

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 manage-

ment 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