# TRANSPORTATION AND THE POLITICAL CULTURE

Frank C. Colcord, Jr., Political Science Department,
Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts

In contrast to European cities, the American urban political culture has 3 distinctive characteristics. It gives a high value to local autonomy, direct participation in decision-making by elected political leaders, and similar direct participation by private civic leadership. The relative degree of devotion given to these 3 principles defines the differences among cities. It structures the character of (or in some cases the absence of) the current political controversies surrounding transportation policy and programs and the solutions that are being proposed to resolve these controversies. In general, current transportation policy-making processes tend to contradict these principles, and it is those places where this is most evident that controversy has been most chronic. The impasse caused by these controversies will not be resolved until these contradictions are overcome. The author draws on his study of transportation politics in 7 large metropolitan areas for examples of the contradictions and solutions.

•AS WITH any area of policy, differences in political culture help to explain differences in public policies relating to urban transportation. The analytical problem is somewhat more complex than would be true of other issues because transportation policy is a product of the interaction between state and local political bodies; thus, it is necessary to study the political cultures of both to understand their impact on decisions.

My study of transportation decision-making in 7 urban areas suggests that the impetus for policy innovation generally originates in the central city. A policy innovation is defined here as a major change in program, process, or organizational structure. Such innovations are reflective of a dissatisfaction with existing policy or, to put it another way, a sense of conflict of existing policies with other strongly held values. These values are defined by the political culture.

The characteristics of the state's political culture are also of central importance. Fundamental changes in transportation matters are unachievable without at least state acquiescence or, in some instances, positive programs. Thus, the innovations desired by the central city must also be compatible with the political culture of the state in order that the state be responsive to these demands.

The political culture of any social group organized into a political unit is defined as the collection of attitudes, beliefs, and traditions that determine the character of the political system, including things such as the limits or boundaries of the political system relative to other systems (e. g., the economic or the religious systems); and the roles to be played by political actors, such as elected officials, the bureaucracy, and private groups (5, pp. 50 ff.).

## AMERICAN VERSUS EUROPEAN URBAN POLITICAL CULTURES

While we will ultimately suggest some of the differences in urban political cultures evident in the United States, it is perhaps useful at the start to contrast some of the most general and fundamental aspects of our system with those prevailing in western European cities. Although these latter generalizations are most applicable to continental Europe, they are not far off the mark for Great Britain as well.

Two key factors are confronted here: the level of government at which decisions are made and the identity of those who participate in or dominate the decision-making process. I would argue that in the United States there are two strongly held values that govern these questions: (a) that decisions should be made at the lowest possible level (i.e., we believe in home rule), and (b) that there should be a high level of popular participation in those decisions. This is accomplished in two ways: first, through active involvement by elected politicians in even rather minor decisions and, second, through involvement of citizens groups of various kinds in the making of those decisions (1). The accompanying negative side of this value system is that professional civil servants should play a subordinate role to the politicians and citizens groups. We have come around to the view, in most places, that professional bureaucrats are needed, but the prevailing view is that their role should be strictly limited. A result of this general viewpoint is, in almost all cities and states, a public service with a relatively low level of prestige compared with other groups in the society.

In European cities, the situation is very different. In the first place, many if not most of the functions that we regard as local are seen to be matters of national policy there. Decisions about the most minor questions are often decided by the representatives of the national government. Mayors have extremely limited powers, and, in some of the capital cities, there can hardly be said to exist a local government. "Citizen participation" is a phrase that would be meaningless to most urban Europeans. Even that bastion of political involvement and influence in the United States, the business community, plays a very modest role in the major decisions made about the cities in Europe. There, it appears, practically all the problems we call "urban" are defined as "technical" and are generally resolved by the bureaucracy following very broad guidelines defined by the national political decision-makers. In Europe, while the bureaucrat may not be very well liked, he is generally respected, particularly the bureaucrats at the national level. In France, Germany, Britain, Holland, and Scandinavia, for example, the bureaucracy contains some of the most prestigious jobs in the whole national society, easily equivalent to the jobs of top businessmen (8).

At this point, one matter should be clarified. I am stating here that, within the role defined for local government, the politicians and citizens groups play a relatively larger part in decisions, and the bureaucrats a relatively lesser role, in the United States than in Europe. Indeed, this can be said of all levels of government. What I am not saying, of course, is that government plays a larger role. In general, the contrary is true, although the differences have narrowed considerably in recent years.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF TRANSPORTATION POLITICAL PROCESS

These generalizations apply to policy-making across the board in urban areas, but I would argue that transportation is an exception to these generalizations. The principal reason is that urban transportation is a function without a government. Unquestionably, there is a general consensus that this is a policy area that is metropolitan in scope; it cannot be dealt with adequately at the municipal level, with very few exceptions. Because of this, it operates somewhat outside the normal political process characteristic of American urban areas. Contrast it, for example, with urban renewal. While the latter is largely financed from afar, nonetheless the specific programs developed for a community are locally produced and fully within the local political process of the city. Urban renewal programs are reflective of the prevailing political culture of the city at the time of local approval.

An even starker contrast may be found in education. While this function is generally constitutionally a responsibility of the state, there is little question that basic educational policies strongly reflect the dominant municipal values and that this local control is jealously guarded. Except with respect to racial integration, the federal role remains minimal, and there is considerable debate as to whether there is a metropolitan dimension to the problem.

While transportation is certainly "political" in the sense that it is increasingly the subject of lively political debate and controversy almost everywhere, it is much more shielded from the influence and control of elected political officials than are other

"urban" programs. Highway programs are, in most states, run by semiautonomous commissions, fairly free of control of even the states' elected officials. Transit is generally the responsibility of even more autonomous metropolitan authorities. Bridges, tunnels, turnpikes, and parkways are also often the responsibility of such agencies, reporting essentially to no one. Thus, transportation policy tends to be made in a narrowly conceived political arena, at least relative to other policy areas. I realize that it may not seem like this to transportation policy-makers, but everything is relative.

In this respect, transportation bears little resemblance to the European model; it is uniquely American, even though it is inconsistent with the elements of the political culture I have defined as basic. It is the tenaciously maintained product of a now anachronistic view that important programs should be "removed from politics," which is generally translated to mean divorced from control of the executive. What this tends to accomplish instead, at least in this age, is to remove the program from any requirement to be responsive to the voters.

In another respect, however, it does resemble the European model, that is, in the relatively important role assigned to the professional civil servants, compared to the roles of politicians and citizens groups. The key difference with the European model is that our transportation men are not subject to the broad policy control of key decision-makers at the level of government that is relevant to the culture, namely (in the United States), the local level. Nor, in fact, are they fully subject to such control at the state level. This is partly due to limited authority on the part of the governor, but more importantly because of the limitations the states have placed on themselves in the functions they perform in urban areas. While both urban renewal and urban education programs give major roles to their professional bureaucracies, neither insulates its bureaucracy from political control to the extent that transportation does.

The politicization of transportation decisions is limited because it is not clearly related to other policy areas that it affects and that affect it. Indeed, decisions with regard to one aspect of transportation are not even clearly related to those made about others. Transportation operating agencies tend to interact with a narrow band of outside interests, mostly users or beneficiaries; they have no adequate means of relating to the full range of affected interests. That is normally done, for other operating agencies, by and through the general political leadership.

To conclude, then, my thesis is that the process of decision-making for transportation is inconsistent with the prevailing urban political norms in the United States and that this largely explains the difficulties now being experienced in the planning and construction of urban transportation facilities.

## CHANGING CHARACTER OF TRANSPORTATION POLITICS

These characteristics of urban transportation politics in the United States are changing, however. The description was broadly accurate almost everywhere until sometime in the mid-1960's. It remains so in some places but is changing dramatically in others. Basically, what is happening is that in many places transportation politics is gradually being forced into a more traditional American mold. This did not happen sooner because, in most urban areas, the objectives of the transportation bureaucracies were consistent with those of the vast majority of the politically relevant public. The public clearly wanted freeways and was evidently apathetic (perhaps because they did not understand the implications) about public transit. Furthermore, the definition of the politically relevant public has been changing. For a variety of reasons, lower income groups, whose transportation needs and desires vary considerably from those of the middle class, are developing greater political power.

It was only when the freeway program and the absence of a transit program began to come into conflict with other major values of the culture that transportation came to the forefront among local public issues. Among those values have been the integrity of neighborhoods, the freedom to choose among different modes of transportation, the maintenance and improvement of a high-quality visual environment, the preservation of the heritage of the community through its historic districts, and the viability of a truly urban life style. It was when these and other values were perceived to be

threatened that transportation politics went high on the agenda. It was only after these values became salient that the two basic values of the urban political culture became consequential: the desire for local autonomy, and the desire that locally elected politicians and the civic guardians of the community, including its "street leaders," participate in locally important decisions. Only then did the community become aware that transportation decision-making was inconsistent with its political culture.

## Municipal Initiatives

The "freeway revolt" can thus be seen as an effort to impose the American urban political tradition on a functional area that had strayed away from it. We had allowed ourselves to stray away because there was an urgent job to be done, and there was a ready-made agency to do it, the previously rurally oriented state highway agency. The response of local, elected officials to the freeway revolt and their gradual recognition that it relates to transit needs and to other nontransportation goals and objectives of the community (no matter how ill-defined) have been the most significant steps toward "continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative" transportation planning that have occurred in our cities. Federal policies since the 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act amendment have strengthened the hands of these local officials in challenging the existing (and often nonresponsive) methods of transportation decision-making. Through these developments, we are groping toward new techniques of achieving transportation systems that reflect the broader values of the community.

In many American cities today, however, the new transportation politics has produced a transportation stalemate. In those cities where the local political system has succeeded in achieving a consensus on which values must structure transportation decisions, such a consensus has not yet been achieved in the state's political system. The city cannot impose such a policy itself, but it can in most places effectively veto transportation programs inconsistent with its own value system. This occurs either through a formal veto or through informal political pressure; thus, the impasse. To overcome the stalemate, it will be necessary to devise ways to make state policy in urban areas consistent with local values. This can be accomplished in a number of ways, and a number of states have already moved significantly in this direction. Before describing these ways, however, let me note some of the differences observable in U.S. urban areas by using the 7 cities I have been studying as examples. There are 3 identifiable types among these 7 cities.

Places With Nonconflicting Values—The places with the least likelihood of controversy over transportation are those areas where agency-defined transportation policies are most consistent with local values. Houston is the best example of this among my cities. That city, "born" as a big city in the automobile age, is physically structured in a manner consistent with the motor vehicle. Furthermore, its transportation program is largely a local product, although the state has facilitated it through funding and expertise. Because the city is the metropolitan area, for all intents and purposes, there is an authoritative political body to deal with the region's problems. The very strong tradition of business involvement in local decision-making has been respected in the transportation field.

Kansas City is a somewhat similar case. That city has a very strong tradition of sensitive urban planning, and it was largely responsible for the development of the postwar freeway plan carried out and respected by the Missouri State Highway Commission. While it is older than Houston, at least as a big city, it is also very decentralized and automobile-oriented. It is also a very large city in area. For these reasons, its objectives and those of the highway planners have generally not been in conflict.

Places With Undefined Objectives—Another category of city in which controversy has not been severe is the place that has not yet developed a well-defined set of objectives. It would probably be reasonable to suggest that this was true of practically all large cities 10 or 15 years ago, but I would argue that it is less true today. Federal-aid programs of various kinds, such as urban renewal, allocated to the city itself have helped cities to define their objectives. Transportation funds, however, have sometimes been counter-productive in this respect. Where the city was able effectively to

control their use, they operated much like urban renewal money. Where control was lodged in the state, transportation funds (particularly those for highways) have sometimes been the cause of identification of values, previously unarticulated, through the process of threatening them.

Where the community has not defined its objectives, there has been little controversy for the obvious reason that there has been nothing to conflict with. St. Louis is a partial example of this. Under former Mayor Tucker (1953-1965) there were well-defined goals, agreed to by both civic and political leaders, and the freeways were designed to fit those goals. More recently, the city has been drifting; there is a lack of consensus; but the freeway program goes on, in effect setting the goals of the city. There is some evidence that this situation is changing, but as yet there has been little visible policy change.

State-Municipal Conflict Model—Opposition to transportation policy-makers' decisions developed earliest in the places where their policies contradicted the largest number of articulated local values. Inevitably, this developed soonest in the old, densely populated tradition-oriented and transit-oriented cities. Given the limited powers and perspectives of the semiautonomous transportation agencies, these controversies (with hindsight) were easily predictable in such cities. Among those cities included in my study, Boston, Baltimore, and San Francisco are examples of this phenomenon. In all of these cities, transit problems raised the issue of transportation needs long before anything like a freeway revolt developed. The subsequent construction of freeways into the heart of these cities was bound to be controversial when their impact became clear.

Another of the cities studied, Seattle, does not fit this model in quite such an obvious way, although its transportation disputes have been chronic for some years. In that city, transportation plans ran headlong into a rapidly growing concern for the environment. Given the very strong tradition of local citizen participation in political decision-making, the contradictions of the highway program were peculiarly evident.

## State Responses

State responses have been equally varied. For the "no-conflict" cases there has been no need for a changed response. To put it another way, the state had long since responded by developing cooperative arrangements. This was relatively easy because of the lack of conflicting goals. In the second category, undefined objectives, the state's response is logical; where there are not clear-cut objectives, there is little choice but to carry out the agency mission according to its own notion of the public interest. In none of the 3 cities in question (Houston, Kansas City, St. Louis) has a consensus developed on a rapid transit program; thus, conflict between the proponents of 2 alternate modes of passenger movement has not emerged. (Of the 3 cities, only St. Louis has seriously studied the question, and it has done that twice. Following the most recent study, the local council of governments recommended the creation of a rapid transit system, but it would be inaccurate to argue that a consensus has been achieved among major political leaders.)

The differences in state responses to city pressures in the 4 urban areas characterized by conflict are very interesting to observe. In all four, the central cities are strongly committed to a "balanced" transportation system, to use a hackneyed phrase. Clearly, the leadership, both public and private, in those cities would like to find the means of achieving this policy with state financial help. In Massachusetts and Maryland this has been achieved to a substantial degree, in Washington State more modestly, and in California, not yet.

In all 4 states the early political battles over transit and highways were fought as if they had nothing to do with each other. Highway officials met the early freeway disputes first with political strong-arm tactics and then later with minor concessions. The most popular of these latter are the so-called "design concept teams." While these may be modest reforms, they are a step in the direction of achieving a local voice in planning. It appears, however, that in none of these 4 cities has this step satisfied the communities, because it did not get at the heart of the problem.

California, a state well-known for its political innovations, seems clearly to be mov-

ing well beyond this level of change. Transportation controversies have been developing in most of the urban areas there, even including Los Angeles, and it is becoming clear to both the state's political leaders and the transportation officials that more fundamental changes will ultimately have to be made. Already, the state has instituted a system of "built-in" design concept teams, the so-called Community and Environmental Factors Units, now established in the larger district offices of the Division of Highways. Their objective is to ensure a higher degree of knowledge of, and therefore of sensitivity to, local values in the highway planning process. A second major new policy is directed at ensuring that low-income families impacted by highway construction do not suffer a loss in the quality of their housing as a result of relocation. There is also legislation requiring the replacement of park lands that must be taken by the highway. Other similar legislation is in the discussion stage. The third major step, and ultimately the most important one, is still only being talked about. This is to find the means of having the local areas determine their own transportation policy, including all modes. This was recommended in the 1968 Transportation Task Force report to the governor, and legislation to this effect has been introduced but not passed. To effectuate such a policy would require that local areas have access to transit funds equivalent to that available for highways. In November 1970 California voters defeated a referendum that would have made this possible.

The most dramatic changes have occurred in Maryland. The legislature has approved, first, a comprehensive and powerful department of transportation, which specifically includes urban transit as one of its constituent units, and, second, the establishment of a single transportation trust fund for all approved purposes. In Massachusetts, the establishment of a transportation department has also been approved, although it is not yet certain how it will relate to the existing independent agencies. The governor's task force has urged rather drastic changes in structure and financing. In both places, strong leadership from the governor suggests much greater sensitivity to the relationships between transportation and other values in the future. Similar efforts have been made by the governor of Washington, but there have not yet been major reforms of the system apparently because of resistance from highway-oriented groups in and out of government. All signs suggest such changes will come, however.

I am not suggesting here that all states will necessarily be responsive to the demands for change from the cities. Obviously some states have exceptionally strong opposing sentiments within their political systems and will resist to the end. Where the city can prevent the completion of an urban freeway program, however, there will be at least some incentive to reach a meeting of the minds to overcome the impasse situation. It appears that, where the state is highly urban in character and has only one dominant metropolitan area, it is most likely to be responsive. Initiatives from federal officials will also continue to help to overcome impasse situations.

## POLITICAL CULTURE AND "NEW" TRANSPORTATION POLITICS

In this concluding section, the objective will be to relate these evidences of change in the transportation decision-making process to the basic values of the urban political culture described earlier.

First, it should be noted that these changes are not occurring in a vacuum. The politics of almost all substantive policy fields is changing in all urban areas to some degree. Participating in the process are new groups that were largely inarticulate before. New issues that hardly existed 10 years ago are coming to the fore. Both factors are interrelated, of course, and both see their effects in many policy areas, including transportation.

American cities have distinctly different political cultures, although the differences are much less extreme than those suggested between our own cities and those of Europe. The values we described earlier—local autonomy and active participation—are present everywhere, but the degree of emphasis on each and the ways in which the values are expressed differ from place to place. In the remaining paragraphs, I will seek to suggest differences among the 7 cities and relate these differences to the changes in transportation politics described in the last section.

Local Autonomy

Differences in the degree of attachment to local autonomy are more evident than those relating to the other factors. However, these differences are more apparent than real. In the field of transportation, it is difficult to translate this value into an operative method of decision-making because of the metropolitan character of the policy questions and the absence of a metropolitan government to assume political responsibility. The decade of the 1960's has seen the evolution of metropolitan institutions in every large urban area in the country. Typically, in 1970, such areas will have a council of governments, a metropolitan planning agency, and a metropolitan transit authority, to name those relevant to transportation. Some also have special authorities operating bridges, tunnels, parking garages, and other facilities relating to transportation. The establishment of such institutions has made it possible to deal with transportation needs, but the limited function authorities have increased the difficulty of coordination and comprehensive planning. The councils of government and planning agencies rarely have sufficient authoritative powers to bring these agencies together.

Of the 7 metropolitan areas studied, six have councils of government (all but Boston), and all have metropolitan planning agencies (all but those in Boston and Baltimore being administrative agencies under the council of government). Five have metropolitan transit authorities (all but Houston and Seattle).

The possible routes to effective local autonomy for transportation functions are threefold: effective location of decisions in the municipality, location of decisions in authoritative metropolitan governments, and location of decisions in a state government that has broad local functions.

The first is only possible in metropolitan areas in which the city represents almost the totality of the urban region. We have indicated that this is the case effectively in both Houston and Kansas City, if the latter's metropolitan area is defined as that part lying in the state of Missouri. For highway decision-making purposes, it effectively is. We have already suggested that, in these 2 metropolitan areas, for all intents and purposes, local autonomy has been achieved in the field of transportation, particularly for highways. In neither city is there any serious consideration being given to development of any new modes of public transport, so the issues in this aspect of urban transportation are relatively minor.

With respect to the second option, effective metropolitan government, none of the 7 cities (and indeed few anywhere in the United States) has yet come really close to achieving this objective. California, and especially the Bay Area, is clearly moving in this direction. Home rule is strongly in the local tradition. Where municipal capability is insufficient to deal with a problem, California typically responds to local pressures by creating a locally run authority. The recently created Bay Conservation and Development Commission is a good example, as are the previously established Bay Area Rapid Transit District, the Association of Bay Area Governments, and numerous smaller sub-metropolitan units. The key problem facing California at present in the field of transportation planning is to find an effective way of achieving local (i.e., metropolitan) agreement on priorities and plans for future facilities. An area-wide planning agency was recently established with what are said to be extensive powers, but it will remain to be seen whether it will be able to achieve agreement on future programs. It is doubtful that such agreement will be meaningful until the state provides the financial means to allow such agencies to allocate funds freely to whichever modes of transportation the area desires (within certain broad national and state policy guidelines, of course). The Seattle area is more than likely moving along this same path, but there is much less evidence of progress; there is also much less evidence of a willingness to think in these terms within the highway establishment.

The third option, like the first, is only really applicable in certain cases, and both Massachusetts and Maryland are good examples. Both are small states in which there is only one dominant metropolitan area (although in the latter case the situation is somewhat confused by the Washington suburbs). This urban region represents a very high (and growing) proportion of the whole state's population. The smallness of the states has had the political result of irrevocably intertwining the political systems of each

state and its major city. Neither constitutionally nor politically is there the degree of independence of the cities from their states that is prevalent in the two western states. Both states have long traditions of interference or involvement in their cities, the decision as to whether this is desirable or otherwise depending on the identity of the observer. In both places, the metropolitan agencies (except the council of governments—Metropolitan Area Council—in the Baltimore area) are either joint state-municipal-county institutions or entirely state. In Boston, the Transit Authority, the Metropolitan District Commission, and the Port Authority are all pure state agencies, albeit supported by local taxes. In Baltimore, the comparable units are mixed bodies.

This involvement of these states in local affairs has a long history in both cases. In the case of Massachusetts, it has been in the urban transit, water, park, and sewerage business since the 1890's. In both large cities, the states for many years appointed the police commissioners, although this practice was terminated in Boston in the early 1960's.

In the case of Massachusetts, there is considerable logic to state intervention. Unlike the rest of the country, the counties in New England are extremely limited-function units (where they exist at all); the functions they perform elsewhere are performed by the cities and towns. Thus, a board representing the Boston area would have to have about 80 members, while in the San Francisco Bay area, the relatively manageable number of counties could represent the whole region. In this respect, Baltimore is the opposite extreme of Boston. The urban area really has only 3 governments: the city and 2 suburban counties. There are no other municipalities in that region. This is reflected in the somewhat greater autonomy of that region than that existing in the Boston area. Nonetheless, the fact remains that state involvement is much greater in Maryland than is the case in the western states. The places of Missouri and Texas in this continuum are coincident with their geographic location. Missouri most closely resembles Maryland but is complicated by the presence of more than one large urban area and large numbers of municipalities. Texas, too, has several large urban areas but, in the case of Houston, relatively few municipalities.

## Direct Involvement by Politicians

There is a clearly visible trend with respect to this tradition, at both state and city levels. The shift is away from petty nit-picking by politicians and toward a greater involvement in policy leadership. This in effect means a shift from legislative to executive control. At the state level, as we have already indicated, this is particularly visible in Maryland and Massachusetts, where the governors (in both cases more than just the current one) have increasingly been responsible for policy innovations. Similar efforts in Washington State have been less successful; and California has been noted for its governors' policy leadership. In this respect, both Texas and Missouri are following far behind.

A similar trend is notable in the cities; the old-fashioned petty politicking is losing ground to clear-cut policy leadership from the chief executive. In transportation policy this trend has been most noticeable in Boston, Baltimore, Seattle, and San Francisco; but, as previously suggested, both Houston and Kansas City have long had such leadership from the executive branch. St. Louis is a current exception.

Policy innovations are particularly evident in those city-state combinations where this kind of creative leadership has become accepted within the political culture. In those cities where local politicians are most concerned with doing favors, fixing tickets, and the like, there is less evidence of creative policy change. At the state level, because of the semiautonomy of highway commissions—designed for the very purpose of avoiding "political" interference—the states where such activity remains a major part of political life witness relatively little of this with the highway program. The absence of either strong gubernatorial leadership or petty political interference correlates with strong bureaucratic control. This remains true in Texas, Missouri, Washington, and, currently, California. The power of the bureaucracy appears to have been seriously undermined in Massachusetts and Maryland in the past few years.

## Direct Involvement by Citizens

Citizen participation takes a number of different forms, ranging from domination of policy-making by the business community to broad citizen group leadership. The distinction between civic leadership and special interest groups has always been a rather muddy one at the local level of politics. Direct citizens' involvement is not a part of the tradition of state government, so the question is relevant only at the local level.

In general, we are currently witnessing broadening of citizen participation in urban decisions nationwide, including transportation decisions. Although only a decade or so ago the influential citizens groups were, in many places, almost equitable with the business community, this is much less true today. Not only have we seen the strengthening of many middle-class neighborhood associations in recent years, but quite typically they are sharing their power with lower income groups, notably but by no means entirely black associations.

Houston and, to a somewhat lesser degree, Kansas City seem still to be strongly dominated by their business leaders; this has been consistently true in Houston, less so in Kansas City where memories of Mr. Pendergast and his machine constantly remind the leadership that it cannot let down its guard. Seattle, until just a few years ago, was also dominated by a conservative business elite, but recent elections have seriously eroded its power and enlarged the relevant constituencies. This city and its state have long looked to citizen initiative for policy change and viewed the politician as a follower rather than a leader. As suggested in the previous section, this aspect of the local political culture is undergoing revision.

San Francisco, too, has a strong tradition of citizen involvement. This city also appears to be elevating the politician to a higher role in the community while maintaining an extraordinary array of citizen watchdog groups representing practically all elements of the community. Boston, too, has a rich array of community groups, including in recent years strongly innovative business associations who work well and closely with political leadership. The ancient enmity between the Yankee business elite and the Irish political leadership has diminished greatly as ethnic identity fades. Baltimore's civic leadership was for many years (in the 1950's and the early 1960's) dominated by strong downtown business interests, who still maintain their vigor and innovativeness, but these groups now share power with a burgeoning group of associations ranging from black power proponents to historic preservationists. There are many evidences that these groups have influenced city policy and become a part of the decision-making process.

Among the 7 cities, St. Louis has shown the least change in this respect. Although working relationships between the city and the business leadership were good in the Tucker administration, they are not creative today. Nor has black leadership emerged sufficiently to influence city policy in many visible ways.

To sum up, the evidence suggests that there is a clear trend toward stronger political leadership from the executive at both the city and state levels and that its effectiveness is heavily dependent on citizen involvement. In other words, this is not a zero-sum game; given the nature of the challenge, both kinds of leadership are needed. When one develops, the other tends also to emerge.

## CONCLUSIONS

We have argued that, in those central cities where strong and imaginative political and citizen leadership has emerged, the character of local transportation politics is changing dramatically. In those states where strong, policy-oriented governors have emerged, the state has responded to these new local demands in various ways. The places where little has happened are characterized by, first, a close consensus on values between city and state highway agency, or, second, a lack of consensus in the city as to its goals and objectives. The places where stalemate is still the order of the day are those in which the city and state have not yet been able to accommodate their objectives. The initial assumption about differences in devotion to local autonomy turns out from the evidence of the 7 metropolitan areas not to be a determinant of the degree of controversy over transportation, but it clearly does structure the kinds of solutions developed.

This paper has suggested that we are in a state of transition with respect to urban transportation policy-making. We are moving from a technician-dominated system that is contradictory to strongly held values of the urban political culture to one that conforms more closely to that culture. These changes, however, do not suggest that the importance of transportation programs will be downgraded, nor that engineers will no longer be needed. They do suggest that the policies developed in each urban area are likely to conform more closely to the values held in those communities, an objective with which presumably no one would argue.

In our older, more congested cities, it has already become evident to all concerned that they cannot possibly support a full highway system adequate to meet all their transport needs without destroying themselves in the process. In such cities, other modes must carry a large part of the burden, and the means must be found both to support those modes and to determine the appropriate split between the two. The so-called "freeway revolt" that has been most evident in such places is merely a further expression of this reality and reflects a difference of opinion about "how much is too much." Clearly, some freeways are needed even in the most congested cities; and they must carry the major load in all suburban areas. Even if full local control of transportation becomes a reality, I have no doubt such would be the policy everywhere.

The desirability of "local control," while generally acceptable, has its limitations, which means that there will always be some degree of tension among the several levels of government. The necessity for the state or the federal government or both to step in and modify decisions agreed to locally will always be with us, given the sources of funds, the possibilities of local short-sightedness, and the reality of a higher interest. Thus, the state and national governments, given their undoubted responsibilities, will always need to have some means of intervening in local decisions.

We have said much about the present role of the professional and the effect on him of the changes described. It seems likely to me that the professional's role will be enhanced as our environment becomes increasingly complex. The major changes that seem likely to occur are, first, that his "political" role will be downgraded and, second, that his orientation will be broadened to look at the urban area as a system. Also, it would be reasonable to expect a continued growth of interdisciplinary approaches to the solution of transportation and related problems. When the politician becomes truly responsible for transportation decisions, there is every reason to believe he will recognize immediately the importance of skilled professional advice.

One final thought relates to the federal government. I have said little about that obviously important level because I feel that most decisions that are made day by day that affect the urban environment are made by a combination of state and local officials. However, this should not be taken to suggest a lack of importance of federal policy and programs. Some of the changes that have occurred and seem likely to occur at the state and local levels have been encouraged, or even required, by federal legislation. Obvious examples are the 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act amendments and the 1966 requirements of review of local project proposals by metropolitan agencies. The 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act obviously jettisoned us into the situation in which we now find ourselves, and the 1970 public transit legislation will clearly allow more balanced local decisions if such are desired.

What effect this and other federal legislation has had on state and local transportation politics is a fascinating subject of study but has not been my focus. Equally interesting would be the study of the impacts of local decision-makers on the development of such federal legislation. There does appear to be evidence that the pressures work both ways.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

## REFERENCES

1. Doig, J. W.  Metropolitan Transportation Politics in the New York Region.  Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1966.
2. Danielson, M. N.  Federal-Metropolitan Politics and the Commuter Crisis.  Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1965.
3. Colcord, F. C., Jr.  Urban Transportation Decision-Making: Houston.  Urban Systems Laboratory, M.I.T., Cambridge, 1970.  (Similar monographs are now in preparation for Baltimore, Boston, St. Louis, Kansas City, Seattle, and San Francisco areas.)
4. Colcord, F. C., Jr.  Decision-Making and Transportation Policy: A Comparative Analysis.  Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, Dec. 1967, pp. 383-397.
5. Almond, G. A., and Powell, G. B., Jr.  Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach.  Little, Brown and Co., Boston, 1966.
6. Wood, R. C.  1400 Governments.  Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1961.
7. Wood, R. C.  Suburbia: Its People and Their Politics.  Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1958.
8. Walsh, A. H.  The Urban Challenge to Government: An International Comparison of Thirteen Cities.  Praeger, New York, 1969.
9. Altshuler, A. A.  The City Planning Process: A Political Analysis.  Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca, 1965.