



WORKSHOP 4: STATE AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Salvatore J. Bellomo, M. F. Brennan, Alan G. Bullen, Arne Gausmann, Irving Hand, Lawrence J. Harman, Edgar Horwood, Garred P. Jones, Hal Maggied, Christa Marden, Robert Marden, Patrick J. McCue, Joanne McGowan, George Raymond, Phil Robers, Thomas H. Roberts, Nat Simons, Jr., Nicholas P. Thomas, John Walker, Theodore G. Weigle, Neil H. Wilson

Report

Irving Hand, Pennsylvania State University, chairman

Workshop 4 divided its members into 3 task forces to discuss the issues assigned to it. Summaries of these discussions follow. The 3 groups came together at the conference for a final session to present their reports and to agree on research recommendations, which are given earlier in this report.

OBJECTIVES

To identify the current strategies being developed and used in the various states to address the linkages between statewide transportation planning and comprehensive development planning at the state and regional levels (comprehensive development planning is defined to include physical, economic, social, and political considerations in state development policies and plans).

To recommend improvements in the overall conduct of both statewide transportation planning and comprehensive development planning at the state and regional levels.

To develop a recommended program of research or policy development related to statewide transportation planning and comprehensive development planning.

ISSUES

What are the current capabilities of the various states in formulating statewide comprehensive development policies and plans, particularly with reference to land use?

What are the current attitudes of governors, governors' offices, and legislatures toward statewide comprehensive development planning and toward statewide comprehensive transportation planning and the implementation of plans?

How important is transportation to development? What is the role and impact of transportation development in stimulating economic growth and development? How can transportation development be formulated, planned, and programmed to help shape and gain desired economic development?

What are the essential elements in statewide comprehensive development policies and plans?

What should the role of the state be in the formulation of regional development policies and plans? Is a state development policy and plan nothing more than a composite of regional development policies and plans? In view of the foregoing, what should the state-regional organizational relation be?

Can effective land use controls be established at the state level? At the regional level? (Particular attention should be directed to the current discussion on national land use policy legislation, the reallocation of power dealing with land use regulation, and the nature and feasibility of specific land use controls at significant transportation points, such as airports, interchanges, and coastal and off-shore developments.)

What is the role of the private sector in statewide transportation planning and in comprehensive development planning? How might these considerations best be taken into account?

How can the relation of and coordination between statewide transportation planning and comprehensive development planning be strengthened and made more effective?

TASK FORCE 1

Nat Simons, Jr., Ohio Department of Transportation

Task Force 1 was asked to list the issues and problems of linkage between statewide transportation planning and comprehensive development planning, define the organizational concepts needed to provide linkage, identify deficiencies related to issues and organizations, and evaluate current methods of implementing linkage solutions.

The basis of comprehensive planning is the same as that for land use or transportation planning. The same factors are analyzed: the economy, population growth and migration, labor force participation, industrial change, and social problems. Although each type of planning uses the basic information for alternate purposes, there are resulting policies expressed in the base information.

There is a lack of linkage between comprehensive planning and transportation planning. That lack leads to short-term program plans rather than longer term, policy-oriented planning. This is manifest in a series of dichotomies, e.g., budget decisions instead of policy planning, executive staffing capability without a countervailing capability in the legislature, and decision-making without executive or legislative arbitration.

There are 2 deficiencies.

1. Long-range comprehensive policy-oriented planning does not exist as an identifiable entity in most states. It requires a distinct strategy, an identifiable constituency, specific goals and objectives, and a system of countervailing power among governmental branches.

2. In transportation there is only implied state policy that derives mainly from the federal budget allocations. Therefore, transportation planning is mainly programmatic.

With the current method, control through budget allocations for planning is developed by federal transportation agencies and funneled through the states to local agencies. Therefore, the broad federal policy is implemented by state transportation program planning.

Problems arise because of the nature of local and state governments. part-time legislative bodies, limited staff capabilities, administrative agencies that often work directly through the legislature rather than support the executive, administrative departmental plans that are often unrelated to one another, and significant lack of cooperation among governmental branches at local and state levels.

Section 112 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 provides a breakthrough. The transportation agency used as the driving force now makes it possible to obtain greater involvement of the governor with substate agencies. Also, links from comprehensive planning functions other than transportation can be obtained through implementation of the unified work program process. Thus, transportation planning will become more comprehensive.

Linkage assumes a series of relations which must now be explicitly stated, between (a) comprehensive planning and transportation planning, (b) programs and policies, and (c) budgets (financial allocations) and alternative systems requirements. The explicit expression of processes of interaction will permit more accurate evaluation of policies and programs as these factors change.

Assuming that there exists a lack of understanding of the processes of comprehensive planning, we should study the process, experiment more with the process within the framework of existing governmental institutions, and experiment with variations of the process and institutions.

The focal point for central policy is the federal government, which allocates funds to states and local governments for comprehensive planning. Therefore, each governor or legislature must proceed to tie planning processes together functionally.

TASK FORCE 2

Thomas H. Roberts, Atlanta Regional Commission

Task Force 2 discussed the following list of issues (problems) relating to state and

regional transportation and comprehensive development planning. Following each issue is a statement of institutional or operational gaps (needs) associated with that issue.

1. There is no system of land use controls comparable to the present (admittedly imperfect) transportation implementation system.

There is a need to define and implement statewide and regional roles in land use controls. These should consist of a selective and appropriate mix of the following land use control functions at various levels: land acquisition, zoning and related controls, mandatory referral with override or reversal powers, and mandatory referral for advice and comment (such as the A-95 review).

2. Transportation systems should be used as a shaper of development as well as a server of travel needs. This has 2 aspects: It should be provided to shape desired development and withheld to deter undesired development.

There is a need for larger explicit statewide and substate contexts within which to make transportation decisions.

3. There is a lack of interstate (and substate) coordination (i.e., "horizontal" jurisdictional conflicts).

There is a need for federal support and mandate for interstate (and substate) planning and coordination.

4. There is a conflict between "top-down" and "bottom-up" decision-making processes (i.e., "vertical" jurisdictional conflicts), and both should be accommodated.

5. There is a lack of an adequate evaluation framework for transportation decisions. The need is to find various ways, such as special task forces, to provide evaluation capability. The Boston Transportation Planning Review is one example.

6. It is not clear whether the state role should involve policies, plans, or programming.

The state needs at least to provide (a) a policy framework within which plans can be made and (b) priority programming to guide and coordinate state expenditures. The state may not need to make the plans per se.

7. It is not clear who makes what decisions. There are too many people who can veto and not enough who can implement.

The need is to make decision-making powers less fragmented.

8. There is a lack of advance awareness or acceptance of the consequences of current action or inaction on the part of the public and, therefore, often on the part of the public's elected representatives. This is a dilemma or "tension" resulting from short-term office tenure (which is a necessary consequence of democratic accountability) versus long-term effects.

9. How should we cope with capacity-demand dilemmas, e.g., in situations where capacity cannot be provided to meet demand or where various capacities cannot be satisfied compatibly?

There is an institutional void here. It is politically difficult to accept demand constraints.

10. How can we better use fiscal and regulatory choices along with physical system choices to achieve desired results?

Institutions for doing this are too fragmented or in some cases absent. The need is to combine or provide these functions where appropriate.

11. How can state transportation planners and decision-makers relate to the state air quality control process?

There is need for a federal mandate for cooperation among state agencies and between state and substate agencies.

12. How can state transportation planners and decision-makers relate to state energy policy implementation processes?

The need is the same as that for issue 11.

13. There is lacking a comparable environmental-impact-statement process for all public and private development, not just for public federal-aid systems and projects.

The need is to explore various ways for states to do this. The California act is one example.

TASK FORCE 3

George Raymond, Raymond, Parish, and Pine, Inc.

Task Force 3 discussions focused on 3 questions.

1. Can effective land use controls be established at the state level? At the regional level?

Without trying to anticipate how effective controls established at the state level may be, if we consider the gross ineffectiveness of the present system, there is no question that more effective controls can be so established.

The chief ingredient in effectiveness is the power to implement plans and enforce controls. If the power is lodged at state and substate levels, care must be taken to ensure that plans relate to local concerns and that any override power will be limited to matters of more than local concern. One model might be local adoption of locally devised plans and corresponding land use controls, giving the state or substate level authority to ensure that such plans and controls are consistent with statewide objectives.

National land use policy legislation is the most significant tool now on the horizon whereby the capability and capacity of states to develop and administer a more effective land use planning and regulatory system might be enhanced.

A land use control system at the state level could include effective controls at significant transportation points, such as airports, interchanges, and coastal and offshore developments. Controls would vary with the nature of the area in which such transportation points are located (e.g., developed versus rural) and, for maximum effectiveness, would have to be established at the earliest possible time after the decision to establish the particular transportation facility.

Future requirements for coordination of areawide transportation planning with area-wide land use and other aspects of comprehensive planning should recognize the ineffectiveness of continued reliance on powerless planning structures.

Given the fears generated by efforts to place land use controls at any level higher than the local level and the consequent resistance to the establishment of any effective system, the Transportation Research Board might consider (a) documenting effects and impacts of laws recently enacted in advanced states such as Vermont, Florida, and Oregon; and (b) establishing a center to monitor further developments in this field and assess the effectiveness of different approaches. Both efforts would greatly assist states in moving in the direction of establishing effective land use planning and control systems.

Once a statewide system is established, federal and federally assisted actions should not work against it. The Transportation Research Board might inventory all federal actions that are now having land use impacts in the states preparatory to recommending a system whereby they could be coordinated with the states' efforts.

To be effective, a state land use regulation system must be directive as well as protective.

Impediments to the rationalization of land use patterns, such as continued reliance on the property tax, must be removed. Useful models are the Hawaii state-supported education system and the Twin Cities metropolitan tax-sharing system.

2. What is the role of the private sector in statewide transportation planning?

Since the private sector makes up a major portion of the comprehensive statewide transportation system, it cannot be left out of the transportation planning process. The Transportation Research Board might develop an inventory of the types of information that statewide transportation planning agencies would need regarding the private sector in order to be able to develop an integrated transportation plan.

Competing interests of the several segments of the private sector of the transportation system affect the public interest and are therefore of major public concern. Such issues should be resolved as part of statewide transportation planning, and the power to implement the resulting decisions must be focused at the appropriate level.

There was a feeling that part of the problem arises from the fact that the several segments of the private sector are subject to regulation by different agencies. Tentative suggestions were made regarding centralization of all transportation regulatory

functions and possibly lodging all transportation-related regulatory functions in the state transportation department.

3. How can the relation of and coordination between statewide transportation and comprehensive development planning be strengthened and made more effective?

Comprehensive development planning, characterized as a deliberate, purposeful, internally consistent activity and accompanied by the power to implement the resulting plans, is nonexistent. Consequently, it is difficult to conceive of linkages and improved coordination between it and statewide transportation planning. Comprehensive land use planning, designed to achieve accepted social, economic, and environmental objectives, can be established in the reasonably near future. The level of funding contemplated in the national land use policy and planning assistance act would, for the first time, bring the level of support of at least this aspect of comprehensive planning closer to past support of functional planning.

If comprehensive land use planning is established on a statewide level, transportation planning should fit in with it rather than continue to be an independent determinant of land use distribution patterns.

Resource Paper

Nicholas P. Thomas and Jeffrey J. Orum,
Linton, Miels and Coston, Inc.

A resource paper could be written on each of the issues assigned to Workshop 4. All that this particular paper can accomplish is to help place statewide transportation planning in perspective given current intergovernmental trends and patterns affecting statewide comprehensive planning, regionalism, and regional structure.

Since universal agreement has not been reached as to precisely what terms and definitions should be used to describe the various aspects and levels of planning, some basic definitions must be set forth to facilitate communication.

1. Regionalism. The use of processes and systems by our 3 tiers of general-purpose government to directly affect persons, the economy, and the natural and man-built environments within geographical areas. Efforts of the federal government to bring the full force and effect of numerous policies and programs to bear on Appalachia to stimulate social and economic progress offer one example. Another example is the action taken by a state legislature a few years ago that altered state general revenue sharing to local governments by changing the distribution formulas to reflect factors such as population and tax effort. This change in process was aimed at eliminating community tax islands and reducing fiscal disparities between central cities and suburban communities as well as between multicounty urban and rural substate districts.

One of the major characteristics of regionalism is a conscious attempt on the part of one or more governments to deal with equity questions. The Minnesota legislature, for example, granted authority in 1970 to a regional organization to collect a significant portion of the taxes paid by new commercial and industrial enterprises anywhere within the region. These taxes are to be reapportioned and allocated to local governments. This redistribution process is intended to provide imbalanced fiscal capacity-fiscal equity communities with what might be termed "regional general fund revenue." The process also represents an attempt to reduce economic competition among communities not consistent with orderly regional development.

2. Regions. Geographical areas used by our 3 tiers of general-purpose government to deal with problems and realize opportunities. National regions are groupings of states by the federal government. Examples include the 13-state Appalachian Region