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 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 multimodal, multiobjectives and facets, and multijurisdictions, 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.
2. A national multimodal transportation plan, not just selective attention to single modes by individual federal agencies, is required.

3. Transportation planners tend to emphasize techniques and fail to grasp policy principles and implications.

4. State DOTs are still preoccupied almost exclusively with highways and have established few mechanisms to respond to other modes.

5. Many state DOTs see themselves almost exclusively as builders and operators of a highway system. They need to look at transportation in a governmental and institutional sense.

6. Long-range planning has been de-emphasized in favor of incremental planning, but we may have gone too far in retreating from long-range planning.

William Goodman maintained that action items should address themselves not to techniques but to the institutional structure, the planning process, the decision-making process, and financing. In addition, reform should be focused at the state level as the critical link in the transportation planning process, mediating between federal funding and legislation and local community needs. Actions should address the role of the executive, the responsibilities of the planning agency, the criteria for evaluating objectives by the state transportation department, and the need for monitoring existing systems.

Transportation Policies, Programs, and Priorities: Questions of Equity, Efficiency, and Revitalization of Cities

Anthony R. Tomazinis, University of Pennsylvania

Speakers: Melvin M. Webber
           William Rafski
           Paul Davidoff

Melvin M. Webber urged a search for longer-term trends rather than shifts in fashion or fad in developing principles for research and policy. He noted that the demonstrations of the 1960s have given rise to some new concerns for personal liberties and for the needs of our multiple-minority society, i.e., not only racial or religious minority groups but also groups of people who like different styles of music, clothing, residences, or games. The demonstrations also led to unusual roles for lay citizens in transportation and in other matters that until then had been the province of engineers or economists. Concerns for efficiency yielded to public concerns for equity.

Webber identified another trend: a high level of accessibility throughout metropolitan areas. Virtually every place in the metropolitan area is connected to every other place, so the influence of a new fixed transit system does not affect location decisions very much. However, high accessibility in metropolitan areas is not available to those without automobiles, and nonprivate automobile systems are needed for these people.

He contended that the definitive trait of the planning approach is the identification of alternatives and the evaluation of the chains of consequences associated with each alternative course of action. Webber particularly emphasized redistributive consequences associated with each, i.e., the differential effects as they fall upon different population groups, each with its peculiar wants and preferences. In a highly pluralistic society, the thousands of minority groups belie the prospect of a single public interest; each public has distinct interests and wants. Those conditions of pluralism also deny the possibility of ever finding the single best solution.

In search of what he called distributive justice, Webber argued that there can be no technical way of discovering which of the alternative courses of action and consequences is the "right" one, let alone the "best" one. He argued that only the give-and-take of political processes can determine the acceptable course. So, in the interest of individual and minority rights, Webber supported increasing politicization of the transport planning process, increasing voice for consumers, and relatively lessened roles for technicians.

William Rafski challenged the definition of efficiency, indicating that the narrow definition of the past, based on aggregated total regional minimizations of travel time, is not really a very efficient way of distributing public funds or implementing public policy. He indicated that, in calculations of efficiency, land variables must be included. It is imperative, Rafski indicated, that a land-related impact (positive or negative) be included in calculations of cost and benefits; and if this is begun, a large part of the equity question may be answered.

Paul Davidoff then challenged some fundamental notions about the legality and the ethic under which transportation planners operate. He called on planners to examine whether by their actions some individuals had been deprived of their constitutional rights, especially regarding travel and mobility. Planners usually neglect to check the final outcome of transportation plans, i.e., to see whether some people have been neglected or have been deprived.

Participants met in four groups to discuss some of these issues, and summaries of those discussions follow.