

Consumers and Users

SANDRA ECHOLS HAYES, CAL PIPAL, DELAINE EASTIN, AND
KIRK P. BROWN

SANDRA ECHOLS HAYES

In the downstate New York metropolitan region it is both the very best of times and the very worst of times. In mid-April, the Bi-State Transportation Forum—a forum composed of the chief transportation officers of New York State DOT, New Jersey DOT, New York City DOT, New Jersey Transit Corporation, the Metropolitan Transit Authority, and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey—jointly released a regional assessment document developed by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in New York and New Jersey.

Now when the six transportation executives of metropolitan New York and New Jersey bring together their collective resources and concerns for meeting the future mobility challenge of the region, it is the very best of times.

However, when that assessment finding indicates that “the assessment shows that chronic congestion has become the common denominator for virtually the entire region during peak commuting and weekend travel hours,” it is the very worst of times.

This focuses the critical need for statewide multimodal transportation planning in the New York region. To the extent that the MPO, the collective body of local governments, is the consumer/user of statewide transportation planning, it is appropriate to ask how effective is statewide planning in the New York Metropolitan region.

I will limit my comments to two of the elements of statewide transportation planning, two elements in which locals participate and in which the region can benefit: (a) assessing and forecasting the short- and long-term transportation environment, needs and resources, and (b) participating in the metropolitan planning process.

In this region, and perhaps in other regions within the state, there is a changed environment. Even as the current highway and transportation systems were being put in place, the trends on which they were premised were changing. By 1980, a noticeable loss was registered in the region’s population, and even with equivalent growth in the mid-1980s, the population has not reached its 1970 level.

Within the region, economic activities have increasingly spread to the suburbs to the point that intrasuburban trips

have become the dominant pattern for the suburban commuting network. The highway and transit infrastructure is now a mismatch for the dispersed intrasuburban travel patterns.

From 1970 to 1981, there was a 40 percent increase in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) in the region, and by 2050 a 50 percent increase in VMT is projected. The New York metropolitan region is a region at risk and the state transportation planning process has assumed the leadership role in meeting this critical mobility challenge.

Statewide multimodal transportation, to be most effective for users, must present a perspective that is regional, intermodal and multijurisdictional and it should include:

1. Articulating the strategic issues to the policymakers and the voters;
2. Taking the lead on data collection and management, a prime requisite to proactive planning;
3. Expanding the transportation partnership to include private stakeholders; and
4. Addressing the capacity needs for both highway and transit.

STRATEGIC ISSUES

Proactive planning can be a useful first step in the process. The notion of developing strategic transportation issues in cooperation with other stakeholders in the region has already proved beneficial as the region moves toward a shared understanding of the mobility crisis in the New York region.

The Bi-State Forum jointly convened a regional mobility conference hosted by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. They invited public and private sector participants. The findings of that conference can be the first step in articulating the strategic issues to the policy makers in the downstate region.

DATA COLLECTION AND MANAGEMENT

The data collection, storage and analysis element is a mandatory part of the regional planning process. It has been a major effort of statewide planning in New York since the early 1960s and the state is a key player in this area.

The New York region has a heavy overlay of separate public entities and jurisdictions, some autonomous while others are executive departments of government. This contributes to a fragmented regional data collection and management system. The state assumed the lead in convening the regional trans-

S. E. Hayes, New York Metropolitan Transportation Council, One World Trade Center, Suite 82E, New York, N.Y. 10048. C. Pipal, 3M Company, 3M Center, Building 570-1-01, St. Paul, Minn. 55144. D. Eastin, California Assembly, State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif. 95814. K. P. Brown, Colorado Department of Highways, 540 United Bank Building, Pueblo, Colo. 81003.

portation system data in the region as a whole. The regional assessment document I mentioned earlier was that beginning.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

The transportation system in the region has historically reconciled the imbalance between jobs and housing availability. A system operating beyond capacity such as it is in our region, however, has a much tougher time satisfying that need and, thus, puts the economy of the region at risk.

To maintain the region's transportation system in a state of good repair, not only must the existing partners find ways to increase their investment levels, the partnership must be expanded to include private providers, developers, employers and new and creative funding methods.

Major capital investments in the transportation system around the globe are impressive: In Tokyo, Hong Kong, Paris, and London multimillion dollar projects are being implemented with a massive infusion of private funds. State planning has taken the lead in expanding this public/private link to begin the dialogue on resources versus needs in the metropolitan region.

The whole issue of financing transportation should be securely linked to the issue of what transportation service should be provided in the region and what quality of the service should be there.

EXPANSION

Significant expansion of the highway system can be ruled out in most locations in the New York metropolitan region. Capacity needs, both highway and transit to move people and goods, continue to pose the problem of congestion and immobility. Three issues related to capacity needs in the region are (a) the high cost of mobility, both in terms of time lost in moving people and goods, as well as the cost of maintaining and building the system; (b) access to the Manhattan central business district; and, (c) intersuburban commuting.

The state planning process must move to the forefront in capacity building through improving and managing the existing highway and public transit systems.

In summary, statewide multimodal transportation planning must serve as the catalyst for the new mobility perspective in New York. The car-versus-transit, city-versus-suburb debate must end. New commitments among jurisdictions to harmonize transportation planning and operations, a new level of intermodal integration and a new sense of balance between expanded capacity and continuing maintenance and renewal should be on the statewide multimodal transportation planning agenda.

CAL PIPAL

I am going to speak to you both as a member of the business community and as a private citizen. From a business perspective, it is important to discuss the people issue, the employee issue and the goods issue.

In looking at transportation, the first concern is transportation quality. Transportation quality means getting people and goods to destinations safely, and I put safety above every-

thing else. It does no good to deliver products if they are damaged when they get there. Safety certainly is important. In addition, these goods must be delivered within consistently predictable times. If we tell the customer that delivery will occur the day after tomorrow, then it must arrive the day after tomorrow. The delivery times must also be considered reasonable by the customer. Maybe we can get it there in 4 days, but 4 days is not reasonable; the customer may consider 2 days or 1 day or 8 hours reasonable. We have to live by the customer requirements and cost must be affordable.

Another issue of great importance to a business is employee transportation. We have more lost time because of accidents that occur on the trip to and from work than because of accidents during the working hours. Industry and business have a responsibility, along with government, to deal with this problem. Rush hours are terrible, but industry can do something to help. We traditionally have had people come to work at 8:00 a.m. and leave at 5:00 p.m. We really do not need to do that. We can stagger working hours better than we have. I will give you an example in 3M's case. Our St. Paul headquarters with some 10,000 people is located next to Interstate 94. For years everyone came to work 7:45 a.m. and left at 4:30 p.m. There were only two exits from the freeway then and they were continually jammed. The parking lots were jammed. Someone thought of staggering work hours. The office employees, half the population, could come in at 7:30 a.m.; the laboratory employees, the other half, could come in at 8:00 a.m. This simple approach solved our congestion problem.

I will now cover one item relating to the "people" issue, that of senior citizens. Society owes these citizens good mobility because for the most part they have made major contributions to society. And they are becoming a larger segment of the population. People are living longer, driving longer, enjoying good, healthy lives and able to contribute longer. The "baby-boom" era is over. I think we have to look at making it easier and safer for senior citizens to drive. Certainly, this helps maintain their quality of life.

I know that I do not react quite as well as I did 30 years ago in emergency situations. My vision probably is not quite as good as it used to be. I do not even like to drive at night because my night vision is poor. We need to look at the aging driver in our planning efforts and prepare for a different world.

Representative Eastin mentioned that we need to think globally and act locally. I very much subscribe to that point view. Global logistics is the competitive battleground of the nineties and if we in the United States are to be successful, we must be concerned about global competition. The requirements for competing effectively include having good products and services. That is a given. In addition, we must have the right price. If we price ourselves out of the market, we will go out of business. Beyond that we have transportation requirements. We have to have reliable delivery and timely delivery. And we must have flexibility, because our customers requirements are changing very quickly.

"Just-in-time" delivery is a good example of our changing world. More and more companies are using it. More and more customers are demanding it. It means more frequent shipments, and more use of transportation deliveries. We have customers telling us that delivery must be made in a certain time slot or they will not accept delivery. Appointment deliveries are becoming more common.

As I look to the future, I see some significant challenges. Europe will become a common economic bloc in 1992. Europe is going to be one market with 300 million people, just like the United States. I recently saw a cartoon showing a big truck at a customs station and a driver talking to the customs agent. The driver had a small package in his hand; this was the cargo. The paperwork was in the rear. This is going to change. With the Common Market there will be no paperwork. Crossing boundaries will be the same as crossing state boundaries here in the United States. This is a dramatically changing situation.

We also have a changing situation in the North American market. The tariff barriers between the United States and Canada will be coming down. We cannot look at the U.S. market as separate from the Canadian market. In 3M's case, we have had them separate all these years. Now we are saying, "Vancouver British has been supplied out of our Toronto warehouse. Why not use Los Angeles which is only half the distance to Vancouver?" We were going to build a warehouse in the northeastern United States, but now we have a big warehouse in Toronto. Maybe we do not need another warehouse.

Another global factor that will affect us locally is the emergence of the Pacific Rim countries. I am not talking about Japan or Australia, but rather the Taiwans, the Koreas, the Singapores, the Hong Kongs, the Malaysias, the Thailand, and the Philippines. Look at the gross national product. It is growing faster there than it is in any other part of the world. My company has traditionally supplied these countries out of St. Paul. The St. Paul office sends orders to the plants and they are consolidated in St. Paul and shipped by rail to the West Coast and then to our Far East subsidiaries.

A \$4 million subsidiary like Taiwan 8 years ago was acceptable, but that \$4 million has grown to \$40 million today and growth is continuing at that rate. We can no longer conduct business like we used to. We are going to build a warehouse on the West Coast that will supply our Far East subsidiaries. Instead of waiting 3 months, they will only wait 2 months. Beyond this, we have to look at building a distribution center somewhere in the Pacific area, maybe in Taiwan or Singapore. Then we can reduce our delivery time to 1 month because this timeliness is absolutely critical to our survival.

So, these are the changes that are coming. All of us need to recognize these changes and their consequences.

Let me end with a listing of "wants." One of them is to relieve congestion. That may be impossible, but I travel around the country and I see freeways at rush hour that are giant parking lots. Congestion will seriously constrain our ability to compete. Another "want" is uniformity among states. It is frustrating when trucks are legal in one state but illegal in the next; or legal on an Interstate highway and illegal when you turn off. We must strive for better uniformity, particularly if we are going to be globally competitive.

Transportation planners have to be the visionaries. We cannot afford to say that it is working now, so let us be comfortable. Things are going to change. Two things are required for encouraging change—courage and effort. Peter Drucker has said that innovators do not create change, they exploit it. He went on to say that the best way to predict the future is to create it. I think that this group is in a position as much as any group to create the future. We in industry and business have been remiss in not helping you. I would like to suggest

a transportation partnership between business and the private sector, private citizens and people in government. Such a partnership, I think, is absolutely necessary.

I would like to close by reciting something I read not long ago. "Don't walk in front of me, I may not follow. Don't walk behind me, I may not lead. Just walk beside me and be my friend." I think that people in government and in private industry and private citizens have to walk side by side as we create the future in transportation.

DELAINE EASTIN

This conference has given me hope. I find myself recently thinking about that great philosopher Woody Allen, who said that we have reached a crossroads. One path leads to destruction and the other to despair and he hoped that we would have the wisdom to choose wisely. I first came to the California State Legislature from corporate planning and asked myself what I could do to prepare for this job. I was on the transportation committee, so I asked if I could see the long-range plan for transportation in California. You know the one, the long-range plan for transportation, *the long-range plan*. I found that, in fact, California had stopped doing long-range planning in transportation several years before. Although we had a laundry list of projects that we call the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), it was in fact a list of projects that we were intending to build, nothing more than a laundry list of highway projects. The state was not doing long-range transportation planning and it had also stopped funding transportation.

Under the previous administration, California dropped from being one of the leaders in transportation, a position it held for a great many years. In fact, we used to have a jingle in California: "So, sing my friends, be blithe, be gay or weep my friends with sorrow. What California is today, the rest will be tomorrow." If I thought that were true in transportation, I would suggest that we all join hands and pray for the future of our country, because under the last governor we dropped to 49th of the 50 states in our per capita investment in transportation. It is hard to do worse than 49th out of 50, but under the present governor, we dropped to 50th. In fact, we are 51st, if you include Washington, D.C. as a state.

So, not only does California fail to have a long-range plan, California also did not have an investment base worthy of its problems. To put this in context, we are spending on roads in California the same amount in constant dollars as in 1948 when I was 1 year old. During that time, our state population has increased by almost 500 percent. The number of vehicles and vehicle miles driven has expanded dramatically. Especially horrifying is the dramatic growth per day in California.

The growth per year in California is the equivalent of a new Boston every year. So, California, which is adding 600,000 people every single year, has failed to plan and failed to invest and is really in deep yogurt at this point.

I also discovered when I got to the legislature a remarkable inability to appreciate the difference between expense and investment. I think that this is to some extent, a problem in our nation as a whole today and I fear for the republic when I look at our failure to plan for several aspects of the infrastructure of the United States.

Recall that in the immediate postwar period we were pretty puffed up with ourselves. We had 26 straight trade years of surplus, 26 straight years as the number one trading nation in the world, and we felt pretty darn good. When you look at the asterisk next to the 26-0 season, however, you discover that, as Tom Peters said, all wins were by forfeit. We were the only game in town.

In a real sense, the 1970s was the first time that California entered a global economy with global competition. California and the United States are competing in a world economy quite different from that of the immediate postwar era. So, if we fail to invest in our infrastructure, not just in our roads but in all aspects of transportation including airports, sewers, bridges, water delivery systems, and even education, America will surely be competitively disadvantaged as we move into the next century.

One of the things that is striking to me is the failure, at least in California, and I believe to some extent in your states and certainly at national level, to differentiate between expense and investment.

Just for a second, let me point out to you that every major company—and I know that this is true at 3M, which is one of the finest companies in America—has a 20-year plan. Now not every member of the company may have seen the 20-year plan. Some of it is privileged information. Most are familiar with the 5-year business plan, but in the top drawer of the chairperson's desk of every major company in America, if I am not mistaken, is a 20-year plan for investment.

In the State of California, we require every city and every county to have a 20-year plan. We just don't do it ourselves.

Last year, I carried a bill, Assembly Bill 2927, requiring the State of California to do long-range planning for transportation. We received wonderful support from the Business Roundtable, California Chamber of Commerce, California Manufacturers' Association, the California Transit Association, and the California State Auto Association. In his veto message, our governor said that it was impractical and unnecessary to do long-range planning for transportation. Interestingly, however, that same week he formed a strategic planning group at Caltrans.

So, I am hoping to be able to tell you at some time in the future that although we lost the battle, we won the war. I also have to tell you that I believe that Franklin Roosevelt was very shrewd, when having listened to a group of people who were lobbying him on an issue that he cared very much about, said to them, "I agree with everything you have said. Now, go out there and put some pressure on me to do something."

I think it is imperative that the business community in America begin to put pressure on each of the 50 states and on the national and local governments, to look at this issue in a clearer fashion. Yes, we ought to hold down expenses in this country. You bet your life. And we could do a better job at it. But even as we hold down expenses, and every major corporation does that, we have to know when it is time to invest, and I am here to tell you that I think that it is time to invest in America again.

Now, if you do that, you really ought to do it with the kind of vision and foresight that our ancestors had. I have to tell you that I think this country's history is absolutely stupendous. If you think about how hard it must have been for people in the 1820s to figure out how to build the Erie Canal, in the

1800s, to build the Transcontinental Railroad, how hard it was at the turn of the century to build the Panama Canal after the French had failed, how difficult it was to build the Golden Gate Bridge and the Bay Bridge at the height of the worst depression in the history of this country, when you think about how hard it must have been to build the freeways that we built in the immediate postwar period and how we built the BARTs and the Metros and expanded systems during the sixties, you ought to really ask yourself what in the world happened. How have we lost this sense of purpose and sense of vision of our ancestors?

And how did we get so out of touch with the people whom we serve? In the end, the same is true of excellent government that is true of excellent companies. We have to be customer focused. We ought to be running the transportation system in this country as if we were customer focused. If you understand that—which happens to be one of Tom Peter's primary rules for excellence in corporations—then you will begin to understand why multimodal transportation planning is absolutely essential.

The environmentalist community has a great slogan, one that we should all pay close attention to: "Think Globally, Act Locally." I am here to tell you that I do not believe it likely that the solution for the future transportation policy in the United States will come out of the federal government.

The process in Washington has become so convoluted, in part because of the deficit and in part because of the very size, scope, and scale of the country. As a result it is hard to imagine the kind of system that you would build to serve the rural regions of Iowa, the urban regions of New York, and the suburban areas that are growing so rapidly. Increasingly, the commute in my area is no longer from the suburbs to the city, but too often it is from the suburbs to the suburbs.

You have families that pick a place to live so that they can split the difference on their commutes because the husband goes west and the wife goes north, or the husband goes east and the wife goes south. You find areas in which the commute is so stretched out that you have to begin to be customer focused. In the San Francisco Bay area, a region that is as interrelated as any I can think of in the country, there are 24 transit agencies and they hardly talk to each other. There is no common universal ticket, and no systematic attempt to coordinate the schedules between those various transit agencies. It is as if you had 24 little fiefdoms and no one ever traveled between counties.

The only exception—probably the best exception—is the BART system, which carries a quarter of a million passengers a day and proves that if a system is clean, convenient and timely, people of all classes will ride it. The BART system is full. You could practically use pushers to get people in during commuting hours, despite the fact that it does not go to some of the most important work centers in the Bay area. If there is more than one transit agency, they should communicate with each other. The bottom line should always be not, how do we get the greater glory of any one agency, but how do we get the consumer, that customer, that transit rider, from Point A to Point B.

We also have to begin to rethink exactly how we develop the transportation system of the future. In our California we love our cars. We are joined at the hip. We have cellular telephones and stereos and we spend half our time thinking how we can enhance our cars even further. At the same time,

California is experiencing a series of devastating problems. Not only is every citizen in California spending more than \$120 extra per year on vehicle maintenance, but California is having terrible air quality problems. In Los Angeles, Draconian measures being discussed. In fact, the air basin authority, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, is talking about banning such things as charcoal fire starters because the air quality of the district is so deteriorated.

Sacramento is also one of the top 10 worst air quality basins in the entire country and we also have serious air quality problems in other regions of the state. And so we find ourselves in a situation with lengthening commutes, growing out of an imbalance between jobs and housing. That will be one of the great challenges not only in our area, but in this city and in other cities.

Land values are so high in many of our cities that we are pushing people further and further out into the countryside so that they can own a piece of the rock and have their own home. We have people commuting two and a half hours each way. They are living in the Central Valley of California, in Tracy or Stockton or Merced and literally driving 80, 90, or a 100 miles into work.

My husband works in downtown San Francisco. His secretary has a home in Sacramento. The distances are nearly a hundred miles. So, the truth of the matter is that California, in addition to not being focused on interrelating its transit system, has forced many people to live further out because of land values. At the same time, however, we are not building roads to those areas. So congestion is spreading into many areas outside the San Francisco Bay, outside the Los Angeles and Orange County areas. I know that the same thing is happening in Boston; I heard reference to it on the news the other day.

We thus find ourselves in a position where we either have to start thinking about what to do to put jobs and housing back into balance or our problems are going to get worse. In addition, I would suggest that we need some new models. We talked about this a little in our breakout group this morning. I think that we need some new models for evaluating the cost of transit versus the cost of highways. You will recall that during the energy crisis in this country we created an avoided-cost model of energy. We said that there was a value to the United States of America not to import foreign oil.

Is there not a value to this country in protecting and maintaining the vast stretches of land that could be lost to new highways? In California, where extraordinary housing prices exist, the cost of building a freeway approaches the cost of building a rail system, even without an avoided cost.

The Century Freeway in Los Angeles costs a hundred million dollars a mile to build. That is a freeway. It costs that much because you had to buy people's homes in order to put that freeway in. When you start buying up California real estate at a quarter million dollars a house, you begin to run into some high costs. The Los Angeles Air Basin won't let you continue to build Century Freeways over the long term, even if you wanted to write a check for the amount.

We are building a new freeway in California that will cost \$41 million a mile, Highway 85 in Santa Clara County. At those prices, you begin to approach some of the costs of light rail construction in Santa Clara, which run on the average between \$30 and \$70 million a mile. Again the highway figures do not include the long-term cost of taking all that land off

the tax rolls and the long-term cost of air quality problems that you generate by having more people in their cars.

So, California has a lot of work to do. As bad as things are in California today, estimates are that the 500,000 hours of commuter delay that occurred in 1985 will grow to 3½ million hours of congestion and delay for commuters in the year 2010.

Put somewhat differently, the \$620 million or so cost to business in California in 1986 associated with traffic congestion is estimated to grow to \$2.3 billion in the year 2005.

So when you see people in traffic jams in the San Francisco Bay area or in the Los Angeles or Riverside or Orange County area, you are not just seeing inconvenience. You are seeing goods late to market and you are seeing customers late to make their purchases. You are seeing workers late to their jobs.

The economic development of the United States, and nothing less, is at stake in the infrastructure planning and the investments of the next 20 years. I fear for this country's future when I think about that. The thing that makes me hopeful, however, is the people that I see thinking globally and acting locally.

If we are to be competitive, it will be because local jurisdictions have decided to take matters in their own hands, as have some counties with half-cent sales tax measures in California. In fact, counties representing approximately a third of the population of California have passed half-cent sales taxes to support transportation improvements. That is extraordinary and it has come about because of the willingness of the public and private sector to join in trying to resolve the problems of a given local area.

Think globally, act locally. It is time to improve our local planning. I carried legislation that said that regional transportation plans in the San Francisco Bay area had to reflect the individual county transportation plans and that county plans had to reflect city planning. It is hard to believe, but they were not required to match prior to the passage of this bill.

We have to improve communication among all levels of government. I remember having a political science professor who said that if you want to think of American politics, don't be tricked into the habit of thinking of it as a layer cake. It is a marble cake. We are all swirled up together.

If we could begin to strengthen the planning process at the local level and at the regional level and ultimately at the state level, I think that it will put pressure on the national government to begin to understand what we must do to ensure the economic development of our country.

We have a lot of work to do and it requires us to go beyond reacting to tomorrow's pothole or tomorrow's immediate problem, but to anticipate what the long-range developments of this country will and should be. That means thinking about transcontinental rail service rather than just pouring a little more concrete. It means thinking about the next stage of communications and telecommunications. In the end, there is no such thing as a free lunch. We had better make ourselves a lot leaner and meaner, make our departments of transportation a lot more efficient, and ensure that they are delivering much faster.

California's Department of Transportation is working on that, but only after we discovered that it currently takes us 8 years to deliver the 5-year STIP in California. We need to make the average taxpayer willing to invest in us because

we give them a decent return on their investment. If we define this as an investment and communicate effectively and get the business community to work with the public sector to see transportation planning and delivery as an investment in the future of this country, we will have a chance in the twenty-first century. Remember that the twentieth century was the American century. The twenty-first century will be the global century. California is not competing against Texas or Michigan or New York. California is competing along with those states. Our competitors are the European Common Market. Our competitors are Japan and Taiwan and Korea. I do not think that they are going to drop a bomb on our heads; through economic competition they can just as effectively reduce our ability to grow in a way that we have come to expect and in a way we would want for our children and grandchildren.

I am proud to be an American. I like the sense that we have been entrepreneurs, but we need to dig down and rekindle that sense of adventure and begin to have vision again. After all, what is vision but planning, foresight and more planning. If we do that, we will find that just as our problems are bipartisan problems, we can come up with bipartisan solutions. In my state it was governors from both parties who failed to do the job. So, this is not a partisan problem. This is an American problem and together we can do some exciting things.

KIRK P. BROWN

Let me present a different perspective than the previous speakers. I will give you my perspective, or bias if you will, as a trial lawyer. In my role as a member of the Colorado Highway Commission, I look on planning documents as a kind of Exhibit A in planning and promoting a construction program, promoting revenue-raising programs with the state legislature and with Congress, and meeting with the public at large. I see the legislators and the governor as a jury judging whether the documented needs justify the expense.

So, if we look at planning documents as Exhibit A, how we can improve or adjust them so that we can sell that jury, so that we can come back with that award of a revenue increase?

The Colorado Highway Commission is somewhat unique, I think, in that the legislature gave the 11-member commission decision-making authority on maintenance programs and operational decisions. We are perceived as a joint budget or finance committee with respect to oversight. In addition, we serve as a kind of board of directors, controlling the development, contents, and implementation of the plan. The commission sets construction priorities in Colorado and the legislature sets the level of funding. A trust fund is shared with local governments.

Because of the diversity (urban, rural, geographic, and ethnic) of Colorado, it is very difficult to come up with a statewide plan. I see myself as a broker for the Highway Department in trying to convince the public, the media, and the legislature that a statewide plan exists. I also see myself as providing feedback from local governments and from the public at large on how it is working. So, I deliver the baby both ways in this process.

Colorado experienced tremendous growth in the seventies, as well as ravaging inflation that wiped out our ability to meet

our infrastructure needs. In addition, as our former government said, we are seeing the Balkanization of the transportation system. Special authorities have been formed because statewide revenues cannot do everything, such as provide for transit, HOV lanes, and highways. Developers are joining with other constituent groups to develop these authorities for transit and highways. One of the authorities is constructing a beltway around Denver.

We are all talking in this conference about a scarce resource allocation program. The documents of the past, the Exhibit A's of the past, were not geared to surviving with that kind of program.

Well, how do we live with it? One of the key tools is communication. How do we make our planning documents communicate to that jury out there? In the 1980s, Colorado had a traditional planning document that identified maintenance needs, safety needs, capacity needs, bridge needs, and service to the state. It was called the Colorado Forecast of the Year 2001 Highway System and it worked quite well. In fact, we got a 6-cent fuel tax increase using this document. It set forth the surface condition of the state, the objectives we wanted to meet, and the cost. It had foldout maps (some with capacities), levels of service needs, costs, and geometrics. It listed bridges and bridge rehabilitation needs, and told which were structurally deficient or functionally outmoded. It also described rest areas, noise walls, grade separations, and interchanges. We worked closely with local governments in a joint planning effort and relied heavily on local advice and input in selecting priorities.

The problem with the plan, however, was that it was a wish list. Accordingly, it made no commitment to a construction program. We have, as many of you do, a 5-year program. But this long-range planning document did not commit to a long-range construction program. We can argue about the merits of having or not having such a commitment. One of the reasons for no commitment of course, is that Colorado has a very unstable revenue stream. One year we get 6 cents, adding \$110 million to the trust fund. The next year \$58 million is cut. This year, the 6-cent tax is sunset and the governor is threatening to go into a special session and hold the legislature all summer until the 6-cent fuel tax is extended, but that could result in a \$110-million loss a year. It is obviously very difficult to make long-term commitments with such instability.

Another problem with the plan was that it did not clearly identify how our transportation forecasts met state needs. In other words, how did they relate to economic development, to air quality improvements, to land use plans, to development patterns, and to the strategic state objectives set by the legislature and governor?

We suffer from the same problem as you do. We suffer from taxpayer revolts. We suffer from the "read my lips" mentality of no new taxes. We suffer from "I want, but I won't pay." We suffer the inability to perceive the long-term investment needs that have to be made, but that lack the glamor of some other projects. We suffer from competition for funds with the educational system, the prison system, and other areas. What is needed in future planning documents, therefore, is an increased sensitivity to justifying the system. That justification, moreover, must be able to defend itself from the scrutiny of the public and the legislators. It also needs to say how the system is relevant to our objective.

In some areas, the plan must be designed with greater relevancy and accountability. We need to look at highways as more than just ADT, vehicle miles traveled, and surface condition. We need to look at how users travel on them, why they travel on them, and what the benefits are. If you can measure your road system on the basis of how it is used, or in terms of the air quality strategies that you need to adopt or the environmental strategies that you seek, then a cooperative attitude begins to develop among all the groups involved.

Highways should be viewed as corridors, as more than just a means of carrying traffic. We should view them as "utilidors," which are corridors for transporting water or telecommunication systems, such as fiber optics. If you can make multiple use of the corridors, you might get contributions to right-of-way cost.

Colorado designates certain routes as hazardous material routes. This policy has created a whole new constituency for particular highways because constituent groups interested in safety improvements on that road emerge. Such constituency groups could be the nucleus for a statewide transportation constituency.

Special generator access roads are, of course, critical and should be a factor in any kind of core system. Economic development should be a factor as well. Colorado has enter-

prise zones, for example, which have special taxing exemptions to encourage companies to locate in them.

The planning document of the future should also include a performance budget or an efficiency plan that shows how the department will operate more efficiently and how it will be more accountable to the public at large. If the public gives us \$250 million a year in new taxes, which our governor wants, can we spend it? How fast can we spend it? How efficiently would we spend it? These are the kinds of questions that must be answered by the planning documents of the 1990s.

The plan should also contain financing strategies. Financing strategies for roads may differ depending on the particular road. If it is a new road, you might look at tax increment financing. If it is an improvement in an existing corridor without much growth, you might have a different strategy. If we are going to present a vision of the future and allow the leadership of our states to go forth and broker the planning document and the highway program, we must include the tools that are being asked for. At a minimum, these tools include justification for the present system and for future plans, relevance to the objectives and needs of the state, and relevance to the public and the legislators. Providing these components will provide that vision that we all seek.