policy should we ask for? Should we pursue it in view of the past defeats or should we have some modification? We have also talked about joint planning of transportation and land development. We must not impose transportation plans on any existing city planning or urban planning, but they must be integrated. We must start them from the same base, rather than try to fit one into the other. I think the way that is done is an important research topic. We must recognize that development is not endless and that we have to relate it to transportation capacities. European cities have been doing this for decades, i.e., tying the building of highways to potential development and relating it to the peak traffic that the highways and mass transit can carry. We must learn how to do that better in this country as well.

In terms of this coordinated planning, we are talking about economic policy and about human resources policy as well. Coordination and how we can best accomplish it should be studied in terms of available HUD, DOT, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, EDA, and U.S. Department of Labor programs. The research agenda might also include a study of block grants, state legislation that impedes joint approaches, and air-rights legislation.

Basically, we ought to find ways in which transportation officials can move away from the direct-cost factor and deal with more comprehensive and meaningful efficiency in terms of impact on the revitalization of cities and equity. Only in this way will we move from the discussion stage of the past 10 years to action.

Effects of Questions of Equity, Efficiency, and Revitalization of Cities on Transportation Policies

Paul Davidoff, Suburban Action Center, White Plains, New York

A critical problem for society is the social injustice that maintains poverty and racism. There is no decent solution possible to the urban problem so long as poverty and racism exist. These issues must be tackled. They are the basis of a sound urban policy of which transportation is an essential part. Since mobility is one of the fundamental rights in our society, transportation plans should be checked to see whether some people have been neglected or have been deprived of this right.

I want to talk about equity in our society as it affects the revitalization of cities and national urban policy in terms of distributive justice. I think the common ethic that joins those of us who agree on this matter is a concept of redistribution of wealth and redistribution of opportunity in our society. We share a commonality of feeling that wide disparities in such distributions in our society exist and that they are wrong and unjust. There are "haves" and "have nots," blacks and whites, and men and women in our society. But the way goods are distributed among these groups is not fair. The difference in the distribution of wealth or the distribution of income in our society is an area demanding attention. Nothing could be more important to the revitalization of cities than creating a full-employment economy. The maintenance of a permanent unemployed class in our society is far too costly.

Those of us who are concerned with housing, transportation, and land use must, I believe, recognize the keys to establishing a good society, if we are to think integratively—and I do not mean in a racial sense. Rather, we must consider how we can achieve goals for our urban community or for our larger society. One way is to afford the opportunity for decent work to everyone in society.

In our discussions of the social problems of society, some comments were made about the people who do not have automobiles or who are poor. The problem is to try to structure a solution in which we eliminate the condition of poverty in this society. The goal is not to provide decent minimum housing for the poor. It is to enable those who are now poor to not be poor and to join a class or group that receives an adequate income in order to live decently and securely.

Suburban Action is seeking to expand opportunities for minorities to gain access to those opportunities that exist in our suburbs. It also aims to have the suburbs share equally (or maybe more than equally where suburbs have more population or more wealth than the cities) in solving our social and economic problems.

Suburban Action has not dealt much with transportation. We have been involved with exclusionary zoning. We were concerned with expanding housing opportunities in the suburbs because job opportunities had moved there. We observed that it was very inefficient to have inner-city residents make very difficult commutes to those new employment sites. It was very hard for minorities to maintain their employment when their jobs moved from the cities to the suburbs. We were afraid that if we began to work on equity in transportation we might be giving an excuse to suburbs to avoid housing issues. Recently, we realized that this position was not very sensible on our part, because the minorities who live in the city are going to be there for a long time, even if we open the suburbs and win all the court cases. Many will choose not to leave the city. Nothing is going to change very quickly.

But there are problems of transportation, of access to the growing job base in the suburbs. We can keep talking about how it would be good to revitalize the cities—and it would be—but we have failed at that. In the meantime, there is job growth in suburbia. However, we are not doing a good job of expanding opportunities for those who have the greatest need for jobs or of accessing this growing suburban job base. Clearly, this is an issue of equity that has not been handled very well. It also leads to more severe problems of massive unemployment in the city.

Suburban Action has been particularly concerned with the issue of corporate relocation, particularly in the New
York area, of leading corporations that leave the city to go to the suburbs. What happens to minorities who are left behind and who cannot afford the price of new housing in the exclusionarily zoned communities to which these corporations relocate? On the basis of title 7, Suburban Action's position is that a company is engaged in employment discrimination when it moves to a suburban community, unless it takes steps to see that adequate housing is available in that community. We think there is also a violation of federal contract compliance procedures when a company moves from a place that has a 20 or 30 percent minority population to an area having a 2 or 5 percent minority population. I think the Federal Office of Contract Compliance will say in the future that companies have to maintain their city percentage of minority employment when they move to the suburbs. They cannot reduce it because they have moved to a place that has a relatively small minority population.

Moreover, transportation issues are involved in corporate relocation. Government dollars are being requested to improve highways so that companies can leave the city and move to the suburbs. Such a move is energy inefficient, environmentally wrong, and disastrous in terms of racial policy because these moves are segregationist. They are enlarging patterns of discrimination in our metropolitan areas. Federal funds for highway improvement should not be used to make this possible—on energy grounds, on environmental grounds, or on racial grounds.

Finally, there are some interesting theoretical perspectives that I would like to briefly mention. For example, people find a location for their home. Having found a residence, they look for a place in which they can compete for the goods of the world. Location is crucial. Making it possible for people to locate in a place of their choice is to offer them mobility. Mobility may be the underlying concept that ties together much of what we are talking about in equitable urban growth policy. Whether the term used is mobility or the constitutionally protected right of travel, it is still the right to have spatial mobility, to move from place to place in order to find opportunity.

The equity issue then becomes one based on the constraints imposed upon economic and racial minorities and how they operate to deny economic and social mobility. The denial of spatial mobility results in the maintenance of the permanent underclass of economic and racial minorities.

People involved in transportation must consider the fundamental importance of the right to travel. The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized that the rights to travel and to find a place of settlement are on a par with privacy and the right to vote. We were always free to have mobility. We celebrate the right of the black person to come from the South to seek greater opportunity in the North. We celebrate the right to travel of those who migrate to the sun belt seeking better opportunity, or of those who come from the Caribbean to New York and elsewhere to find a better place. This right is as crucial as the right to speak. However, the right to move or to have mobility is constrained, denied, and rejected because people lack wealth and opportunity or because their color prompts discriminatory practices.

It is really very important for those of you in the transportation field to consider these vital social concepts as they relate to transportation, mobility, and the right to travel. They are well within your domain but have not yet been adequately developed as a social philosophy, either in transportation or in national urban policy.

National Land Policies and Programs Affecting Transportation: Session 1

Mortimer L. Downey, U.S. Department of Transportation

The relationship between transportation and urban development is central. The revival of cities as places to live as well as to work does not mean that the abandonment of the suburbs is imminent or even desirable. Instead, it means pursuing an equalization of city and suburb as residential, social, and economic centers. The present Administration seeks to revitalize central cities, to equalize cities and suburbs as residential environments and as economic centers, and to conserve energy. To take advantage of benefits that transit can provide in these areas, preference will be given to cities that accent public transit as an expression of coordinated transportation and land development planning and action. Transportation priorities will change from highway construction to maintenance and to making the best use possible of existing facilities. The process of developing policy is as important in staying abreast of trends as the policy and its resulting programs. Reform of current programs is necessary in making more effective tools to reach policy objectives.

The topic of this conference is of great importance to the present administration. We are in the midst of developing a strategy to coordinate the activities of the many agencies concerned with the health of urban areas. The sensitive relationship between transportation and the shape of urban development is a central concern in that strategy. Our contribution will be generally in the areas of physical and economic development. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) is concerned about all aspects of transport—domestic and international, economic and social, rural and urban—and many of the most difficult challenges relate to the needs of cities and those urban complexes that require planning and coordination on a regional basis. DOT believes that the revival of our cities as places to live as well as to work is necessary. This does not mean that the abandonment of the suburbs is imminent or even desirable, but it does suggest that DOT is not only responding to market forces but also is actively pursuing an equalization of cities and suburbs as residential, social, and economic centers.

The energy situation is a most significant factor favoring the return to the cities. Since local motor vehicle travel—e.g., shopping trips, driving the children around, and commuting to and from work—now requires approximately 22 percent of the petroleum products used in this country, costs of suburban living will necessarily rise. While rising costs are not usually encouraged, in this