A basic question for this panel and this conference to consider is, Francois stated, "Do we still need transportation planning? We must somehow relate all of these changes to each other, interrelate the things that are happening, and, in the process, devise an effective transportation network. At the same time, we must also ask if all the regulations that we have built up around transportation planning are necessary."

In concluding Francois said that "the transportation issues before us are not too dissimilar from the old classic phrase of what it takes to be a good newspaper reporter, the 5 Ws—Who, What, Where, When, and Why." Francois then charged the five-member panel to consider some of these factors from the perspectives of their activity and experience in urban transportation planning. Their comments are summarized below.

RAY A. BARNHART
Federal Highway Administration

This country voted in 1980 for a change in the way the government has conducted its business.

I believe that we in Washington are responding by significantly redefining federal responsibilities and carefully examining federal relationships with state and local governments. I have said it before all over the country, and I say it again now because I believe in it and I believe it must be one of our guiding statements, that control over local issues belongs at the local level and not in Washington, D.C.

So, we at FHWA are attempting, to the extent permitted by the Congress, to return authority and responsibility to state and local governments in those highway matters that are predominantly of local interest. Federal involvement will be curtailed or eliminated in areas in which the benefits of federal activity do not justify the intrusion of federal requirements or where the federal interest is questionable. In short, national significance and Congressional direction will be the criteria used to determine the extent of FHWA involvement.

In addition, beyond defining what is the federal responsibility, we will do everything possible to reduce the red-tape burden that you have had to cope with and minimize the delay that state and local agencies have experienced in trying to get transportation improvements implemented.

Beyond that, FHWA believes that the Interstate highway system must be completed and that we must rehabilitate those older sections now in a serious state of deterioration. Therefore, we will expand the 3-R program to include a fourth R—reconstruction.

Our continued involvement in the primary system and the bridge programs is also high priority. I also see the continuation of FHWA involvement in planning assistance to state and local agencies in carrying out their responsibilities.

We have produced legislation that would provide for some $46 billion over the next 5 years to the Federal Highway Aid Program. Both Houses of Congress have introduced their own legislation. The House of Representatives has already passed a 1-year bill that essentially re-authorizes existing federal aid programs and the change in definition that we have requested.

The Senate's multiyear bill has been reported by the full committee. However, the Congressional response to the FHWA program has not been overwhelming and has not embraced all of what was requested; both bodies have retained the federal aid urban and the secondary programs. In our bill these were to terminate after 1983.

Such continued involvement, however, is not inconsistent with the current philosophy of government, which says that the federal level should be involved only in those matters that are beyond the abilities of local governments to resolve or that are in the broader national interest.

What are the likely impacts of this shift of responsibility and authority back to the state and local governments? It seems obvious that planners will be called on to make increasingly difficult choices among the various alternatives that you can consider. New directions and innovative solutions are needed, obviously, to meet the shortfall of funds. Planners are going to have to look for alternative providers for many services and new sources of revenue. With control comes responsibility and it will take ingenuity and foresightedness in trying to cope with the massive problems that we face.

Certainly the strength of the transportation system in this country rests in its diversity, in having a choice. With money in short supply, we will have to concentrate our spending on those elements that are most cost-effective in order to increase transportation capacity.

Can we afford to have the federal government fund the increasing cost of transit capital and operating costs? Can we continue to afford to build thousands of miles of costly new highways under the same laws and practices that were set back in the fifties? Certainly we will have additional capital improvements that are necessary and must be made. But alternatives and innovative solutions are going to be the call of the day.

Transit will continue to serve a most important transportation need, especially in the urban areas, and support for untraditional transportation services such as ridesharing and paratransit will become a significant part of our program and will have great interest and priority.

Utilizing federally assisted construction of HOV facilities, fringe parking, and ridesharing has gained new credibility as a legitimate element in efficient transportation systems. Like so many good ideas, it has been conceived in cooperation with the private sector. In the case of ridesharing, the private sector has managed to do what millions of dollars of federal funding and many reams of federal regulation have failed to do.

We do support ridesharing, we do support HOVs, and we will continue to insist on them in the various areas of this country. The federal government's role there should be to promote and to innovate, not simply to dictate. I do not see so much less federal involvement in the process as I do less federal intrusion and dictation about courses of action. To a very large degree it is going to be you who are in the planning area, you who are the professionals in this part of the industry, who will have the responsibility for laying the groundwork for unconventional ways of solving our transportation problems.

For too long we have been constrained by traditional thought within the highway community. It is time that we join hands and try to resolve the problems of transportation as they affect people and not seek to simply perpetuate one mode of transportation over another.

I believe that each mode has its legitimate function in our modern society. Whether transit or highway, rail, bus, vanpool, or some other private automobile mode, each has its legitimate function. FHWA will cooperate to concentrate on the
movement of people and not simply to protect a special interest.

It is clear that we must continue to emphasize HOV lanes and transit opportunity in urban areas. Certainly the ultimate funding will have to be found. In my estimation, there is nothing wrong in going to private industry, which benefits from transit and transportation facilities, to see whether they are willing to participate fiscally to make some of these transportation systems feasible. It has been done throughout this country and it is a logical cost of development.

The key to trying to find the answers is working together in a cooperative atmosphere of mutual support and I think we must do it, and I pledge to you, as Federal Highway Administrator, the FHWA will be doing its best to be responsive to you, but not to dictate. We are looking for answers, too, and so we have gone all the way by saying to you that we will eliminate the duplicative red tape that has denied your making progress in resolving projects and getting them off the ground.

We have gone through our priority reviews and have reviewed some 150 regulations. But we need your guidance. I would like to have the answer to what is the proper federal role in the planning process, how should the federal role relate to the states and the local communities? Are the MPOs legitimate creatures who should handle the planning process, or should they be subservient to those constitutionally created authorities called state and local governments? Those are some basic questions that I think must be resolved so that we might structure a program at FHWA to better respond to you who have the obligation of performance.

KENNETH TORP
Colorado Department of Highways

The subject at hand, which is urban transportation planning, is one that is topical for us in Colorado because the 1980 Census is bringing onstream new urbanized areas. We used to have four in Colorado, and we are going to have seven. So we have to rethink our approaches to transportation for such areas.

The key to good planning should be establishing a good rapport among the participating agencies rather than setting up a rigid process. There is an interim period between old and new federal regulations and guidelines, and it lends itself to flexibility in establishing a workable structure for MPOs.

I am heartened by the fact that FHWA feels that there is merit in simplicity, and this should not be overlooked. Toward this end, FHWA is currently seeking to minimize burdensome federal regulations.

The federal position on reorganizing regulations has been surfacing, and we are happy to see it from the perspective of the State Department of Highways in Colorado. Unnecessary red tape, detailed and prescriptive regulations, and the imposition of undue emphasis on federal policies not directly related to transportation must be eliminated.

The fundamental question facing us seems to be, What should be the scope of urban transportation planning? To answer this question, we need to focus on three cardinal areas. First, we need transportation plans that mesh with land use—with economic, environmental, and other functional plans. Second, we need various transportation modes to be broadly and cooperatively planned and that include capital investment, operations, and those transit system management techniques that must be carried out in concert with each other. Third, we need state and local officials to plan in concert with citizen input. I think the officially coordinated aspect of urban transportation planning is essential.

A second question that we might ask is, What should be the appropriate level of transportation planning? Let me suggest that the Governor needs to decide where and how transportation planning is to be done, with the approval of affected local governments and with the review of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and subject, perhaps, to broad DOT guidelines that avoid requiring any specific institutional arrangements. I think that would streamline the process considerably.

Finally, what are the possible outcomes of a reduced federal role in urban transportation planning? The first thought is that there will probably be less planning and that such planning will be cost-effective. There would be a reduced focus on meeting federal requirements and more emphasis on matching our planning requirements with genuine state and local needs. We would have enhanced accountability. That is critical from my perspective. Furthermore, we would have our projects implemented more rapidly and in this economy that represents money, efficiency, and productivity. We would have improved state and local cooperation because we will no longer be able to blame the federal government for our problems.

The states need help in planning for the future, and I am not certain that our mindset about transportation planning is appropriate to the agenda of the 1980s. I think our assumption about transportation planning is that we have got to do something new, we have got to build something new, we have got to respond to growth and development in the cities and, therefore, we have to plan what to do.

Planning for the future is planning for declining resources, it is planning to do something smaller. It is planning to consume fewer resources and it is planning to do what is left as well as we possibly can in the public interest.

THOMAS M. DOWNS
District of Columbia
Department of Transportation

My comments perhaps will reflect the uniqueness of the District of Columbia, but they will also reflect some changing public attitudes about the nature of the transportation system. The public expected an improving mass transit system, they expected some improvement in air quality, and they expected us to provide for some optimum utilization of existing streets.

Each highway bill since 1970 has put increasing emphasis on these types of planning activities. Such emphasis, however, robs you of the resources to continue to make transportation system management (TSM) improvements because you are shifting away from large-scale capital programs.

We had made a suggestion at one time to the Senate that there ought to be a revised formula on PRPL money. It should put some kind of emphasis on person miles of travel in the area, a minimum floor level for PRPL—some indication of density of population and urban versus rural population. We also made the suggestion that planning research and systems management activities be eligible for funding from the entire federal aid highway program at state and local discretion, including the Interstate system. In other words, you could take