

inadequate and even dangerous to the long-range health of the city, but could complicate the metropolitan situation so much that solutions would become prohibitively expensive.

Planning itself is a complicated, expensive item which takes years to accomplish. In Seattle, we have started our planning with Federal funds made available through the 70 programs. The next stage of our planning, the preliminary engineering studies, are vital if we are to present a coherent picture to the voters of the Seattle area 18 months from now. We need the preliminary engineering to give us the facts and costs of the system prior to a vote. I do not want to belabor you with the details of Seattle's program. I do not wish to show you why I believe that the Urban Mass Transportation Act should be amended.

To begin with, no other source of money is available to the cities for the rather large expenditures which are required for this stage of the planning. You are already enough aware of the financial plight of cities to realize that we must use appropriate Federal programs if we are to solve our problems. The cities which are likely to have urgent transit needs are the ones which are most likely to have urgent financial problems. In Seattle, we looked to the 702 advances for public works planning funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This revolving fund, however, is inadequate to the needs of transit planning. Transit planning for a dozen cities like Seattle would exhaust the fund and leave nothing for the equally demanding problems of planning for needed utilities. The Department has been most helpful and has made significant suggestions on how some of our plans could be pared down to a size which they could assist. If I may interpret their statements, the department recognizes that planning is a necessary step in transit development, acknowledges that it should be financially assisted, but does not have the capacity to do so.

At any rate, I believe that the Urban Mass Transit Act is the vehicle which should be used for Federal participation in transit planning.

The roles of planning and construction should be linked together. One implements the other. Construction is not possible if planning is not performed. The two equally necessary functions should be combined under one legislative roof, just as they would be on the local level.

Planning on this magnitude will not be accomplished by local governments unless they are supported by Federal funding. I speak for Seattle, but I am joined by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors in asking for consideration of mass transit on the same basis as highways, which include planning costs.

I use the analogy of highways to point up one of the perils which confronts a city like mine. There are two possible solutions to the problem of moving people into and through our downtown areas: transit and highways. If the two programs are not put on an equal basis, then the cities of America are left at the mercy of the highway builders. And I believe that the highway builders have demonstrated that they are either insensitive to the real problems of the cities or incapable of meeting their demands.

A look at any city during the rush hours is ample demonstration that the people who have so creatively and intelligently met the demands of intercity transportation have failed when it came to intracity travel. Indeed, the very roads they have built have tended to destroy some of the values which we strive to protect.

To many of us, and to the citizens who live in urban America, it seems logical that we should devote more energy and more money to developing rapid transit systems sensibly scaled to present needs and designed with flexibility to meet whatever tomorrow brings.

No city is capable of attacking this job with its own resources. That is why I urge you to expand the act to include the detailed planning function. Unless you offer this opportunity, many cities will be unable to take even the most tentative steps toward solving their transportation problems.

You gentlemen are well aware of the huge amounts of money which are required if our cities are to construct the transit systems they need to survive. Only a fraction of the systems now in planning would use up all the authorized funds. Seattle's contemplated transit system would cost perhaps \$170 million for the first two corridors.

It is you who have to determine the order of priorities. I might only remind you that many cities cannot ignore their transit problems while they attempt to