the city. All the facilities and people that comprise a metropolitan area -- workers, homes, transit, parks, theaters, sports arenas -- demand a metropolitan approach. The benefits are shared, so the costs must be shared too.

I have been asking myself how we arrived at our new perceptions of metropolitan America. I have come to three conclusions which I would like to discuss with you today. And then I will talk about the action we're taking as a result of our changed perception.

First, I think we owe our changing perceptions to an improved understanding of the environment -- the natural environment and the human environment -- the physical environment and the social environment, if you will. Some of the things we're doing today really would have surprised us a few years ago. For example, I think we've decreased our emphasis on cost effectiveness and cost benefit and we've begun placing heavy emphasis on environmental impacts. We are really focusing our attention more on human values now than on dollar values, and this is progress.

Another change I would cite is the shift, especially in the Federal Government, away from programs and toward goals. Innovation for years in the Federal Government meant more and more programs. During the 1960's, for example, the number of categorical grant programs rose from 44 to 480.

Now we are recognizing a need to simplify things. We do not need more programs. We need better management of existing programs. We need better coordination.

When I speak of coordination, I don't just mean in metropolitan areas. We have to shape up in the Federal Government as well. Sometimes, for example, you must live with highways that weren't integrated with urban renewal programs because two separate Federal agencies couldn't

get together. Or that you must live with conflicting Federally-sponsored projects competing for the same piece of land locally or for the same local dollar.

This is why President Nixon has developed a government reorganization program to make the Federal superstructures more efficient...and more responsive to people. He wants people to be able to locate and work with government agencies on a more reasonable and sensible basis than we have today -- in short, with better coordination.

There is also another trend which has forced a change in our perceptions -- and this may be the most important of all. Our cities and towns -- our population, really -- have moved into a metropolitan configuration which requires larger scale planning and decision-making than our cities can provide. At the same time, the state legislatures, whose compositions have changed since the Supreme Court edict of one-man, one-vote, really show the effects of redistricting. They are now reflecting the urban configuration of the population. The governors and state legislatures alike are showing new concerns for urban affairs, for the real city, for areawide solutions to areawide problems. In many states, including Massachusetts, I'm happy to say, there has been state action on behalf of metropolitan areas.

Here in Massachusetts, Governor Sargent intervened in a growing community controversy over a 20-year old highway plan for the Boston area, and he ordered a task force to review the plan. Their report convinced the Governor to restudy thoroughly the planning for the area's urban transportation system. Now, of course, we are eleven months into this eighteen month restudy -- funded mostly by innovative pooling of \$3.5 million in Federal money for planning highways, transit, and airports and characterized by a high degree of citizen involvement. The restudy will produce not only a transportation plan for the Boston area, but also recommendations for new or strengthened permanent metropolitan institutions to handle metropolitan planning decisions.

In other words, we are seeing a major problem-solving effort, which may well have as a by-product some institution building -- and a metropolitan scale institution at that. The Massachusetts Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Boston Transportation Authority are both providing staff for the study. This assures that any new

plans and institutions will be practical. This is bound to be better than letting the Federal Government prescribe the style and relative power of State or metropolitan planning bodies.

In the Department of Transportation we feel that by offering coordinated planning assistance -- such as we have done for the Boston and the New Orleans areas -- we are best able to contribute to the future of the real city.

Today we really stand at the crossroads on the issues of the environment and of metropolitan life. We have come to this crossroads with radically altered perspectives. Earlier, I cited the environment, the population shift, and the newly recognized need for better goals and management as reasons for the shift in our perception of the real city. There is also another reason -- we have been through a period of confrontation on the construction of major public facilities. Conflicts over highways, airports, housing and urban renewal have all pointed up the need for reforming the way we make decisions in urban areas.

The Boston Transportation Planning Review, I believe, is distinguished by two things: First, it is a forum for Boston area citizens, and it is also a forum which is sensitive to the area's environment. It brings together citizens and technicians for a two-way flow of information. I think it is fair to say that all decisions of metropolitan impact should be made with informed citizens and technicians of many disciplines. The future success of urban America will rest on sophisticated planning of the type we are now seeing in Boston.

I believe it goes without saying that, in the past, we have not dealt well with this idea of planning on a metropolitan scale. We have, for the sake of convenience and presumed efficiency, fragmented this 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 on a roadway, enlarge it. The fact is, this has been most inefficient -- because without control of land use and development, facilities grow obsolete.

We are, thank goodness, 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. And 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. But, 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 some 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 insure implementation.

But right now, the basic problem facing us is that the planner may come up with a beautiful metropolitan transportation plan or a metropolitan recreation plan; but, unfortunately, 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 jurisdictions 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 is, then, 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 within 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, employment, public safety and recreation.

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.

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 a given city if airport development would benefit the citizens in that area 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 President Nixon'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, and we can help them buy new transit equipment. And I'm pleased to note that President Nixon, in his budget announced this week, requested that \$1 billion be allocated for public mass transit for Fiscal Year 1973, a 40% increase over current expenditures.

But, despite our capital grant program, we really cannot help keep old systems in operation with up-to-date service. Many mass transit operations throughout the country 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-of-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, exclusive bus lanes, busways and other programs 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 today 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 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 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

11-DOT-72

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
HERBERT F. DeSIMONE BEFORE THE GARDEN CLUB OF AMERICA'S
CONFERENCE ON OUTDOOR ADVERTISING, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8,
1972, IN WASHINGTON, DC.

I believe I should begin by re-emphasizing what Secretary Volpe said about the importance of people in achieving a quality environment. I am quite impressed with the concerns of your group, as you are among the leadership in our country in the fight to preserve our environment.

I know that your concerns -- like mine and that of my office -- encompass a broad range of subjects -- air, noise, water, zoning, wetlands and historic areas. But nothing is more symbolic than the very foundation of your organization: the garden.

We are all aware of how difficult it is for us to learn to live in balance with our environment. Frankly, all too many times we have -- out of ignorance -- destroyed what the good Lord has given us. A garden, I believe, is symbolic of this all-too-rare ability to live in balance with nature and the environment. A person who has planned and maintained a garden has learned to co-exist with -- not destroy -- the world around us. If there is one perfect example of a person's ability to improve their quality of life, it is the garden. From this simplicity of the garden, a strong voice for the enhancement of our environment has grown. As conservationists, you have awakened government and industry to pay attention to the long-ignored environmental issues. It has become evident that the future depends on the policies we adopt now. Let's face it, we are changing our relationship to our planet. Historically, we have taken what we wanted, using what we needed or what we would sell. Now our choices are being challenged -- and just in the nick of time.

What we do upstream affects the river mouth; what we mine from the side of the mountain may alter the living pattern elsewhere. We have to think in terms of waste products and consequences; we must think of food chains, of breeding grounds for birds, of drinking water for ourselves and those to follow, of beaches and parks -- just to name a few.

All of you here today have come to realize the importance of making peace with the environment, as we in the Department of Transportation have come to realize that the quality of life for all Americans must be preserved and improved.

The country obviously is becoming more and more concerned. In this environmental age -- so to speak -- we must be concerned with our stewardship over the Earth. You, of course, demonstrate this sensitivity today.

But, at the same time, we also believe in the free enterprise system. And there is no doubt that we enjoy the greatest freedom of any people on the face of the planet. But with this freedom comes a tremendous responsibility to regulate ourselves. I believe, and this Administration believes, that he governs best who governs least. The hard reality, however, is that when it comes to advertising along our roadsides, for example, we just don't seem right now to be able to regulate ourselves.

Yet, in a way, this is a spin-off from the competitive spirit that made our nation great. If I were a businessman advertising by means of one

sign at each end of town, my competitor probably would want to put up two, three, four or whatever number of signs it would take to insure that you stopped at his business and not mine. And vice versa. As the president of A & P Corporation put it: "We know that half of the money we spend on advertising is wasted. But we don't know which half."

In outdoor advertising, I think it's time to stop this kind of pyramiding and de-escalate the billboard race. The majestic vistas along our scenic highways belong to the people, and it's high time to return them to the people.

As you know, Congress has given the Department of Transportation the 1965 Highway Beautification Act to administer. For what it intended to accomplish, it is a good act. In very simple terms, it acknowledges that outdoor advertising signs are a lawful and certainly a legitimate business enterprise and, therefore, will be allowed to exist in areas where other businesses are... in commercial and industrial areas along our Interstate and Federal Aid Primary Highway System. The Act does not allow signs in residential and rural agricultural areas any more than current zoning procedures would allow an industrial plant or other commercial enterprise.

The Highway Beautification Act also, of course, provides for the removal of signs from our rural, open countryside. We expect this sign removal program to take from four to five years with the hope of having it substantially completed by the end of 1976, our nation's bi-centennial year.

Congress has supported this program by authorizing \$97 million for sign removal for fiscal years '71, '72 and '73. Thus far, some \$14 million has been made available to many of those states now in full compliance with the law. And I am happy to say that we are planning a \$75 million Highway Beautification Program for fiscal '73 with the bulk of the monies being programmed for sign removal.

Obviously, we seek your support and influence for this sign removal program. We in government can only accomplish our task and expedite sign removal if we have the cooperation of the states, garden clubs, roadside councils and other interested groups. I'm delighted with the kind of cooperation we've received thus far, as some 28,000 signs have already been removed through the efforts of government, private industry and interested citizens like yourselves.

The 1970 Federal-Aid Highway Act also created a Study Commission on Highway Beautification to examine the existing billboard law and the problem of outdoor advertising signs, both on and off premises which are not covered by the existing statute. They are to make their report to Congress by August 10 of this year. As you know, Mrs. Marion Fuller Brown, your meeting chairman today, is a member of this Commission. We have no way of predicting what their recommendation to Congress will be, but I would hope that the Act will be strengthened rather than modified or weakened.

Good progress, I should add, has already been made toward the implementation of the Beautification Act. Thirty-nine states have satisfactory statutes, and thirty-four have signed the required agreement regarding size, lighting, spacing and definition of an unzoned commercial or industrial area. This compares to only fourteen states in full compliance and eligible for Federal funds when President Nixon took office. This success has been due, in large part, to the very firm position taken by the Department of Transportation regarding implementation of the Act.

There are, I'm sorry to say, some thirteen states which even now have not complied with the will of Congress and requirements of our Department. I'm going to list these states and urge citizens of these states to inquire of your local officials why they are not acting to improve scenic vistas along your highways. The states which do not yet have acceptable statutes are Alabama, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas and Wisconsin.

Our responsibilities under the Act are not all negative -- not by a long shot. We recognize that if you take something away which is filling a need, you must replace it with something to fill the void. In implementing the Highway Beautification Act, one of the more important aspects of the Administration's program is the encouragement of tourist information centers.

Many such facilities are now in operation, both publicly and privately owned, and countless others are under construction or are in the planning stages. We believe the answer to informing the traveling public is a combination of information centers and tourist guides and aids made available at a variety of points as gas stations, restaurants, hotels and motels. Quite frankly, I believe it is an insult to the intelligence of the American public to say that the only way they can find a place to eat or sleep is by the use of a myriad of signs clustered along our rural landscape.

I would like to conclude my remarks as I opened...by emphasizing the importance of citizens in achieving a quality environment. No program, no matter how carefully planned or executed, can succeed without the aid of concerned citizens as yourselves.

Our government relies on the sensitivity of Americans and their willingness to tell government when there is a problem that is not being solved or when there is a solution which could be improved. All of you are these kind of people. I urge you to continue and build upon your interest in saving our environment...whether it be in the enhancement of our scenic vistas or cleaning our air. We need your help.

18902

550

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

STATEMENT OF HERBERT F. DeSIMONE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN SYSTEMS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE THE SELECT SUB-COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965, MARCH 22, 1972.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

It is indeed a pleasure to appear before you today to discuss the proposed amendments to the Older Americans Act, particularly those which relate to the provision of more efficient, effective, and less costly transportation services for the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, Americans regard mobility as one of our basic rights. We live in an era of shopping centers, hospital complexes and recreational areas. Few of us today still live in small neighborhoods where doctors, grocery stores, churches and friends are all within walking distance of each other. The things we need for daily living are spread out and public transportation no longer ties together the people and the services they require.

Most people, obviously, compensate for this change in our way of life by owning an auto and driving from place to place. In many respects, I believe this discriminates against our elderly.

Let's face facts. Only 45 percent of our older Americans are licensed to drive automobiles; yet, many of these in fact do not because of finances, safety or health. As we all know, small communities often do not have bus service or even taxis in American today. Even when these are available, the fares can be staggering to our elderly who live on fixed incomes--so staggering that transportation has become their third largest expense. Only food and housing rank higher.

As a result, many older Americans lead lonesome lives and often neglect their health because they have no way to get to their friends or to their doctors when they are sick.

I believe we must create a society where the elderly must have the same opportunity as other persons to utilize public facilities and services and to participate fully in the life of the community.

This problem is particularly complex because the elderly are not an identifiable minority confined within specific geographic areas. The more than 20 million Americans over 65 years are interspersed, often unrecognized, throughout the general populace. They are as varied and selective in their individual wants and desires as any other segment of our population.

The Department of Transportation is conscious of the mobility problems of our older Americans. I am here today to pledge our continued commitment to develop ways to make public transportation systems serve the means and needs of the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I wish to provide the Committee a few examples of our current programs to improve transportation services for the elderly and the handicapped.

The Department is currently conducting a study of Metropolitan Washington's transportation system to determine its accessibility to the elderly and handicapped. The study, scheduled to be completed in June of this year, will produce a set of recommendations which we hope can be tested in METRO as it is being constructed.

In a Dial-A-Ride demonstration project just begun this month in Haddonfield, New Jersey, one vehicle in a fleet of 12 is specially equipped with a ramp to accommodate wheelchair loading on the vehicle. The demonstration vehicles take commuters to and from the Lindenwold line during rush hours and are utilized for local transit during off-peak time.

In the lower Naugatuck Valley in Connecticut, a suburban locale in which 10 percent of the population is aged, UMTA funding will be used in a demonstration to develop transportation services to health and medical facilities. Demonstrations will test demand-responsive and fixed-route services, as well as combinations of the two. A specially equipped dial-a-bus system will be tested and demonstrated.

Helena, Montana, capital of that State and its retirement center, has no bus system. The only transportation available for the aged is by taxicab at high cost. Accordingly, UMTA has provided a demonstration grant for a multi-modal system which will be demand-responsive and designed to fulfill the mobility needs of senior citizens. The operator of the system will be the local taxi company and if the demonstration proves successful the city will continue the operation.

The National Urban League has been awarded a four-phase study grant by the Department. Phase I is a literature search of all efforts dealing with the marketing of transit services and providing information on transit services to the elderly and handicapped. Phase II will be a nationwide demographic identification of the "transportation deprived". In Phase III, the Urban League will conduct a ten-city analysis of transit user and

non-user attitudes. In Phase IV, the result of all of the above will be the development of guidelines of proven and new transit marketing and information techniques.

In St. Petersburg, Florida, UMTA has funded a demonstration planning project which will lead to definitive design of a multi-faceted transportation demonstration project aimed at providing improved mobility for the aged. The project planning area which is comprised of census tracts have as much as 80 percent senior citizens.

In Cranston, Rhode Island, a planning grant has been awarded in order to determine the optimum system, routing and scheduling in order to link five senior citizen public housing units plus an education and training center for mentally retarded children and adults to community social service agencies, medical facilities, employment and recreational activities. When the plans are evolved it is anticipated that the city of Cranston will apply for funding to test these plans.

A demonstration grant has been awarded to Klamath Falls, Oregon, which will test the feasibility of, and develop a model for, the use of school buses for public transportation. The demonstration will serve primarily senior citizen housing complexes.

In fiscal year 1972, UMTA has funded three demonstration projects in Model Cities neighborhoods in Grand Rapids, Michigan; Des Moines, Iowa; and Los Angeles, California. These projects are primarily oriented toward testing the economic feasibility of providing mass transit for inner city circulation. They offer transit services from the model neighborhoods

to medical facilities and social service agencies. These projects directly serve the elderly as a large proportion of the population of inner city residents are over 65.

The Department believes, however, that the solution to this problem does not lie entirely in developing separate facilities for the elderly and handicapped, but in making all transportation facilities available to them. Section 16 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 seeks to deal with this problem by requiring that localities give special consideration to actions designed to meet the needs of the elderly and handicapped when planning and designing federally assisted urban mass transportation facilities and equipment. The Department has taken the position that no capital grant or technical study project may be approved under the act until the applicant has demonstrated that this requirement has been complied with. Let me just give you an example of what we are doing in this regard. UMTA has on its staff transportation specialists with responsibility for providing assistance and advice in the development and application of architectural standards relating to facilities for the elderly and handicapped. They assist in reviewing applications for capital grants to assure the adequacy of proposed facilities designed for the elderly and the handicapped. Finally, they advise cities that apply for Federal funds on architectural solutions to design problems that will ensure ready use by the elderly and handicapped.

UMTA is not the only administration within our Department sensitive to this problem, however. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

and the Federal Highway Administration supervise a Pedestrian Safety Program. One of the specific objectives of this program is to define special problems associated with elderly pedestrians. Our statistics indicate that pedestrians account for approximately 18 percent of the Nation's annual traffic deaths (last year 55,000 total deaths). Of the pedestrian deaths, a disproportionate 25 percent is accounted for by older persons over 65. Consequently, the Department has a research program under way to determine the causes of pedestrian fatalities and to develop countermeasures for accident avoidance and injury reduction taking into consideration the characteristics of victims. We are very hopeful that the results of this program will have particular benefit to the elderly.

Another modal administration of the Department that is taking into account the problems of the elderly is the Federal Aviation Administration. They have been considering the portal-to-portal needs of the elderly and the handicapped. These include terminal accommodations as well as those for enplaning, enroute comfort, and deplaning. At many large airports, the level "jet ways" which extend from the terminal to the aircraft have made things a lot easier for the elderly and handicapped traveler.

Since airport terminal buildings are not funded under the Airport Development Program, the FAA is not directly involved in their construction. They do, however, issue guidance material for the use of architects and engineers in the design of terminal buildings. Likewise, in regard to the enplaning, enroute comfort, and deplaning accommodations, they suggest means of making air travel more comfortable for the handicapped and have found

that the industry shares their concern. In this regard, on November 27, 1968, the FAA issued an Advisory Circular entitled "Airport Terminals and the Physically Handicapped". This circular, which deals with suggestions for aiding the elderly and handicapped traveler, has been very well received.

In addition to the foregoing programs, we are also investigating the financial burden of full transit fares on older persons in an effort to determine how this burden may be offset.

As you are aware, recent legislation guarantees that all persons, including the elderly, who are displaced by transportation projects are provided with adequate compensation to pay for their relocation. This expanded authority means the Government will pick up the tab for more of the actual costs of transportation projects, costs which were previously borne by individuals.

On the basis of the best evidence available, the Department of Transportation believes that an accurate estimate of the proportion of expenditures for relocation assistance to elderly persons as a result of highway construction would be in the range of 25 to 30 percent. Our review of studies in Massachusetts, Ohio, Tennessee and Texas supports this estimate. In one relocation study in Chicopee, Massachusetts, nearly 18 percent of the displacees were retirees. In a study of 730 displaced households in Cleveland, Ohio, the median age of the head of household was almost 52 years. In Tennessee, among 102 families displaced almost 39 percent of the adult males and females displaced were 60 or more years of age. In the Texas study the average age of the displaced household head was 60.

When one examines the conduct of relocation advisory services in light of the intense, highly-individualized, direct counseling relationship between the displacee and the relocation specialist, the added value of the process to elderly persons is seen. More so than other age groups, the elderly may require more detailed interpretations of their entitlements, assistance in selecting replacement housing and consultation with respect to mortgage, leasing or rental provisions.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12017 and H.R. 13925, the Administration bill which would amend the Older Americans Act, both represent efforts to deal with the problems associated with growing old in this society--to get at the "core" problems facing the elderly in their attempts to live fruitful, wholesome lives. However, though the Department applauds the objectives of both bills, we strongly recommend enactment of H.R. 13925 in lieu of H.R. 12017. We believe H.R. 13925 provides the appropriate method to attain these worthy and necessary objectives. H.R. 12017 would give the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare the authority to develop and implement, at the Federal level, a special impact program which would be specifically designed to meet the specific transportation needs of senior citizens. As I have explained this morning, the Department of Transportation already supports a variety of demonstration programs which are designed to meet the transportation needs of senior citizens. We are concerned that enactment of H.R. 12017 would lead to duplication of efforts and the resultant wasting of vital resources.

On the other hand, the Administration's proposal would strengthen State and Area Planning Agencies and make it possible for them to develop comprehensive solutions to the problems of the elderly. It emphasizes local planning to develop full utilization of existing programs. This Administration believes that Federal funds should be available for use by State and local areas on projects and priorities as determined by those areas. We believe this a far more preferable approach than a fragmented attack on these problems.

At the State and community level the problems of elderly citizens are more visible and perhaps even better understood. State Planning Agencies would be in a much better position to obtain from local communities their particular needs and to allocate resources in a manner that would maximize their usefulness in meeting those more accurately defined needs. There are already in existence within the Federal system numerous programs and funding mechanisms which can be utilized to more adequately meet the specific needs of the elderly. The need now is to create a mechanism to match these existing Federal resources to the real needs of the local community.

We strongly support the interagency coordinating process as provided for in the Administration's bill. We believe it will significantly improve the ability of all levels of government to deliver more effectively a wide range of services to our senior citizens.

As to how we can accomplish coordination Departmental-wise, I can speak for the Department. Secretary Volpe has placed responsibility for

coordinating the Department's transportation activities on behalf of the elderly in my office. I have two professional persons on my staff to implement this program. These persons work with other elements within the Department to promote initiatives in this area. In addition, we have proposed the establishment of a Departmental coordinating committee composed of representatives from the various departmental elements to further coordinate and promote programs for disadvantaged groups such as the elderly and the handicapped.

Those closest to the problems should define the needs, set priorities, and actively participate in their resolution. We think it makes good sense. This same theme is part of the Department's recommendations in its Highway Needs Report recently submitted to the Congress.

Specifically contained in the 1972 Highway Needs Report, Secretary Volpe has recommended to the Congress that a Single Urban Fund be created which would be the sole source of financing federally assisted transportation projects at the local level regardless of mode. Through this program we would expect that significantly more money will be available for meeting the needs of our elderly citizens who are so dependent upon the availability of adequate public transportation. Secretary Volpe has also recommended the establishment of a Rural General Transportation Fund for capital investments outside of our urban areas. This fund will be available for funding highway or mass transit projects and can be used to serve the public transportation needs for our elderly citizens in rural areas. The projected level of authorizations for the single urban fund would be \$1 billion for

for fiscal years 1974, \$1.85 billion for fiscal year 1975, and \$2.25 billion for each of the fiscal years 1976 through 1979. The rural general transportation fund projections are \$200 million each for fiscal years 1974 and 1975, and \$400 million for each of fiscal years 1976 through 1979.

Mr. Chairman, at your request we have endeavored to keep our prepared statement brief. This, therefore, concludes my prepared statement, and I will attempt to answer any questions you may have.