STATEMENT OF GORDON M. MURRAY
SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
BEFORE THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA
2:30 p.m.
April 18, 1967

With great pleasure I bring the greetings of the Secretary of Transportation to the Second International Conference on Urban Transportation. Secretary Boyd sends his cordial good wishes for the success of the conference. President Johnson also has been thinking about urban transportation problems and, I am sure, would endorse the purposes of this conference and wish it well. On April 1 when he signed the Executive Order inaugurating the Department of Transportation, the President expressed grave concern about the state of transportation in our cities. "Traffic clogs the streets of our cities . . .", he noted. . . . "Congestion, inconvenience, costly delays, death and suffering . . . demonstrate the urgent need for action." The President reaffirmed his determination . . . "to bring greater safety to the travels of all American citizens, to apply the best of an expanding technology to every mode of transportation, /and/ to strengthen our partnership with private enterprise and State and local governments in meeting America's urgent transportation needs."

Scarcely two weeks ago the Department of Transportation formally opened for business. You are undoubtedly aware that planning for the actions necessary to bring about the inauguration of the Department of Transportation began long before that date. Well before final

passage of the Department of Transportation Act, under the leadership of then-Under Secretary for Transportation, Alan Boyd, teams of specialists in many fields of endeavor began to fill in details of the complex organizational structure and to set the equally complex schedules for coordinating the hundreds of separate actions necessary to bring the Department into being. These tasks will not be brought completely to fruition for some considerable time.

Nevertheless, a good beginning has been made. The Herculean task of drawing together nearly 100,000 government employees into a well integrated operating organization is under way. These employees embody countless skills and many years of highly specialized experience in vigorously independent agencies, each with its own traditions, alliances and objectives. They have participated in respected, successful programs, each going its own way. The Bureau of Public Roads, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Coast Guard and the safety programs formerly attached to the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission (to name only the major components of the new Department) are well known to you and need no praise from me. The essential activities of these agencies must be continued without impairment. At the same time, the constituent agencies must be formed into a single cohesive department of government with unified purposes and policies. New loyalties, new traditions and a new esprit de corps must be superimposed on the old without destroying the best of the past. This difficult task will continue to command attention in the months ahead. We must, therefore, beg your indulgence if

we seem to move slowly on matters of policy reform, on bold new technological research and development or on further program adjustments.

The Department of Transportation will not, however, spare effort in two major problem areas. These problems will not bear postponement. The first is the preservation and enhancement of safety in all modes of transportation; the second is the reduction of congestion in urban places. The President has declared repeatedly and with increasing emphasis that we must improve the quality of urban life. That is the central message of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. To increase safety and to enhance the convenience and amenities of urban transportation would appear to be singularly worthy contributions to the improvement of the quality of urban life. Within reasonable limits, transportation can either facilitate urban living and add to its amenities or, failing, make urban living an even grimmer contest of endurance than it is already for so many in so many places. A life of noisy desperation -- if we may bring Thoreau up to date.

How, then, does the Department intend to meet its responsibilities in the realm of urban transportation? The Act establishing the Department lays upon the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development a precise and concrete assignment. Within one year from the effective date of the Act, the Secretaries must report jointly to the President and the Congress, "how Federal policies and programs can assure that

urban transportation systems most effectively serve (1) national transportation needs, and (2) the comprehensively planned development of urban areas . . ."

The two Secretaries are further required to consult and exchange information regarding their respective transportation policies and activities on a continuing basis, to coordinate assistance for local transportation projects and to carry on joint planning, research and other activities. They must report annually to the President and the Congress on their efforts and results.

The Act also requires the two Secretaries to study and report to the President and the Congress within one year "on the logical and efficient organization and location of urban mass transportation functions in the Executive Branch." The legislative history of the Act makes it clear that the Congress wishes to give further serious consideration to the appropriate organizational arrangements within the Federal Government for the provision of aids to urban mass transportation systems and to make further organizational changes if necessary to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal programs.

I can report that Secretaries Boyd and Weaver have already initiated efforts to comply with these requirements of the law. The White House is watching their efforts with the keenest interest. During the next 10 months substantial resources in both Departments will be devoted to fulfilling in a creditable manner the responsibilities laid down by the Act. The controlling motivation of both parties in the joint study is to assure that urban transportation services, insofar as Federal aids can affect them, make the maximum constructive contributions to both the national transportation system and to the quality of

urban life. Any adjustments made in Federal policies, programs or organization will be made with paramount concern for the advancement of these broad economic and social objectives.

I should like to return now to the specific requirements of the law. First, I think it significant that the Congress recognized the impact of urban transportation systems on the transportation needs of the Nation. The two are not really separable. Manufacturing most of the Nation's goods, dominating its trade and finance, and sheltering an increasingly large majority of its people, urban places depend upon urban transportation systems in closest nexus with the transportation systems of their region and the Nation. The economic and, to a considerable extent, the social activities of our cities bind them to the Nation. Conversely, our national economy is largely dependent upon the speed, efficiency and economy with which unified transport enables it to enjoy the patronage, draw upon the skills, and exchange goods with urban people. In short, the "interface" -- an "in-word" that I use with exultation -- of urban and national transportation systems must obviously be given the closest and most careful attention.

Equally important in the law and in fact, are the problems arising from the relationships between urban transportation and the structure and size of urban communities, their development and redevelopment. It would not appear profitable to spend much time deciding whether, in the framework of a completely free economy, urban transportation systems are primarily the cause or primarily the result of the size and structure of urban places. A more useful question would seem to be whether we wish to use transportation as

one of several instruments that can further community development in the ways desired by local citizens or to allow transportation, operating independently or even blindly, to frustrate desired lines of development, or worse, to provoke or aggravate development that is clearly not desired. In this case, bad planning is worse than no planning.

In any event, the view of the Department of Transportation is that transport services must be subordinate. They are means, not ends. They must be truly servants, not the masters. Yet often in the real world the reverse has seemed to be true. Perhaps this is because, as John Dyckman has suggested, transportation planning has been left so largely to individuals who take advantage in a quite rational way of individual opportunities. These rational individual decisions, nevertheless, add up to collective chaos. Dyckman suggests that "if major changes are to be achieved in the present condition of transportation, deliberate individual and collective decisions on the whole question of the quality of urban life must first be made." If this view is correct it contains a principle of the highest importance for planning and decision-making. (It should not be necessary for me to say here that I mean <u>local</u> planning and <u>local</u> decision-making <u>not</u> Federal planning and Federal decision-making.)

I will risk going somewhat further, perhaps challenging a cherished American belief that "Bigger is Always Better." I will ask whether the primal decision for the community is not one concerning optimum size; a decision that may deliberately limit the size of many communities. How big do we want our cities to be? Clearly the answer need not be the same for every city. Opportunities as

well as ambitions differ. Still, I am probing the idea of an absolute limit. Recognizing the danger of reasoning by analogy, I shall quote from a great Twentieth Century biologist, D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson who said in 1913,

> "Every where nature works true to scale and everything has its proper size accordingly. Men and trees, birds and fishes, stars and star-systems, have their appropriate dimensions, and their more or less narrow range of absolute magnitudes. The scale of human observation and experience lies within the narrow bounds of inches, feet or miles, all measured in terms drawn from our own selves or our own doings. . . . in quadrupeds a large head must be supported on a neck which is either excessively thick and strong like a bull's or very short line an elephant's . . . nor can nature grow a tree nor construct an animal beyond a certain size . . . The thing will fall to pieces of its own weight unless we either change its relative proportions, which will at length cause it to become clumsy, monstrous and inefficient, or else we must find new material, harder and stronger than was used before."

If we can agree that the essential ingredient of cities is the human processes that go on in them, then Thompson's essential material in our context is the human beings who create and are affected by the processes of the city. I do not see that we have changed this basic material very much. I am asking, therefore, whether there is an optimum, perhaps even an absolute limit in terms of human scale for a successful city. I note with some concern that the largest city in

the United States is nearly 4,000 times as large, people-wise, as the smallest range of urban places.

Having made key decisions about the size of their city, the local citizens and their advisers must, of course, go on to answer questions of structure and other characteristics that determine the quality of city life and to the development of statements of goals and means as well as plans for implementation. It is at this stage, and only at this stage, if this view is correct, that plans and decisions can be made with confidence as to the kinds and amounts of urban transportation services that will contribute effectively to the desired results in terms of general community development.

In any case, the required decisions are not easy, and the ways to realize them are no less difficult. Shaping Federal policy, Federal programs and Federal organization is no exception. We believe that casual answers to basic questions of urban transportation policy, programs and organization are not likely to gain general assent and even less likely to produce effective Federal assistance to local planning, decision-making and development processes.

Within the limits of the time allowed for their joint study, therefore, it is the intention of the two Departments to look at each urban transportation function now performed or assisted by the Federal Government; to identify functional gaps, conflicts and duplications, if any, in on-going activities; to relate functions on a logical and sequential basis; and on this groundwork, to develop best solutions for the consideration of the President and the Congress early next year. We believe that Louis Sullivan's aphorism on architecture is of sound application in the field of public organization

and activity: Form follows Function. With consistent policies, and functions related sequentially and logically, we can allow Federal organizational arrangements to fall in as this substantive analysis dictates.

In closing, I should like to suggest that the processes of planning and decision-making are improving. The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 provides a framework and tools by which, if they are wisely employed, this progress can be accelerated. It seems to me that the philosophy as well as the methodology of planning will continue for some time in a state of evolutionary change. Planners are not quite so sure as they once seemed to be that long-range planning is the essence. They talk more of continuous planning, and they see greater need that planning be comprehensive in more than a geographical sense. They talk of incremental decision-making which leaves options open and allows maximum freedom for revision of plans as time goes on. They think less in terms of maps and statistical projections of "need", whatever that is, and more in terms of carefully defined problems, statements of objectives and establishment of priorities and resource allocation. All of this seems constructive and rather exciting.

Paralleling these changes, and also all to the good, is a new ferment of interest in governmental structure, particularly at the State and local levels. To plan and decide continuously and comprehensively, we need more effective local government. The idea of councils of governments seems to be taking hold as a viable method of crossing jurisdictional lines without surrendering completely

the benefits of local autonomy. Metropolitan government and special purpose authorities represent other alternatives that each locality should consider and adopt in accordance with its own needs and wishes. In the long run, these changes should help our cities to use their resources wisely, to call forth and to reap the benefits of new technologies that are badly needed in some segments of urban transportation, and finally to make cities more like what they could and should be rather than what they are.