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The proceedings reported here are the record of the Conference on Transportation and Land Development and its consideration of the meeting's central theme—strategic transportation investments to achieve urban and regional development objectives. The findings summarized here represent points of emphasis, considerations that served as threads linking several sessions and informal conversations, and observations useful in judging needed actions and in assessing impacts.

Among recurring themes were those related to conserving energy, improving the environment and the quality of life, and revitalizing cities. Although several speakers referred to the role of transportation in the economic and social revival of downtown areas, there was a wide recognition that development does not necessarily accompany transportation improvement alone. Since most urban places are already connected with other places, at least by automobiles, improvements in transit may have little effect on development nearby. For economic development and urban revitalization to accompany improvements in transportation, several speakers emphasized that transportation and other key ingredients such as housing must be tied together in an integrated, coordinated program realized through a public and private partnership. The city as the "new frontier" and the issues of efficiency and equity emerged as top candidates for priority attention.

TRANSIT AND LAND USE

In a critique and prescription for transit planning, Harold S. Jensen examined transit and land use impacts as a questionable link between public transportation and its role in assisting and enhancing the viability of a city. He decried the remoteness of reality that has been experienced in making relationships between transit and land use, suggesting that neither the planning process nor the implementation process are adequate to achieve this linkage. Abstract relationships and scenarios will not work, Jensen observed. He acknowledged transit as a very special economic development tool that could not stand by itself but, if coordinated with other leverage mechanisms and if tuned to the strengths of the city, could be instrumental in its rebirth. He called for cooperative detailed planning before the route and mode are set and for a created capacity to carry out these developments through a public and private partnership.

Jensen's admonition stimulated the observation that the committee should offer its assistance to watch the people-mover demonstrations. Some nonparticipant monitoring and evaluation might be strategically useful in both facilitating and strengthening the opportunities for and results of joint development.

CRITICAL NEEDS

Philip Hammer maintained that

There is a large underutilized, underprivileged population within the central city, a backwater economy that is not getting any more viable as time goes on. Land and buildings are underutilized. As a result, municipal corporations are under tremendous pressure in terms of revenue and tax support; at the same time, they are under tremendous pressure to maintain service delivery to a large number of people whose service requirements are higher than average and whose service requirements are not proportionate to their ability to pay for them.

He underscored the urgency of the economic development of the city as a corporate unit and emphasized that the initiatives for such development should involve transportation as well as housing and other programs. The revitalization of the nation's cities is imperative and represents an investment in people and capital fundamental to societal well-being.

Hammer paralleled Jensen's sense of dynamic incrementalism in commenting that "we are talking about using transportation as well as other devices tied together in an integrated, coordinated program, in very specific project terms, on specific pieces of land, doing specific kinds of economic activity, and hoping to get the kind of reinvestment response that makes some sense."

He concluded that "there has to be a major commitment by the public to deal with these problems, to build the infrastructure, to bring in transportation, and to make it work. If you do that, you can get private reinvestments."

OTHER ISSUES

In exploring relationships between city form and energy, Milton Pikarsky's conclusions called for energy comparisons derived from examining a transit-oriented environment rather than an automobile-oriented environment. William Rafsky suggested that "one ought to take every transportation program and ask: What are the development aspects that we can identify? How can we benefit from this investment in terms of revitalizing our city? What can we do to try to take that project and to achieve other urban goals?" Such questions would eventually lead to a new definition of efficiency. The new definition of efficiency would take into account not only the lowest price, the most direct route, and the safest engineering but also would consider the values that accompany land development and the revitalization of urban areas.

In the latter connection, Paul Davidoff highlighted the necessity of educating students in the field about the implications of civil rights, class, and distributive justice for highway investment. Davidoff also prompted participants to think about raising the consciousness of the administrators of highway and mass transit funds regarding these issues.

He emphasized that it is really very important for those in the transportation field to give consideration to the fact that these vital social concepts related to transportation, mobility, and the right to travel are well within their domain. They have not yet been adequately developed as a social philosophy either in transportation or in national urban policy. Melvin M. Webber focused on several considerations for guiding policy and research on these equity issues. He noted that a high level of accessibility exists throughout metropolitan areas (virtually every place is connected to every other place). This suggests that transportation additions to the system may not have a great effect on
development decisions. He observed, however, that this range of accessibility is not available to those without automobiles. People without automobiles need nonprivate vehicular systems to facilitate their functioning in society.

Congressman Robert W. Edgar shared a utilitarian agenda essential to the achievement of a national urban policy and a national transportation policy, efforts that are "the moral equivalent of the space program." His agenda consisted of four points:

1. Planners must communicate with elected officials.
2. Persons involved in transit and land development must know what is happening and must participate in the debate on transportation priorities in achieving a stable funding base, ending the urban-rural conflict, and achieving a single transportation policy.
3. In spelling out a national urban policy we cannot talk only of cities but must address densities and patterns of development, quality of life, and the interrelationships of transportation with other sectors.
4. It is essential to recognize the interdisciplinary dimensions of a national urban policy and a national transportation policy and to make operational the planning and coordination of programs and projects that impact community development (e.g., transportation, housing, water and sewer facilities).

NATIONAL AND STATE PLANNING

In his review of national land policies and programs affecting transportation, Bruce D. McDowell determined that transportation planners have a major stake in improving the predictability of development; interrelating the locations of housing, jobs, and public services more efficiently; scaling development densities and public transportation more precisely to one another; and increasing lead times in construction work. These goals could be approached through improved coherence in (a) the administration of all 448 federal grant programs, (b) the use of federally owned and managed lands, (c) the location of federal employees and contractors, and (d) the impacts of federal credit assistance, taxes, and regulations. The role of the federal government in supporting and facilitating a state, regional, and local creative capacity to face problems and to manage opportunities central to these considerations was stressed in contrast to the imposition of rigid institutional models.

Mortimer L. Downey reported on a number of U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) activities central to the Chicago conference, including revitalizing central cities, equalizing cities and suburbs as residential environments and as economic centers, and conserving energy. He emphasized that, to take advantage of benefits transit could provide in all of these considerations, preference will be given to cities that accent public transit as an expression of coordinated transportation, land development planning, and action.

Roger L. Creighton called attention to the complexity of statewide transportation planning and cautioned against attempting to do too much. To help state departments of transportation control diverse planning studies, he offered an approach for conducting, controlling, and monitoring studies that recognizes what exists now and what can be implemented.

These observations and the principal presentations that follow may stimulate a personal action agenda, similar to the Action Agenda presented by the Committee on Transportation and Land Development for policy, program, and research purposes (see Part 3). This agenda can guide the committee's future activities and is suggested to the Transportation Research Board community and those government agencies and private-sector interests whose principal responsibilities concern transportation and land use.