

Value Capture and Joint Development: Fad or Future

*Robert J. Harmon, Robert J. Harmon and Associates, Inc.
Snehamay Khasnabis, Wayne State University*

Speakers: Carl Sharpe
Alex Anas
David L. Callies

There are at least three studies under way on joint development. One study, sponsored by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) and directed by Carl Sharpe at the Rice Center for Community Design and Research, is looking at the joint development and value capture potentials at 49 transit stations in 14 U.S. cities. Alex Anas of Northwestern University is conducting a study sponsored by the National Science Foundation. The project is investigating the theoretical and empirical aspects of joint development. Snehamay Khasnabis of Wayne State University is conducting an UMTA-sponsored research study that will investigate the joint development potentials of five selected stations on the proposed transit system for the Detroit metropolitan area. The legal, institutional, and economic constraints related to joint development projects will be studied also.

A number of new research areas were identified during this group discussion, including:

1. Joint development in smaller communities. Although some research work has been done on joint development aspects for large cities, practically none has been conducted so far for small suburban communities. It will be interesting to find out whether the tools and

techniques identified for implementing joint development in large urban areas are applicable for smaller communities or whether these have to be modified.

2. Coordinating funding for joint development. The second area of research is related to a need for coordination between various funding sources at the federal level for implementing joint development programs. Specific mention was made of the UDAG program, the Young amendment of the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1964 (providing assistance for compatible development near transit facilities), and the programs of the Economic Development Administration.

3. Identifying optimal locations. This area relates to the development of a procedure for identifying optimal station locations from a list of candidate station locations where the potentials of joint development are high. Thus, the product of such research may enable the planner to select 5 station locations from a list of 40 candidate stations where joint development is both desirable and feasible. In an urban area, if we are working with 10, 15, or 20 station areas, is there any objective means that will pinpoint those with the most potential for joint development? Is there any objective means for identifying how these few stations could be selected?

Short-Range, Politically Acceptable Planning Versus Long-Range, Overview Planning

*Jonathan B. Howes, University of North Carolina
Vincent Moore, Adirondack Park Agency*

Speakers: Walter Johnson
Thomas H. Roberts
Charles D. Bigelow

The consensus among participants in this group was that its title presented a needless dichotomy, that there was a need to do long-range planning in a realistic political context. Politically responsive planning should be done in a long-range planning context. Both are necessary, and they should not be incompatible. It was observed that there is some evidence of an attitude antithetical to

long-range planning in the U.S. Department of Transportation, particularly in the Federal Highway Administration.

The speakers suggested that research is needed:

1. On better methodologies for small-area and aggregate projections of population and economic activity, as well as economic and demographic analyses (transporta-

tion studies of the 1950s were considerably off the mark in their projections);

2. On institutional models for regional planning and development, including careful analyses of factors contributing to success and failure;

3. On planning methodologies for smaller communities;

4. On planning impacts of energy supply and costs; and

5. On the demographics of the central cities, e.g., factors inducing the return of the middle class and its impact on emerging black political strength.

The principal points regarding policy included:

1. With renewed policy emphasis on revitalizing central cities, consideration should be given to placing

all urban transportation programs in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

2. To provide top-level federal coordination, an Office of Planning Coordination in the Executive Office of the President should be established.

3. Federal policy should eschew the imposition of rigid institutional models on local areas. (This point was made in particular regard to one-person-one-vote construction of regional bodies. This is an appealing political concept that would destroy many existing, successful regional agencies such as the Atlanta Regional Commission.)

4. Coordination of measures affecting land use at local levels by the Office of Management and Budget A-95 regulations was found to be a successful mechanism that should be strengthened through stronger federal enforcement.

State Transportation Planning to Achieve Multimodal, Multijurisdictional, and Multifaceted Transportation Objectives

William I. Goodman, University of Illinois
Charles F. Floyd, University of Georgia

Speakers: Pearson H. Stewart
J. Douglas Carroll, Jr.
Roger L. Creighton

There are two widely separated institutional views of state transportation planning. One maintains that federal agencies are imposing increasing and burdensome personnel costs on state DOTs (adding annually some 8 to 10 percent in personnel requirements through the addition of regulations, guidelines, and documentation and through courtroom appearances and resulting court interpretations). Another is based on the feeling of federal officials that the states are unwilling or unable to accept the enlarged concepts and objectives that are critical to current and future transportation planning; that they are, in effect, still building the Interstate highway system in the post-Interstate era.

Pearson H. Stewart, a state transportation official, agreed that the states do not have a firm grasp of their responsibility. The so-called multimodal planning that is practiced today consists largely of stating platitudinous goals rather than setting forth specific targets to be acted upon, Stewart observed. He felt that specification of population, economic, and settlement targets and growth trends must be a given before the state transportation planning process can take root.

J. Douglas Carroll, Jr., a regional planning director, emphasized the need for more joint action between the cities and the state, vis-à-vis federal agencies, in dealing with their problems. The basic problems are energy conservation, environment, and equity; these elements are too tough to be resolved without the formation of coalitions in which the state takes the lead, in conjunction

with central cities and suburbs.

Roger L. Creighton, a consultant, felt that the transportation planning possibilities, incorporating multimodes, multiobjectives and facets, and multijurisdictional, could produce so many combinations to investigate (he called it the problem of the 3Ms, with each M standing for 1 million combinations) that it becomes a chaotic exercise. Therefore, planning needs to be tied down to a disciplinary set of steps. For example, statewide transportation planning involves at least five freight modes, four passenger modes, four levels of jurisdictions and hundreds of individual jurisdictions, private carriers, and many other agencies dealing with land use, the economy, social welfare, and the environment. To help state departments of transportation maintain control over diverse planning studies, he offered an approach involving special efforts to coordinate three ordinary tasks: (a) detailed studies, (b) maintenance of unifying controls (e.g., demand estimates and environmental reports), and (c) performance monitoring (e.g., recognizing such key objectives as safety, energy consumption, and costs). This three-pronged approach recognizes the inevitability of detailed studies, the need to control and monitor studies, and the need to be able to implement such an approach with only minor organizational changes.

Other points made by group participants included:

1. Recognition of different planning needs for cities of different sizes is needed.