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.

GROUP 1 DISCUSSION, Anthony R. Tomazinis

The Group 1 discussion was based primarily on remarks by Congressman Robert W. Edgar of Pennsylvania and Lawrence J. Harman of Call-A-Ride, Hyannis, Massachusetts. The discussion focused on definitions of efficiency and equity. Discussants agreed that the definition of efficiency needs revision. Under a broad concept of efficiency, one may include a significant part of equity, i.e., if efficiency is translated as cost effectiveness in reaching social objectives, including equity. The definition of efficiency is extremely important; it can easily include the revitalization of cities and the distribution of equity.

The notion of equity, it was pointed out, is universal. It is not really addressed to any specific individual or group. The notion of due consideration exists because, at any given time, a segment of society is in one way or another being deprived of equal consideration. It was noted that efficiency is much easier to quantify and, in fact, our definition of efficiency comes from the need to ease our work, to include only the things that we can control, that we can judge, and that we can measure. We limit, then, the definition of efficiency to serve our convenience and to permit our professional survival. When it comes to equity, we never are against equity—no one is for inequitable treatment of anybody—but we may leave for somebody else the task of providing equity.

There is a real need to review the planning process in a manner that would permit us to take equity considerations or broader definitions of efficiency into account. Two tools were suggested and both could be helped decisively by the legislative and executive branches of the federal government.

The first tool would be the inclusion of the client group in the planning process itself. Since a broad notion of efficiency includes definitional elements, and any definition of equity includes similar elements, those who can provide the best help in firming up such definitions are the client groups. Therefore, the workshop concluded that the planning process must consciously and structurally include the client groups to make sure that the planning process is consistent, coherent, and effective.

The second tool suggested during the workshop, but not outlined in detail, was the potential establishment of a referee group in each metropolitan region. That referee group could review the output of a metropolitan planning organization for the year 2000, for instance, to make sure that certain basic notions have been treated in the best way. The referee group should be independent, uninfluenced by the people who made the plan, and responsible to the public perception of what is right and wrong, what is good and bad. Some thought that an administrative judge could serve in this capacity and could call hearings. Others said that a peer review of top professionals from the nation could be formed to review, accept, and analyze regional plans; each state or region could establish a review group. Street demonstrations were not to be considered a permanent solution to expressing differences of opinion. Similarly, taking planning projects or proposals to court is very unsatisfactory, Something structural must be included in the planning process.

GROUP 2 DISCUSSION, Edward W. Wood

Group 2 concentrated on several research ideas. First, Paul Davidoff's concept of the right of travel and mobility in American life is, perhaps, a key right that we have never really talked about. We need to begin a "think" piece on what mobility has meant and will mean to this country, particularly as we enter a period of energy shortage. Davidoff was raising the issue: Is there a right to travel? What does that right really mean in the United States today? What might it mean in the future?

From the discussion we derived two other potential studies which might prove quite interesting. First, we approached the problem of data. We do not know much about central city suburban flows or central city flows when a detailed disaggregation by class, income, and race is made. An enormous amount of generic information exists, but it must be broken down into such categories as who are the disadvantaged in terms of trips and for what purposes are trips being made.

Perhaps what should be done is to take a variety of energy scenarios in reference to the future and talk about distribution of jobs, residences, shopping, and leisure in terms of these scenarios. What could happen as energy begins to become scarce might then be calculated. We could really talk about the role of transportation vis-à-vis the kinds of changes that are occurring in reference to the distribution of jobs and residences and the issues of equity and efficiency.

The right to travel as an equity issue was a recurring discussion topic. Participants would structure research into the concept of the right to travel in terms of equity and efficiency. They would examine the equity issue involved in travel: Who in this country can and does travel? What benefits are received from these trips? The right to travel may, in fact, be an essential issue of the next few decades. We would relate this to efficiency and to the potential economic importance of travel. Travel has been built into the American psyche. What happens if that right is infringed on? What happens to those who have never been included in that right?

GROUP 3 DISCUSSION, Leonard Simon

Samuel J. Cullers began the Group 3 discussion session by noting that Paul Davidoff and Melvin M. Webber raised interesting points, but they were not getting at the fundamental problem of revitalizing central cities. He suggested that we were placing too much emphasis on establishing a federal public system; the programs that we were talking about tend to create new institutions. Cullers suggested that regional planning agencies are relatively useless because planning and implementation have not been united.

Martin Convisser stated that we have looked at the concept of efficiency from too narrow a base historically—that we have to bring externalities into transit decision making. He offered the Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1970 as an example of taking externalities into account. Other examples were legislation about air and water quality, noise control, historic preservation, and wetlands. Convisser noted that, while these externalities are good, we do not have the tools to deal with them properly. He also stated that expanding the joint development concept might help incorporate externalities into transportation decision making. Convisser then reviewed some of the policy initiatives that the U.S. Department of Transportation will be undertaking in the coming months, including the consolidation of planning programs and the introduction of greater flexibility in categorical and formal programs.

The group discussion then shifted to the need for a closer working relationship among federal agencies and a need to better coordinate federal resources at the local level. The consensus was that, while the federal government can help, there is a great burden on the local government. The group then turned to a discussion of regional decision making and its problems. Evaluations

of councils of governments, metropolitan planning organizations, and agencies involved in land planning activities under Circular A-95 of the Office of Management and Budget's coordination regulations were discussed. The general conclusion was that all of these were necessary and desirable organizations, but that none of them had sufficient resources to do their job properly. In addition, they were hampered by such problems as lack of proportional representation and inherent national suspicion of regional planning; without resources and confidence they are reduced to paper-shuffling organizations.

Specific recommendations from this group included (a) a proposal to explore direct federal funding for A-95 agencies, perhaps in the form of a HUD formula grant dispersed according to population, poverty, or other factors indicating need, and (b) a proposal to explore the establishment of a strong federal mechanism to coordinate federal grants at the federal level.

GROUP 4 DISCUSSION, Kathleen Stein Hudson

Group 4 first took note of the frustration felt in contemplating the very complex problems of transportation, land use, and development. On the one hand, response has been an urge to make things neat, clear, and coordinated. Alternatively, perhaps, accepting nonrationality (not irrationality) is a more realistic way to view the issues. As others did, this group focused on the importance of distinguishing between conditions in the sun and snow belts and between areas experiencing growth, stability, or decline. The need to avoid broad prescriptions for all areas, and instead to respect differences and to work with the forces of change, was stressed.

Much of the work that has been done in transportation with a focus on development and rejuvenation of center cities has been a process of random innovation. Many measures have been palliatives. Two improvements are needed: first, more deliberate and thoughtful anticipation of actions and what their consequences might be and, second, better evaluation of the consequences of those actions.

Considerable time was spent discussing declining areas. It was observed that many measures, such as a string of small grants, are really palliatives that work against the forces of change, prolonging the agony of decline instead of working gracefully with the forces of that decline.

It was thought important to step back and look at transition areas in our country for lessons that might be applied to center cities. In this regard, some important problems were noted in transition areas—e.g., economic problems in Appalachia and class problems in the center cities, usually taking the form of racial conflicts. Civil engineering and technical solutions are not the answer to such problems; rather, answers lie more in the areas of finance, organization, marketing, and dealing with equity issues.

It was also observed that many needs do not require major construction or new capital investments; smaller tools will do. Much energy has been spent on broad public actions, but discreet actions zeroing in specifically on the private market, including direct cash grants and incentives for private subsidy, deserve much more attention.

Several observations were made about the federal government and about localities. At the federal level, an aggressive response is needed in the way of national policies on development, but these alone are not sufficient. Administrative arrangements and practical tools to implement development policies and to ensure that the policies are responsive to differences between areas are also needed. Even the best of policies do not take care of themselves; deliberate efforts to see that they happen as intended and fit real situations are as critical as the formulation of policy.

In the area of current federal policy, transportation seems caught in a critical struggle between two irreconcilable objectives. On the one hand is the striving to achieve objectives for national level programs for development (i.e., development broadly defined), and on the other hand is the striving to meet pluralistic objectives for local determinism.

It is important for localities to play a critical role in pulling together transportation and land development. However, localities desperately need help from the federal government in two forms: first, pure dollar assistance and, second, financial assistance against a backdrop of federal development policy. Many localities jealously guard their prerogatives and are plagued by a kind of parochialism that works against carrying out a national policy. The impact of broad regional plans in obscuring important, vital, local differences that used to exist in more locally based planning and development was discussed. Answers to these questions did not materialize, but the complexities of the problem were pointed out.

The need for coordination and cooperation was noted, but some people expressed a fear about the potential move toward massive organization in order to become more efficient. The consequence could be to resolve some of the morass of little things that concern us now, but potentially at a very great cost. Melvin M. Webber observed that two warring notions currently exist in our society. There is a doctrine at the public level that duplication within government is a sin; yet, as expressed in the Sherman Act, duplication in the private sector is regarded as something very good.

Finally, while planners have had bad experiences with coordination and it is easy to be critical of it, perhaps a more constructive response would be to look at some examples of where coordination has been attempted and to evaluate them very carefully for what is happening. From such evaluation, it can be determined how best to draw on these experiences.