DOT News

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL 1776-1976

Published Bi-weekly for the Employees of the United States Department of Transportation by the Office of the Secretary — Volume 1 Number 18

Participants in the recent minority business enterprise conference at DOT headquarters with Transportation Secretary William T. Coleman, Jr. From left: Col. Milton Carey; Delon Hampton; Mr. Coleman; Fran Womack; A. L. Nellum; and LeRoy Campbell.

Coleman Assures Minority Firms 'Piece of the Action' in DOT Jobs

More than 250 members of minority business firms and minority trade associations met at DOT headquarters in July to explore business possibilities within the Department.

Welcoming the delegates to the all-day session, Secretary of Transportation William T. Coleman, Jr., said the meeting was called "to discuss the full range of opportunities our operating administrations provide for minority businesses."

Mr. Coleman told the businessmen that the Department insisted on two provisions in its negotiations on the $1.75 billion Northeast Corridor section of the Rail Act:

- that the work be done in such a way as to assure jobs to those presently unemployed in the cities along the Northeast Corridor;
- that the contracts for Northeast Corridor work be administered by the Department rather than Amtrak to assure that the responsibilities for minority business participation are not delegated.

Citing the $6.4 billion Rail Act President Ford signed in February, Secretary Coleman said it provides exceptional opportunities for minority enterprises.

"The work that needs to be done—architectural and engineering services, rebuilding roadbeds, restoring track, renewing bridges and tunnels, repairing rolling stock, refurbishing stations—will entail thousands of new jobs, and subcontracts, and I have no intention of spending $6 billion without making sure minorities

(See MINORITIES, p. 2)

Lutz Sworn In As DOT Deputy Under Secretary

Theodore C. Lutz has been sworn in as Deputy Under Secretary of Transportation, replacing John W. Snow who became Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration last month.

Lutz has been Deputy Under Secretary of Transportation for Budget and Program Review since March 1973, and will retain these duties in his new position.

Before joining the Department in 1973, Lutz was from 1970 senior budget examiner for National Capital Area Affairs in the Office of Management and Budget. He joined the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, in 1968 as a budget examiner for the Treasury Department.

Lutz received the Secretary of Transportation's Award for Outstanding Performance in 1975 and the Secretary's Award for superior performance in 1973 and 1976. He also received the Professional Achievement Award from the Office of Management and Budget in 1972.

Lutz, a native of Philadelphia, received his bachelor of arts degree from Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., in 1967 and his master of public administration degree in 1968 from Syracuse University's Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs.

He is married to the former Willa Jean Boyd. They reside in Washington, D.C.

President Ford hands the pen he used to sign the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1976 to Secretary of Transportation William T. Coleman, Jr. The new law provides $1.1 billion a year over the next four years to assure the high quality of the nation's airports and airways.

President Signs Airport, Airway Act, Calls it a 'Pay-As-You-Fly' Program

Calling it a "pay-as-you-fly" program, President Ford signed into law the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1976. The President said the law would make possible thousands of jobs in aviation-related activities. It authorizes spending $1.1 billion a year during the next four fiscal years for airport and airways construction and maintenance.

In signing the measure, Mr. Ford said the law "will make possible the continuing modernization of our airways, airports and related facilities in communities throughout the 50 states."

The President explained that, for the first time since 1971, maintenance and air navigation systems will be funded partially out of the airport trust fund.

Highlights of the law include:

- Extension of eligibility to projects for noise suppression, land purchase, and public use terminal development.
- Simplification of the process of approving grants.

Other provisions include:

- Changes distribution formula to more closely relate funding to air passenger activity but provides minimum grants to assist small airports.
- Increases federal share to 90 percent of project cost for small airports through 1978 (80 percent for 1979 and 1980) and 75 percent for large airports throughout the life of the bill.
- Provides for four state demonstration programs designed to transfer general aviation airport grant decision making from the federal government to state elected officials.

The law allows use of trust fund revenues for field maintenance of the airway capital facilities. It continues funding of FAA facilities and equipment improvements through 1980.

The law also provides increased flexibility on determining requirements for emergency services at small airports. It also requires studies on conversion of private airports to public use, land banking for future airports, feasibility of establishing major new airports, and soundproofing of public buildings.

Auto Hotline: Now a Coast-to-Coast Hookup

The situation: you bought, or are about to buy, a used car and you want to know if it has ever been recalled by the manufacturer for correction of defects, and what kind of defect may still remain unrepaired.

No problem. A call to "Auto Safety Hotline," operated by DOT's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, will provide the answer.

By return mail the Hotline can furnish you with a recall history for any make or model car, plus the forms necessary to obtain verification and defect repairs from the car's manufacturer.

In operation as a 10-state experiment since October 1975, Hotline was expanded in July to include all states (except Hawaii and Alaska).

The Hotline can be reached, toll-free, by calling 800-424-9393 for points outside the Washington, D.C. area. The local number is 426-0123.

Trained operators are on duty from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. (EDT), Monday through Friday. During evening hours, and on weekends, a recording device tapes calls, which are responded to within hours of the following day.

Since the toll-free calls cannot be transferred, persons with complex questions are advised that their problem is being referred to a technician who will contact them by phone, generally within an hour.

Persons reporting vehicle defects to the Hotline will receive by return mail a short form on which to summarize the problem. NHTSA will then process the information through its investigative and enforcement divisions for appropriate action.

The Hotline also shares all reported defects and vehicle complaints with the car's manufacturer. NHTSA's Office of Consumer Services, which operates the Hotline, reports that while the vehicle dealer should be the owner's first and best source to remedy problems, manufacturers are often able to provide assistance when special problems are brought to their attention by the Hotline.

Quotable . . .

Transportation is a critical part of today's urban problem and it must be an integral part of its solution . . . The city that lacks mobility is a poor host, a harsh landlord. For our urban centers to survive and thrive, we must have transportation systems that circulate people in and through our cities in comfort and convenience, at affordable cost and with maximum efficiency. Try as we will, highways alone—where buses with 40 passengers must compete with the one-occupant car for the same piece of pavement—will not do the job. Clearly we must relieve the congestion caused by the clogs of cars and the bottlenecks in transportation systems random-planned and too often ill-managed.

Secretary of Transportation William T. Coleman, Jr.
Press Conference, July 21, 1976, Washington, D.C.

Charles A. Ansbacher

Ansbacher to be New White House Fellow at DOT

Charles A. Ansbacher, for the past six years conductor and music director of the Colorado Springs Symphony, Colorado Springs, Colo., will report to DOT in September for a one-year tour as a White House Fellow.

Ansbacher, 33, was one of 15 chosen from 2,864 applicants for Fellowships this year. His final selection was from a field of 30 national finalists.

These were invited to Washington for three days of additional interviews, and a final selection meeting with the President's Commission on White House Fellowships.

The commission makes its recommendations to the President, who then appoints the new group of White House Fellows.

The White House Fellow's duties are not bounded by a tightly-drawn job description—they can be best described as resembling those of special assistant to the Secretary. Assigments are many and varied.

The program was initiated in 1964 by John Gardner, who was then president of the Carnegie Foundation, and approved by President Johnson.

Ansbacher succeeds Dr. Martin C. Jischke who will return to the University of Oklahoma.

Chicago Cub baseball immortal Ernie Banks and Secretary of Transportation William T. Coleman, Jr., examine an antique passenger fare counter which the ball player presented to the Secretary during a recent visit. Mr. Banks is a member of the board of the Chicago Transit Authority.

Thomas H. Lloyd

Lloyd is Named Military Aide To Secretary

Lieutenant Commander Thomas H. Lloyd has been sworn in as the military aide to Secretary of Transportation William T. Coleman, Jr.

Mr. Lloyd had been an electronics engineering officer at Coast Guard Headquarters from August 1973 until he assumed his present duty on July 1.

A 1962 graduate of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, Lloyd's first tour of duty was aboard the tender *Buttonwood*. From 1964 to June 1965 he commanded the *Cape Small* out of Hilo, Hawaii.

Following a two-year assignment as a student at the Air Force Institute of Technology at Wright-Patterson AFB, he served as assistant chief of the electronics engineering branch of the 9th Coast Guard District, Cleveland.

From April 1968 to May 1969, he was assigned to the LORAN-D joint test force at Eglin AFB, Fla. During the following four years he served as a projects engineer at the Coast Guard Electronics Center, Wildwood, N. J.

Benjamin Demps Heads Academy At Aero Center

FAA Administrator John L. McLucas has appointed Benjamin Demps, Jr., superintendent of the FAA Academy at the Federal Aviation Administration's Aeronautical Center, Oklahoma City.

Demps will oversee training of FAA personnel in air traffic control, flight safety standards, airway facilities maintenance and airport safety and construction standards. The school averages 1,600 students in daily attendance.

A career FAA employee, the 42-year-old Demps is a graduate of the agency's executive development program. After completing the year-long program in June 1974, Demps spent a year as assistant superintendent of the FAA Academy.

A New Yorker, Demps joined the agency in 1956 as an air traffic controller trainee. After completing his academy training, he was assigned to the New York air route traffic control center where he advanced over a 16-year period through journeyman controller to team supervisor, and finally, an assistant chief's position.

Benjamin Demps, Jr.

In 1972 he was named chief of the New York common radar room and later that year was selected for the Executive Development Program.

Demps is a graduate of the State University of New York, Stoney Brook, N. Y. He is also a graduate of the Department of Transportation Executive School and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and has earned credits toward a law degree.

FHWA Develops Road Recycle Plan

The streets of America may very well be paved with gold.

A process jointly developed by DOT's Federal Highway Administration and several state highway departments, offers the possibility of recovering hundreds of millions of dollars annually by recycling worn-out asphalt pavement.

Reuse of old asphalt pavement would also substantially extend the supply of asphalt, a potentially scarce construction material because it is made of crude oil.

Using the new process an estimated 50 million tons of asphalt pavement could be recycled annually. This tonnage represents 700 million gallons of liquid asphalt, 30 million tons of crushed aggregates, and 17 million tons of sand having a market value of $300 million.

In addition are cost-savings related to production and transportation of these materials and disposal of the old pavement.

Policy—from page four

how the facilities you envision would actually develop.

For example, I think it's a national responsibility to make sure that we move toward an interstate freight railroad system.

You mean with ConRail, and so forth?

That's right. But along with ConRail and the assistance we are giving to the rest of the country's railroads, I want to have some idea as to where the system is going to end up. Therefore, I've asked the railroads to come forward with their ideas. As you've noted, there's been some talk about consolidation, which I think is necessary. We want to have an efficient system, one that makes sense for the country and enough money for the railroads to enable them to meet their capital needs without depending on tax dollars. So first we have to identify where it would make more sense for the railroads to be part of an interstate system, when they are actually regional railroads.

What about the nation's highway system?

I think we have to complete the interstate system, and I believe we are at a point where we can say, this is what it's going to look like in the rural or inter-city portions.

Once you get past this point, you then say well, what do you do with the cities? If highways aren't the answer, what do we do for urban mobility? You soon recognize that you cannot have a plan nationally, as to what you should do with cities. All you can do is prescribe alternatives. What we're trying to say is, we think that there are certain standards that you should have. For example, how much mobility should you have in the city? If we can establish or suggest those standards, then the city can determine what it will do to try to meet those standards. And I hope to be able to publish that within a year.

When I published the policy statement, I said in the preface that there's no federal official who can make national transportation policy. It has to be a decision of the people.

This would apply to the transportation plan?

Yes. I would issue it, and then I would expect comment and then I would qualify it or change it based upon those comments.

You said at one time that if you had one wish that could be granted, it would be to make things happen faster. Is that still your wish?

Sure! But in government it takes a long time to get things done. I've often said I've felt that the most significant thing that happens in life is the birth of a child and that takes nine months. So I can't understand why it takes any longer to make government decisions.

I think the people want to get things decided. And I know that sometimes you decide things in the wrong way. But by getting them decided, you can then make adjustments, and you can do what you have to do to make sure that the system works.

Minorities—from page one

get a piece of the action," Secretary Coleman said.

Mr. Coleman said the results of DOT's minority business assistance policy have been encouraging. He noted that DOT money directed to minority contractors last year increased over two and one-half times, rising from $54 million to $138 million. He said that in the highway program alone, contracts awards to minority contractors reflected a 250 percent increase of fiscal year 1975. In urban transportation, the awards increased over 500 percent.

DOT NEWS, the official employee publication of the U.S. Department of Transportation, is prepared by the Publications Division, Office of Public Affairs, DOT. Articles of general interest should be submitted directly to: The Editor, DOT NEWS, U.S. Department of Transportation (S-81), 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20590. Phone 202-426-4321. Unsolicited manuscripts, photos, or art work will not be returned unless specifically requested.

Secretary of Transportation ——— William T. Coleman, Jr.
Assistant to the Secretary and Director of Public Affairs ——— C. Ramon Greenwood
Assistant Director for Communication Programming ——— James L. Stafford
Editor ——— Frank J. Clifford

"Oil fingerprinting," a technique developed by the Coast Guard for accurately identifying oil, holds high promise of ending scenes like this polluted beach at Yorktown, Va. by making it possible to track down and prosecute clandestine oil spillers. Boy nudges turtle smothered by the oil scum.

The Telltale Mark

'Oil Fingerprints' Betray Sneak Polluters

Capt. Vassilious Kryanoos Psarroulis, master of the 825-foot-long Liberian tanker *Garbis*, got a surprise last November when he tied up at Gloucester City, N. J., a port on the Delaware River just south of Philadelphia.

Federal officers arrested him and charged him with failing to report an oil spill which involved more than 50,000 gallons of heavy crude oil along a 40-mile-long trail off Key West in July 1975. Because the area is filled with thousands of grass and mangrove-covered shoals and islands, the affected shoreline was more than 1,000 miles.

The Coast Guard alleged that the oil came from the *Garbis*, and said they had the evidence to back up their charges. Oil samples recovered from the polluted waters matched specimens taken from the tanks of the *Garbis*.

The identification was the first major use of "oil fingerprinting," a new technique developed over the past three years by the Coast Guard at its Research and Development Center at Groton, Conn.

Tracking down the *Garbis* was a nautical whodunit that required an estimated 5,000 man-hours over a four-month period during which Coast Guardsmen boarded 284 ships in widely-scattered ports throughout the U.S.

The suspect list of potential polluters was staggering. The Coast Guard estimated that the spill occurred between July 14–18. Some 400 oceangoing ships, from scores of nations, sailed the sea off the Keys during these four days.

Fingerprints Emerge

Slowly, the list of suspects was whittled down to 12, and the investigators at Groton intensified their efforts. Oil from the contaminated area was collected and analyzed, as was oil from the suspect ships. The fingerprint was emerging—and it matched the *Garbis*. A warrant was drawn up for the arrest of the skipper.

The overwhelming number of spills, which occur at the rate of about 12,000 a year, are reported at once. The causes in most cases are self-evident. A tanker runs aground and tears a hole in its hull, or is broken open by turbulent seas. Refueling hoses snap. Drilling rigs fall victim to weather, fire or explosion.

Oil fingerprinting is not for such as these. It is for the ship's master who spills deliberately and anonymously, under cover of night or fog or rain and leaves the scene.

Dumping oily wastes within 50 miles of the U.S. violates the U.S. Federal Water Pollution Act of 1972 and is a civil offense punishable by a $5,000 fine. Failure to report a spill is a criminal charge and the ship's captain can be fined up to $10,000, get up to a year in jail, and the owner of the vessel can be forced to pay for all cleanup costs.

Chemical analysis of oil is not new. Oil companies have long had the capability to analyze their oil for the things they needed to know, but this did not include "fingerprinting," says Capt. Graeme Mann, commanding officer of the R&D Center during the time the fingerprinting technique was developed. (Captain Mann has since been reassigned to Coast Guard headquarters in Washington.)

'Weathered' Oil

"The oil companies were never geared to measuring the problem which is peculiar to oil spills—namely that oil, the moment it hits water, becomes 'weathered,' and it changes in composition," Dr. Lloyd Breslau, chief of the physical science and technology division of the R&D Center, explains.

When a sample of oil is brought to the laboratory for fingerprinting it passes through a four-step analysis that involves infrared and ultraviolet light, iodine vapors, superhigh pressures, and temperatures that range from minus 321° F. to as hot as flaming hydrogen.

"A scientist would summarize this by saying we use fluorescence spectroscopy, infrared spectroscopy, gas chromatography, and thin-layer chromotography," says Dr. Gerd Kleinberg, a Coast Guard civilian who is chief of the facility's chemistry branch.

In *fluorescence spectroscopy* an oil sample is placed in a small quartz container and exposed to a beam of ultraviolet light. This radiation is absorbed by the oil and then re-emitted at longer wavelengths, giving what amounts to an easily read profile of the fluorescent components of the oil.

Infrared spectroscopy is an optical method where an infrared beam is passed through an oil smear held between two thin sheets of solid salt. The transmitted beam is then measured for the amount of energy absorbed in the bonds of the molecules in the sample.

Gas chromatography works by vaporizing the oil sample and forcing the gas through a 50-foot-long column of coiled .02-inch-diameter stainless steel tubes and coils filled with silicone liquid. Because the different components of all oil have different boiling points, their molecules emerge from the chromatograph at different times, according to their chemical makeup.

Thin-layer chromotography involves placing a drop of oil on a glass plate coated with silica gel. The plate is placed in a developing chamber which feeds solvent from a trough to the silica gel surface through a wick. Under ultraviolet light the different fluorescing colored bands of the various separated compounds become visible.

As each component comes out, it is detected, measured and recorded on a chart. If the charts from a spill and a suspect sample look exactly alike, it's probable that they came from the same source.

When the location, the colors and the intensity of these bands from two different samples match, it is likely they are from the same original oil.

As each sample is broken down and its fingerprint revealed, a permanent record is established. The Coast Guard now has more than 1,000 samples of oil gathered from all over the world, each labeled with the area of origin, primary elements, and the refinery where it was processed.

The oil fingerprinting technique has a two-way payoff: as a deterrent to would-be spillers, and as a device for apprehending and punishing clandestine polluters.

It has been estimated that as much as one million tons of waste oil is dumped into the sea each year, worldwide. Various studies have blamed such operations for from 66 to 95 percent of a given year's oil pollution. This vast amount of petroleum "garbage" is the residue from tankers flushing out their tanks in preparation for a different kind of cargo, and ships cleaning out their bilges or deballasting (pumping out sea water that had been used for ballast in lieu of oil of other cargo).

Because of the large number of refineries along the Gulf Coast and on the eastern seaboard of the U.S., the Gulf Stream off Key West is a favorite dumping ground. Its popularity is bound to suffer when word of the fingerprinting technique of the Coast Guard gets around.

Making sure the word is swiftly transmitted, and not misunderstood, Rear Admiral Austin C. Wagner, Commander of the Coast Guard's Seventh District in Miami, says, "Oil fingerprinting can be expected to be used with increasing frequence to identify sources of future oil pollution."

Dr. Alan P. Bentz, a senior research chemist, examines an oil film on a crystal in preparation for infrared analysis.

Harry Giles withdraws an oil sample for use in the gas chromatograph during one of the steps in determining an oil's fingerprint.

Mrs. Virginia Peterson interprets the infrared spectrum of an oil sample under analysis in the fingerprinting process.

Ms. Janet Sheridan, a research assistant, measures chemicals used in the series of four tests which reveal an oil's fingerprints.

To Keep America on the Move

A National Transportation Policy

The following article is extracted from a video tape interview of Secretary of Transportation William T. Coleman, Jr., by Charles Leedham, a nationally known transportation expert. Mr. Leedham has recently been appointed director of aviation of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority of New York. A copy of the tape may be borrowed from S-83, attention Donald Marion, x64333.

Mr. Secretary, the Department of Transportation has been in existence for eight years without formulating a national transportation policy. But you established one in less than a year after taking office. Why did you feel that it was so urgent?

Because we needed a national policy to define the roles of the private sector, the public sector, and the state and the federal governments.

When I took office I studied what the job was about and formulated some ideas about transportation. Also, Congress has indicated that the Secretary of Transportation should have a transportation policy.

There is no nationalized transportation system in the United States such as exists in European countries. Our transportation system is a diverse lot of things: privately owned, publicly owned, municipally owned. What can a national transportation policy accomplish in light of all these diverse elements?

You've put your finger on a very important point. The fact is that the federal government, in terms of the amount of money it spends, probably contributes only about 4 percent of what is actually spent over-all on transportation. The states and local governments spend another 8 percent, the rest of it is paid for by the private sector.

So, the first thing we have to do is to identify what the federal government ought to be doing. Clearly, the federal government ought to provide massive support, as we're doing, to complete the interstate highway system.

We also felt that when the railroads got into difficulty we should provide some help, but this should be done by keeping the railroads in the private sector.

With respect to aviation, obviously the government ought not and does not own the airplanes. On the other hand, we never would have had the airport and airway system we have in this country if the federal government hadn't stepped in and helped to build them.

In regard to mass transit, management has to be on a local level. It is impossible for the federal government to determine the type of transit facilities New York should have, for example, or what type of transit is best for a small, midwestern city. The federal government ought to have money available to help localities make their own decisions without undue federal influence. One of President Ford's first legislative initiatives after he took office was to provide $11.8 billion over a period of six years for the urban mass transportation program.

In the case of improving local transportation and all transportation, the man who gives the money very often calls the tune. As you've indicated with local transportation, do you foresee greater local freedom in determining how the federal money should be spent?

I hope that there is, since I've been Secretary. The most efficient way to raise money in this country is through the federal taxing system.

But once the money is raised by the federal government and, once you get away from the things which are really national such as defense, the interstate highway system, the U.S. Coast Guard, then the proper course is to get the money back to the local communities with minimum restrictions. That's why I think President Ford's efforts to get revenue sharing enacted makes sense.

On a more national scheme, your transportation policy states you're looking for greater equality of competitive opportunity between rails, buses, trucks, barges, air. How can you accomplish this?

First, you have to determine if the federal government has been favoring one mode over another. When I took office, the railroaders were saying that since they paid for their roadbed, and the truckers did not, the thing to do was to give the railroads money for their roadbed. This, of course, would have increased the subsidy.

But, one could say, there is a more responsible way of protecting the public dollar, if it turns out that the truckers are being subsidized. Instead of giving the same amount of subsidies to the railroads, stop or change the subsidies to the truckers.

When we studied it we found that except for the big trucks, the trucker was paying his fair share for using the highway. And even in the case of the big trucks, the information we have is not conclusive, so I've ordered another analysis to see whether the big truckers are paying their fair share. The railroads say the truckers are paying only about 85 percent of what they should be paying. The truckers say they're paying more. That's an issue that must be resolved.

What about barges having free use of the waterways?

There's no doubt that they are using the waterways for free. The federal government spent $8 billion building that waterway system. In addition, the government spends anywhere from $400 million to $600 million a year extending and operating the system. We think there ought to be some type of user charge placed on the barges that use it.

Does this mean you intend to recover the $8 billion?

Whatever we do, we've made it clear that we're not going to try to recapture the $8 billion already spent. We have to proceed cautiously. Whether you like it or not, barge operators built their businesses based upon the fact that they were not paying a user fee. If we're now going to institute fees we have to do it gradually and at each stage we have to make sure that we aren't treating them unfairly.

On a related subject, what about Alton Locks?

We have another problem in Alton Locks and Dam number 26. The dam clearly needs to be repaired or replaced. But if we expanded the locks and dam to the extent that the Corps of Engineers wants to do it we might disrupt the competitive balance, so that there is an increase in barge traffic. The railroads would lose a lot of business. In fact, the railroads say that about five or six railroads would go bankrupt.

Isn't this an alarming situation?

Transportation is not intended to serve the special interests of transportation companies alone. It's to serve the people. If it turns out that you can move goods and services by barge cheaper, and more energy-efficiently, then, perhaps, public policy should say that's what you should do.

I think in the long run part of this problem is going to be taken care of if we get away from the original concept that one mode cannot own another mode. When that concept was developed, it made sense because the policy was to encourage development and growth of water and motor transport.

And, obviously, water and motor carriers have developed and grown.

Yes, now that they're developed, you see that you have all these decisions to make. I'm not saying it is the case, but perhaps today, if the same company owned the barges, the trucks and the railroads, then that owner would move goods over his facilities in a way that was most efficient. Maybe that's what you have to take a look at.

In reading your transportation policy, and in talking to you, the impression comes through that you feel much too much of the informal and even formal national transportation policy was made 20–30 years ago, when the country was entirely different, and you want to move it up into the 1970's and 1980's.

Well, at least I want people to take a look at it. After all the Interstate Commerce Act was passed in 1887, the Motor Carrier Act in 1935, and the Civil Aeronautics Act in 1938. The problems today are different.

An example of changed conditions can be found in the interstate highway program supported by a special trust fund. It was a brilliant program when it was developed by President Eisenhower in 1956. But remember, at that time gasoline was 17 cents a gallon and we all thought the supply would last forever. Today the problems are completely different. And since they are different, don't we at least have the duty to look at and determine whether policies adopted in '56, which made sense in '56, are still valid in 1976?

Americans are said to have a love affair with the car. We prefer to use the car to go across the street to get groceries. We have enormous dependence on the car at the expense of public transportation facilities. Do you feel that the free use of the private car should be restricted?

I have an idea on that which probably isn't quite the idea that a Secretary of Transportation is supposed to have. I start with the premise that the automobile created the amazing mobility we have in this country. Secondly, the automobile industry creates somewhere between one-sixth and one-tenth of all the job opportunities in this country. I just don't believe in good conscience that I can say that I'm supporting policies which will make the automobile obsolete.

But, I think we have to develop programs which will make automobile users much more socially conscious. The automobile industry has to develop cars that are more fuel efficient, that will not emit noxious fumes, and will also be safer.

Then, we must put in place a good mass transportation system. By that I mean, an urban system through the cities, and a commuter railroad system. Once we do that, I think the local political leaders will have the courage to initiate policies which will make sure that the automobile is used in a more socially responsible way.

Do you have a recent example?

I recently approved a $269 million grant to Buffalo to build a subway there. And one of the things that impressed me was that in the downtown sector, the subway will come up to street level and there would be a lot of stops so people can go shopping. This would be an auto free zone.

The overall approach to national transportation policy you issued in September—there's been a chance to review it, to have public comment on it, Congressional reaction and other things. Do you now have, coming up, a national transportation plan?

We do have an on-going program for the development of such a plan. In a year of political activity, anytime one says 'national plan' you run the risk of going against what a lot of politicians will say the American people want, and in a political democracy you have to have policies which are acceptable to the people. But once you have a policy, of course, it's only good sense to consider

(See POLICY, p. 2)