

Richard Nixon Presidential Library  
White House Special Files Collection  
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
55	17	n.d.	Letter	Draft letter. Richard Nixon to Mr. [?] Lindsey. Re: Four questions from California Citizens freeway Association. 2pp. w/ attachments
55	17	n.d.	Letter	Richard Nixon to Mr. [?] Lindsey. Re: Four questions from California Citizens Freeway Association. 2pp.
55	17	10141962	Newsletter	News Release. Edited Text of Statewide Radio Address by Richard Nixon. 7pp.

Dear Mr. Lindsey:

It is a pleasure to give you my answers to the four questions of interest to the members of the California Citizens Freeway Association.

As you know, I have spoken in detail on these questions on my telethons throughout the state and in a major address, "The Face of California," which was broadcast on October 14. I would be delighted to make the full text of this radio program available to any of your members who may not be familiar with its contents.

The basic premise of my transportation program is that Californians deserve dynamic leadership that will preserve and improve the natural and man-made beauty of our state. One important reason why over 1,000 people a day move to California is that our state is a pleasant place to live. California state government has the obligation to see that it remains so.

Now, in answer to your specific questions.

Question 1. I believe, and have repeatedly stated, that local people must have a greater voice in all freeway issues that intimately affect their lives.

To better achieve this goal, I have outlined six exact guidelines that government must follow and five specific procedures on freeway construction.

Question 2. These are the six questions or guidelines that must be given greater consideration in weighing the pros and cons of a proposed freeway *with regard to both location + design.*

—

RN Letter typed at mail  
office - delivered to  
John Ehrlichman - for  
personal delivery - Santa Barbara  
Exec. Sum. Mtg. Sun. Oct, 21<sup>st</sup>

---

Dear Mr. Lindsey:

It is a pleasure to give you my answers to the four questions of interest to the members of the California Citizens Freeway Association.

As you know, I have spoken in detail on these questions on my telethons throughout the state and in a major address, "The Face of California," which was broadcast on October 14. I would be delighted to make the full text of this radio program available to any of your members who may not be familiar with its contents.

The basic premise of my transportation program is that Californians deserve dynamic leadership that will preserve and improve the natural and man-made beauty of our state. One important reason why over 1,000 people a day move to California is that our state is a pleasant place to live. California state government has the obligation to see that it remains so.

The state must not be indifferent to the wishes of our local communities when choosing locations and designs of its freeways and other structures. The Governor does not have to live with a state-built eyesore, but the local people do. Therefore, such factors as the character of a community must be considered in this far-reaching/<sup>state</sup>program.

Now, in answer to your specific questions.

Question 1. I believe, and have repeatedly stated, that local people must have a greater voice in all freeway issues that intimately affect their lives.

To better achieve this goal, I have outlined six exact guidelines that government must follow and five specific procedures on freeway construction.

Question 2. These are the six questions or guidelines that must be given greater consideration in weighing the pros and cons of a proposed freeway with regard to both location and design:

Dear Mr. Lindsey:

It is a pleasure to give you my answers to the four questions of interest to the members of the California Citizens Freeway Association.

As you know, I have spoken in detail on these questions on my telethons throughout the state and in a major address, "The Face of California," which was broadcast on October 14. I would be delighted to make the full text of this radio program available to any of your members who may not be familiar with its contents.

The basic premise of my transportation program is that Californians deserve dynamic leadership that will preserve and improve the natural and man-made beauty of our state. One important reason why over 1,000 people a day move to California is that our state is a pleasant place to live. California state government has the obligation to see that it remains so.

The state must not be indifferent to the wishes of our local communities when choosing locations and designs of its freeways and other structures. The Governor does not have to live with a state-built eyesore, but the local people do. Therefore, such factors as the character of a community must be considered in this far-reaching/<sup>state</sup>program.

Now, in answer to your specific questions.

Question 1. I believe, and have repeatedly stated, that local people must have a greater voice in all freeway issues that intimately affect their lives.

To better achieve this goal, I have outlined six exact guidelines that government must follow and five specific procedures on freeway construction.

Question 2. These are the six questions or guidelines that must be given greater consideration in weighing the pros and cons of a proposed freeway with regard to both location and design:

# NIXON FOR GOVERNOR

NEWS  
RELEASE

State Headquarters: 3908 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles 5, California; DU 5-9161

News Bureau: Sandy Quinn -- Ron Ziegler

PROGRAMS FOR A GREATER CALIFORNIA  
Text of Statewide Radio Address  
by **RICHARD NIXON**  
October 14, 1962

*Speech*  
Press Secretary: **Herbert G. Klein**  
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

This is the fourth broadcast in a series that I call, "Programs for a Greater California. Each Sunday evening until election day I will show you how decisive leadership can solve the pressing problems of our state.

On my first program, I presented an eight-point anti-crime program, which includes strong backing for our dedicated local law enforcement officials, a top-level Governor's Council to coordinate the fight for a safer California and the death penalty for big-time dope peddlers.

On these Sunday broadcasts I have also discussed my four-year programs for better education and to meet the special needs of our elderly citizens. One of my proposals calls for a "California Legion of Service" -- a new voluntary organization to mobilize the talents of our senior citizens to help train the youth, particularly those young people who have dropped out of school.

Tonight, I want to talk about "The Face of California" -- the ways a new Governor can give dynamic leadership to preserve and improve the natural and man-made beauty of our state so that California will be an even better place to live and work.

Many of these problems are created by our tremendous population growth, particularly in the urban areas of the State.

My own ~~hometown~~, Whittier, was a small college community of less than 9,000 when I grew up. In the last ten years it has expanded seven-fold and now has a population of 65,000. We see this same urban population explosion all over our state. Today, 86.4% of all Californians live on less than 10% of the state's land area. And of the half million people moving to California each year, nearly 85% settle in our urban areas.

Today, the face of California is being marred by actions and in-actions of the present State administration. Californians

-More-



deserve a government that is dedicated to making our state a more attractive place to live, raise children and relax.

This is my four-year program to restore and maintain the face of California.

1. Freeways

In California, more people have more cars and drive more miles than in any other state in the union. The automobile has given us a mobility that was unheard of just a generation ago. Every Californian is now within a day's driving distance of our magnificent beach and mountain resorts. Yet the automobile has also brought slaughter on the highways and tedious hours of commuting to and from work.

Many of our transportation problems are closely related to our growing highway system. The California Division of Highways has embarked on a 12,400-mile program of freeways, which will use up to 1-1/4 million acres of land. This undertaking has caused considerable controversy and I want to make my position absolutely clear.

The highway program is vital to the growth of California and has my strong support. In fact, in 1954, on behalf of President Eisenhower, I presented the most comprehensive highway program ever attempted in the world. The Eisenhower-Nixon plan was based on a partnership with the states. And this plan today accounts for much of the growth of the California freeway system.

It is ironic that although a vast majority of Californians approve of a freeway network, there are now 25 communities locked in combat with the Highway Commission.

San Franciscans are concerned about the Embarcadero freeway. On the Monterey Peninsula the fight is over what is called "the can of worms." The people of Chico protest that a freeway is going through beautiful Bidwell Park. In San Jose, the fight is over the use of prime farm land to build a freeway. The people in Santa Barbara are concerned over the construction of a freeway that is out of character with their lovely community. In Sacramento, the battle centers around the destruction of historic buildings for freeway development.

This situation is not in the best interests of the state and is detrimental to the whole freeway program. But we cannot expect a satisfactory solution as long as we have a Governor who says (as Mr. Brown did on April 14, 1961), "In those matters of freeways and things such as that I don't interfere at all. I can't. I haven't sufficient knowledge of either the engineering or the other values to make any decision on them at all."

A Governor, with the whole state government to call upon, must have the knowledge and must make decisions. This does not mean that the independence of the Highway Commission should be changed. It is right to remove the Commission from politics. However, a Governor who is willing to give leadership and has the power of appointment can iron out the present causes of dispute.

In weighing the merits of a proposed freeway, much greater consideration must be given to these six questions.

- 1) How will the freeway affect homes, neighborhoods and communities?
- 2) How will the freeway affect individual property values, personal income, and farm lands?
- 3) How will the freeway affect the tax revenue of local governments?
- 4) How will the freeway affect the scenic beauty of an area?
- 5) How will the freeway affect existing recreational areas and historic landmarks?
- 6) How will the freeway tie in with regional and local comprehensive plans?

In considering future freeways, I believe these five procedures must be followed in every case:

1. Hearings at the locale of the proposed project, after adequate notice, should be conducted by an impartial examiner.
2. Hearings should be conducted with the same regard for due process of law that we have in our courtrooms.
3. No rights of way should be condemned until a highway project has received final approval.

4. Threats of withdrawal of highway funds or promises of extra highway expenditures must not be used to solicit local agreement for freeway routing.

5. No funds for any highway public relations activities other than purely informational programs should be authorized.

Rather than slowing down freeway construction, these procedures will actually speed it up by ending the type of long drawn-out controversy that has been going on in Chico for five years.

My proposals are designed to give greater consideration to the feelings of the people who are most intimately affected by the construction of a freeway. But they are also designed to eliminate the present ill-will toward the Highway Commission, so that it can move forward with the full support of the people.

By following these proposals, Californians will have both the greatest State system of surface transportation in the world and a beautiful place to live.

#### 4. Rapid Transit

Even when California gets the best highway system in the nation, with the best safety record, we will not have licked all our transportation problems.

There are families who do not own cars. There are one-car families who need a supplemental means of transportation. There are people who are not able to drive or who prefer to use public transportation. There are people who waste many hours each day in commuting -- hours that could be spent in more productive and pleasant ways.

The needs of these people can be best met by rapid transit systems in our metropolitan areas.

In the San Francisco Bay Area, rapid transit planning has reached the point where next month the people will vote on a \$792 million bond issue to build a 75-mile system using high speed aluminum cars.

Similar action is now necessary in Southern California.

I will ask the legislature to establish a Southern California Rapid Transit District.

The present Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority would continue to run local bus and streetcar operations and would work closely with the new District.

But unlike the MTA, whose members are appointed by the Governor the Board of Directors of the new District would be chosen by the city councils and the Mayors of the communities directly affected by a rapid transit system.

After years of fruitless planning and the spending of hundreds of thousands of dollars, the State has failed to come up with a workable rapid transit plan for the Los Angeles area. It is time for a new start and a new organization -- an organization not of State appointees, but of the people who are most directly involved in the need for rapid transit.

### 3. Smog

I will not believe a nation that can build a hydrogen bomb and discover a successful vaccine for polio cannot lick the smog problem. But this will only be accomplished by strong state leadership and the will to do the job.

Smog has become a statewide menace.

It is detrimental to the health of Californians, especially people with heart and lung conditions.

It is detrimental to the beauty of our state.

And it is detrimental to our crops. California farmers are losing \$8 million a year because of smog and this crop damage is rapidly increasing.

The greatest single cause of California's serious smog situation is the automobile -- both automobile exhausts and crank cases that emit unburned gasoline.

I propose an immediate three-point program:

1. A speed up of exhaust device testing by the State Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board;

2. A crash program, in cooperation with local law enforcement and fire departments, to crack down on malfunctioning automobiles;

3. A strong campaign to get automotive manufacturers to accelerate anti-smog research.

4. Forest Fires

Forest fire prevention is another area in which strong state leadership can protect the face of California and the property of Californians.

Last year, damages from fires on non-federal land amounted to over \$17.2 million. On State-protected land, there were 3,283 fires causing damage to 315,316 acres. The State Forester believes this is the worst record of damage in California history. And so far this year, fires on State-protected lands are already 13% above the five-year average.

The State must step up its forest fire prevention programs and must actively encourage private parties to start or increase programs in this area.

5. State Buildings

The State of California is the largest single source of non-residential building construction. The latest figures, for fiscal year 1960-61, show that the State spent \$235 million on the construction of buildings.

Obviously, when this amount of money is spent, the State plays a major role in changing the face of California.

The State must not be indifferent to the wishes of our local communities when choosing locations and designs of its ~~buildings~~ <sup>freeways</sup> ~~and other structures.~~ <sup>and other structures.</sup> The Governor ~~will~~ <sup>do</sup> not have to live with a State-built eyesore, but the local people ~~will~~ <sup>do</sup>. Therefore, such factors as the ~~reaching~~ <sup>reaching</sup> character of a community must be considered in the ~~State building~~ <sup>freeway program.</sup> ~~program just as they must be considered in the State highway~~ ~~program.~~

I believe that the same detailed guidelines and procedures that I propose for freeway construction must be followed by the State in building construction.

Also, I believe that we must have competitive bidding on all State architectural jobs. Under the present system, the State only calls for bids on construction. My proposal would insure that the State Division of Architecture is doing the designing for the least money. If the State Division cannot match outside

bids, the work would go to private firms.

\* \* \* \* \*

This four-year program, covering five major areas of State concern, will be a significant breakthrough in protecting, restoring and maintaining the face of California.

My proposals are designed to make our state an even more pleasant place to live and work -- a State of such beauty that all Americans will wish to see it for themselves and a State that will cause every one of us to stand tall and say, "I'm proud to be a Californian."