

Opening Remarks

W. N. CAREY, JR., Executive Director, Highway Research Board

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome you to this Conference on behalf of the Highway Research Board and the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering. I wish to compliment Mr. Aschman and the members of his advisory committee for their effective work over the past year in planning and developing this Conference. These men worked long hours, without compensation. I would also like to recognize the outstanding work of the Board's consultant on this Conference, Mr. Roger Creighton, and of our staff Urban Planner, Jim Scott.

Although this Conference is being held under the auspices of the Highway Research Board, it would not have been possible without the support and cooperation of the sponsors—the U.S. Department of Transportation, in particular the Bureau of Public Roads, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. I would also like to thank the speakers, panelists, and workshop leaders who have prepared papers and discussions for this Conference. It is quite obvious that they hold the key to the success of this endeavor.

Each of the participants of this Conference received a personal invitation to attend. Therefore, we consider this a highly select group of individuals who not only have an interest in the subject matter, but each of whom also has a unique contribution to make. The participants represent many different kinds of organizations as well as a wide range of disciplines and backgrounds. We have engineers, architects, planners, sociologists, geographers, anthropologists, economists, and, importantly, representatives of citizen groups from various urban communities. Let me add that we feel this type of representation is essential for a successful treatment of the complex subject being discussed here. We hope this "marriage" of disciplines will bring forth meaningful interactions among all conference participants. All have contributions to make and we hope that you will find the experience rewarding as well.

For many of you this is your first contact with the Highway Research Board. A special welcome to you! I hope it will whet your appetite—that you will find it worthwhile to join the 2500 or so men who serve regularly on our committees and panels. Descriptive pamphlets about the Board are in the packet you received on registering. Perhaps you will read them at your leisure.

Briefly, the Highway Research Board is a unit of the Division of Engineering of the National Research Council, serving the century-old National Academy of Sciences and the relatively new National Academy of Engineering. This is a non-governmental organization established to advise and assist the government and others in the scientific community on all matters of science and technology. The Highway Research Board itself is supported by the state highway departments, the Bureau of Public Roads, and by a large number of industries and associations and thousands of individuals all over the world. Fundamental policy is determined by a 25-man Executive Committee representing the highway transportation community. The Board administers for the state highway departments a \$3.5 million annual program of contract research in the transportation field. Although the Board conducts in-house research for special sponsors, usually governmental, its traditional functions over the past 48 years involve stimulation and correlation of research and the dissemination of information across a wide spectrum of transportation-oriented subject matter. The Board holds an annual meeting each January in Washington at which over 3000 registrants hear some 300 technical papers in the field.

Some 2500 individuals from government, industry, universities, and consulting firms serve on about 150 committees and panels on a continuing basis. We publish over 10,000 pages of technical literature each year. We maintain an extensive computer-based

information storage and retrieval system for highway transportation research. This storehouse contains descriptions of over 7000 ongoing research projects throughout the world and very comprehensive coverage of transportation research literature.

For its first 40 years the Highway Research Board was concerned almost exclusively with highways. In the past 10 years it has been increasingly apparent that there is little in highway research that does not interact or interface with other modes of transportation and with the community that transportation is designed to serve. This broadened base has been recognized by our sponsors. The Board is undergoing a reorganization of its departmental and committee structure that will result in a three-sided structure for its major activities. First, there will be a group concerned with transportation systems planning and administration; second, a group involved with design and construction of transportation facilities; and third, a group dealing with operation and maintenance of facilities. This Conference resulted from deliberation of Group 1 on Systems Planning and Administration and in particular its Committees on Community Values.

The Highway Research Board has no empires to build. It takes no position in policy matters. It is interested only in the development and dissemination of facts that can be used as the basis for objective formulation of policy by others. Therefore, the Board serves as an ideal forum where men from disparate interests can get together in an atmosphere of objectivity. Individuals are invited to participate in our work because of their personal competence and background—not because they represent any certain interest group. This may be one of our most important reasons for being in these days of increasingly complicated intergovernmental relationships and of suspicion and mistrust among the various professions and industries. In this atmosphere we can all work together.

Before closing I have a few words relating to this Conference on Transportation and Community Values. The idea and concept of such a Conference as a Board function can be directly traced to a special advisory committee chaired by E. H. Holmes that was established by the Board's Department of Urban Transportation Planning in 1966. This committee determined that a Conference was desirable, and as a result the initial planning was begun by Jim Scott of our staff working with our standing Community Values Committee. The Chairman of this committee, Mr. Peter Lewis (former Deputy Undersecretary for Metropolitan Development, HUD, and Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget), was a prime mover in the staging of this Conference.

I would like to refer briefly to a few of the major points expressed in the special advisory committee (Holmes) report because I feel they serve to pinpoint the challenge we face. The report stated in part:

1. There appears to be a lack of knowledge concerning socioeconomic values as inputs to various system analysis techniques being evolved and aimed primarily at the solution of urban problems.
2. There are many unknowns concerning the effects of the transportation system on the environmental aspects of city growth and structure.
3. The values in any community development program have yet to be identified, let alone quantified.
4. The problem of scales in considering value impacts is part and parcel of the total value question.
5. The whole value question is much broader than transportation alone. The value question has a rather wide impact on all aspects of community development, only one element of which is transportation.
6. The testing or questioning of various value assumptions as inputs to the planning process and their resultant impacts on community development is a subject matter that needs greater clarification through discussion and research.

These are only a few of the major points expressed in the Holmes report. He may wish to emphasize others; nonetheless, I feel that these present a rather formidable challenge.

Let me add, however, so that there will be no misunderstanding by the group gathered here, that the Board does not claim to be the only organization that conceived of such a

conference on transportation and community values. Other organizations—for example, the Bureau of Public Roads—had been developing plans for a national conference on this subject prior to the Board's entry into the field. The important thing is that we are here to get it off the ground.

I should also point out that there have already been major efforts that have recognized the need for a greater understanding of community values. The Bureau of Public Roads and several state highway departments have, over the past years, become increasingly involved in research and planning activities relating to the proper place of transportation, especially highways, in the urban environment. The 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act, as a matter of fact, not only required the establishment of a comprehensive framework for urban transportation, but also recognized as one of the basic planning elements the social and community value area.

This concern for community values was further reflected in the Williamsburg Conference of 1965, which generated the "Williamsburg Resolves" that I am sure are familiar to all of you. Another milestone was the presentation by Frank Turner of the Bureau of Public Roads in 1966 of the concept of "Joint Development," under which the joint provision of transportation facilities and of other urban facilities is linked together in the rebuilding of our communities. Many of you attended the Highway Research Board Conference on Joint Development and Multiple Use of Transportation Rights of Way last fall. This highly successful conference evoked a great deal of discussion on how to better integrate transportation facilities in the urban environment.

Research work on this subject is currently under way in many quarters, including various government agencies and the academic community as well. For example, this conference will hear two reports from the researchers on the National Cooperative Highway Research Program project on "Highway Impact on the Urban Environment."

Finally, let me say that we do not anticipate that all the questions will be resolved in the short time that we are assembled here. Our major hope is that through your participation and interaction we might add yet another milestone in the interest of better planning, so that the transportation systems of tomorrow can be truly assets to our urban communities. Our challenge here is most difficult. These matters are in many cases subject to a great deal of emotionalism. Hopefully, we can be objective and yet participate fully so as to take advantage of the opportunity for interaction that has been provided by bringing you together.

Opening Remarks

E. H. HOLMES, Director of Policy Planning, Federal Highway Administration

At the outset let me disclaim any thought that these remarks necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Transportation in its broad areas of responsibility, as the program suggests. Rather, they will be directed toward the relationship between ground transportation and community values, and still more narrowly approached from the viewpoint of the Federal Highway Administration. First, it is hardly appropriate for me to speak in behalf of other modes of transportation and, second, the reason I am occupying this spot on the program is to explain why FHWA (from the Bureau of Public Roads budget) is one of the two sponsors of the conference.

We are seeking two specific results. First is a statement of the present state of the art of relating community values to one another with emphasis on transportation. In descending order of their desires, transportation administrators probably would like to be able to quantify community values neatly in monetary terms, or if not that, to quantify them in other terms, or relate them to one another, or define them, or if nothing better, at least to describe them. Hopefully the knowledge brought to this room can be pulled together to provide the Administrator with usable measures for appraising the effects on the communities of alternate transportation proposals.

Second, we hope the Conference can conclude what areas of research promise to be most productive in improving the capability of the highway or other transportation authorities to carry out their programs in such a way as to provide the maximum in value for the whole community. If this second purpose implies that we are not too sanguine that at its present level the art can now produce all that is desired, it is only because as of now we have to believe that is the case. So we have these two main purposes in helping to support this effort.

This Conference has been on the way for some time, and since I was involved in the laying of the keel, I am particularly glad to be able to be here at its launching. Somewhat more than two years ago the Bureau of Public Roads began to plan a very large research program in the area of social and community values as they relate to transportation. It was to be undertaken in stages, the first of which would be an appraisal of the current state of the art. At about the same time the Urban Transportation Department of the Highway Research Board was seeking means to encourage research in the general area of community values, with the expectation that the first step would be to define the most effective directions the research might follow. The Board and the Bureau saw the advantage in merging our efforts in the first step, and found the Department of Housing and Urban Development willing and able to join in.

Hence this Conference. For a number of reasons, principally budgetary, the launching, both of the Conference and the Bureau's program, has been delayed. But finally tonight we are knocking out the chocks and we all are about to be immersed in the uncertain and troubled waters of transportation and community values.

The concern of the highway professionals with the impact of the highway on community development, and vice versa, dates back many years before preparations for this Conference began, however. That concern was formally and quite prominently expressed in the National Conference on Highways and Urban Development, the Sagamore Conference, in 1958, sponsored by the American Association of State Highway Officials and the Urban Research Committee of the Highway Research Board, the predecessor of the Urban Transportation Department of the Board.

In a series of findings and recommendations, the first finding was the following:

It is essential that all units of government cooperate fully in meeting the urgent needs for highway improvement involving the planning, designing, and

operation of facilities, so as to provide optimum transportation service and accomplish the orderly and proper development of our urban communities.

And among the recommendations appeared the following sentence:

To provide the basis for transportation planning and broad community planning, all agencies concerned should promptly undertake studies to develop the necessary basic facts, using appropriate techniques.

These expressions of agreement among highway administrators, local officials, planners, and other professionals may not in 1969 seem to be a strong assertion of the importance in highway planning of what we now call community values. But surely it was a recognition then of a current and growing problem and an expression of a determination to do something about it.

Gaining an understanding of community values was not easy—far more difficult than the Sagamore conferees probably thought. "Appropriate techniques" did not seem to appear and the "basic facts" still seem to escape us. But progress was made. Transportation officials did begin to pay more deliberate attention to local problems and desires, and increasing numbers of officials and community leaders are recognizing the interrelationship between transportation and other community values. Note that I have put the word "other" in front of community values.

As time has gone on since the Sagamore Conference, the urban transportation planning process that got its real start at Sagamore has developed a much closer rapport between state and local officials. With it the awareness of the necessity and problem of weaving transportation into the fabric of the community has become widespread. But the techniques and facts envisioned at Sagamore seemingly are as elusive as ever. To take another sighting on the state of the art and again to bring together the people and groups most concerned, the American Association of State Highway Officials, the National Association of Counties, and the National League of Cities sponsored the Second National Conference on Urban Transportation, the Williamsburg Conference, in 1965. Many of those present were there, and it is recent enough at least to be recalled by many who were not.

The Williamsburg Conference revealed the great distance traveled since Sagamore, and clearly emphasized what I have already alluded to—that despite considerable advances in the art we still did not know with satisfying precision how to relate community values to one another. Both in planning the conference and during its course the best efforts of the steering committee were directed toward finding within the art the means by which transportation officials could work into their planning in a realistic way consideration of the community values related to or affected by their programs. Either the art had not advanced very far since Sagamore, or the committee failed to locate the artists. The conference did accomplish a great deal, however, in finding broad areas of agreement among diverse groups, as expressed in the ten Williamsburg Resolves—1965, not 1775, version. To me the most significant is Resolve No. 3, which reads as follows:

The planning and development of facilities to move people and goods in urban areas must be directed toward raising urban standards and enhancing the aggregate of community values, both quantifiable and subjective; it should be recognized that transportation values (safety, comfort, beauty, convenience, and economy in transportation) are a part of, and are to be given proper weight in, the total set of community values.

We must start from the base that transportation is itself a community value.

While these and other convocations were being held, highway officials were doing their best to find a way to work community values into their benefit-cost equations. Over the years engineers had developed the benefit-cost concept and had improved their ability to measure road-user costs and benefits. They had learned pretty well the advantages, and perhaps more important, the limitations of their use. It was only natural

that they turned first toward the development of new terms to add to the equations—terms representing the newly recognized community and other non-user effects, hopefully quantifiable in monetary values. These attempts led uniformly to disappointment, as did some fairly extensive and expensive research efforts financed through highway funds. It is, I think, now generally concluded in the highway field that while some community values can be quantified, and some even in monetary terms, there are more that cannot. And unfortunately those that seemed to be possible for expression only in emotional terms have in some cases become decisive in transportation determinations. The fact that the mobility the transportation facility provides is in itself a community value, and perhaps more important to the whole community than any other, is forgotten or pushed far into the background.

Disappointment is not despair, however, and we highway types are still optimistic that ways may be found to rack up all community values, including transportation, in some reasonable order and perhaps to find ways to equate some against others in the context of specific program or project proposals. No researcher to my knowledge has concluded that there are not ways to rate some values against others before a backdrop of an overall long-range goal or a more immediate objective, even though he cannot find it possible to do that in monetary terms. And the research has stimulated other studies of various types, especially new economic approaches to impact analysis. Then, too, the urban transportation planning studies have opened up new approaches to determining community goals, understanding public attitudes, and exploring alternatives, such as, for example, the joint development concepts.

In considering the whole question of transportation and other community values—and "other" is my word again—we must do so in the broad perspective of the future. We cannot overlook that in many cases—and this is the rule rather than the exception—highways and other transportation facilities have been located, designed, and operated in harmony with their environment and have in fact enhanced it and the community at large. The fewer and far more spectacular cases that bring undesired effects, the ones that attract most widespread attention, are most often in presently built-up areas in which any substantial public improvement brings dislocation and environmental change. And here we come head-on into a confrontation between regional and local goals and objectives.

Conflict between goals is inevitable. Regional goals, such as better transportation for the whole community, come in conflict with local and neighborhood goals, which may perfectly well be simply left alone. Public goals often cannot avoid conflict with private goals. And even private or personal goals vary with the circumstance. A person is a road-user when he uses the road, but at other times he includes himself in that great amorphous group known as non-users. He rides with no compunction over a freeway that displaced some anonymous persons or businesses to get to a hearing to protest against a project that threatens to displace him. Trade-offs in values are a part of life, public and personal, and consciously or subconsciously we all constantly trade one value for another as life goes on. And trade-offs between transportation and other community values are and will be a part of life.

The transportation official needs help in responding to these differing, very real, and sometimes very personal values, goals, and objectives. He has too often, especially in the more widely publicized cases, been left pretty much by himself on the defensive. He needs and deserves help, and that is what the Federal Highway Administration seeks in his behalf from this Conference.

But we must recognize that the problems that now loom so prominent may not in the long run be the most important, however urgent their solution may be. With the completion of the Interstate System there will not be many more occasions to need to push highways through highly developed areas, particularly in or near the downtown areas. The challenge and great opportunity ahead will relate to the miles of freeway and other highways, and of other modes of transportation, in the developing areas surrounding our expanding metropolitan areas, great and small, where before the century's end we shall be building as much that is new as we have built to date since we became a nation. We must avoid today the works and policies that will simply repeat today's problems tomorrow. If we could understand and gain wide public acceptance of our goals for

living, and exercise sensible control of the use of the land to achieve those goals as our metropolitan areas grow, our problems in transportation to serve those goals would become simple indeed. In the long run the solution of "the transportation problem" might lie outside rather than within the field of transportation itself.

To conclude, I would like to return to Williamsburg, to a statement made by Kenneth Brooks, then Chairman of the Committee on Urban Design of the American Institute of Architects. As the conference came to an end, he wrote:

The engineers of this nation in this year of 1965 are to be highly commended for their creation of excellence in highway design. These are called standards. This search for high standards has been fulfilled.

It is the nature of the engineer to be satisfied with nothing short of perfection. Therefore, it can be predicted that the next mission of the engineering disciplines will be the search for excellence in highway urban design. They may well invite their colleagues of the environmental disciplines to help in the search.

Ken Brooks, wherever you are, you were right. We have sought out our colleagues.