

pliers act so as to transfer from the less affluent to the well-to-do. This is hardly in line with general social goals. But charging the true costs of parking would probably disadvantage downtown or central city interests, which are in a poor position to discourage the shopper or employer. The regulation of private company or establishment parking is a new idea, and its acceptability is not yet tested.

The extensive public waterways improvement program has already been noted as an area of subsidy. The report of the National Water Commission recognized the unreasonableness of the free provision of costly waterway improvements to users and its detrimental effect on competing carriers—especially railroads. Many public ports are subsidized by local governments to achieve assumed economic benefits.

Discussion of Resource Paper

Ralph D. Johnson, Roy Jorgensen Associates, Inc.

The main problem in discussing transportation policy planning is that the word "policy" signifies different things to different people. The dictionary definitions of the word are far too general to give it real management sense.

To exemplify, consider 2 places on a map. One represents the place we want to get to, the other represents the place where we are. Now, some people say we can have a policy that we are going to try to get to the other place. Thus, the President enunciates a policy to make the nation self-sufficient in energy production within 10 years or a policy to revitalize railroads and improve the quality of urban transportation. These policies are very much like goals or objectives. In a different manner, some people view policies as a step along the way—a policy to underwrite transit through subsidy grants. Many people have not thought to differentiate between these 2 kinds of policy, and perhaps that is not important.

What is important is the way policy or policies affect us. In fact, policy constitutes the basic framework under which we try to carry out the responsibilities entrusted to us. We are, therefore, concerned as to whether policies are good or poor.

Do we have any influence on whether policies are good or bad? At the state level, policies are made largely by the governor and the legislature; at the national level, by the President and the Congress. How do they derive them? In most cases, policies are recommended by some special advisors employed by them, perhaps consultants; the state transportation agency, or some other state agency or office. Federal agencies that recommend policies to the President and Congress tend to be influenced by what is being done by state and local agencies. State and local transportation agencies, therefore, should try to create—through recommendations—the framework of policy they want to govern their operations.

What is a good policy? Basically, good policy is needed policy. First, we need policy to keep our activities directed toward the goals and objectives the governor and legislature want pursued. Second, we need policy to tell us what the governor and legislature want from us. Third, we need policy to establish courses of action—program action and management action—that we should take in the pursuit of objectives.

Good policy is also worthwhile. We want to get to the other place on the map, and it is worthwhile to get there. That is policy number one. We do not know exactly where the place is, but we think it's northeast. So we decide to take off in a northeasterly direction. That is policy number 2. We have no idea how far it is, but we know we will need a certain amount of money each day and arrange to have that sent. That is policy number 3. We discover the place we are trying to get to is really due north, and, even though we did not get there, we are at least closer than we were before.

How many government policies are formulated in just about that way? If judgment is reasonably good, we will be closer than we were. If judgment is bad, we have wasted

our time and money.

There are many transportation policies, proposed and approved, national and state. A few examples are policies to provide grants to transit for equipment and other capital acquisitions, policies to subsidize transit, policies to complete the Interstate system, policies to distribute discretionary funds to cities, and policies to provide loans to railroads. For how many of these is the accomplishment—the place we are going to get to—clearly established?

It is possible to develop positive plans that will go a long way toward solving urban transportation problems. For example, some European cities control traffic downtown by restricting available parking. What about a plan that would

1. During a period of 5 or 6 years, reduce available parking downtown to the amount that would produce a reasonable traffic load on the streets;
2. During the same period, construct outlying parking lots suitably dispersed around the urban area to provide for the amount of parking eliminated downtown; and
3. As the parking lots are constructed, establish suitable transit service to connect them to the city center?

Of course, details would need to be worked out, and phasing would have to be carefully done. Car pools could be given certain privileges. Bus express lanes and reserved curb lanes could play their part.

If such a plan were adopted, control policies with respect to things such as parking and transit service and fiscal policies would be needed. If it were not adopted, perhaps the environmental impacts would not have been worked out well enough to make a good case to the public. Or perhaps there would have been too much political opposition. Or, more than likely, the situation deserves a better plan.

Although policies for stopgap measures may be necessary before definitive plans are worked out, policies that are not based on definite plans may not be headed in the right direction and may waste money.

Fortunately, despite recent recommendations to the contrary, it is practical for a transportation agency to develop fairly extensive long-range plans and to have them adopted. Such plans should be reasonable, in terms of current fund provisions and the existing tax situation, but not necessarily limited by projected revenues. Not all good plans are adopted. But many that have not been adopted have definite deficiencies. Among these are failure to thoroughly analyze environmental and economic impacts and to justify the plans by anticipated beneficial impacts; failure to detail the plans sufficiently; failure to be realistic in terms of funding possibilities; and failure to be consistent from one presentation to another. Examples of plans that have been accepted and whose target objectives—good or bad—have been largely achieved or are likely to be achieved are the Interstate system, supplemental freeway systems in some states, and rail transit systems in some cities.

The following is a recommended framework as it might be applied to policies on statewide transportation planning.

Basic Policy

Statewide transportation planning will establish long-range systems and corridor development plans that are designed to

1. Serve the states' goals and objectives for economic growth, energy conservation, land use, safety, and preservation, enhancement, and enjoyment of the environment
2. Provide optimization of the service provided by all modes of transportation consistent with efficiency, cost effectiveness, environmental protection, and enhancement of quality of life for all citizens, and
3. Support national transportation goals and objectives

Policy on Systems Planning

All transportation agencies in the state shall

1. Develop long-range transportation plans for a period of not less than 10 years,
2. Formulate such plans to show the target accomplishments toward which current capital expenditures will be directed,
3. Estimate maintenance and operating expenditure requirements for the proposed period of the plans,
4. Show the relation of recommended expenditure provisions to projections of revenues in accordance with traditional sources and trends,
5. Describe and show values pertaining to the economic and environmental impacts of systems and systems configurations as related to environmental categories and situations that will be affected by the plans or segments of them,
6. Exchange plan outlines so that (a) the state plan is provided to the governor, the legislature, and all counties and cities, (b) the county plans are provided to all cities in the county, the state transportation agency, and adjacent counties, and (c) the city or urban plans are provided to the state and affected counties,
7. Provide for continual dynamic development of the plans with a minimum update of every 2 years,
8. Notify the agencies to whom plans are distributed of changes as these occur or in accordance with the 2-year update schedule, and
9. Recommend priorities for development of the systems

Policy on Corridor or Route Planning

Based on priorities developed in the systems plan, the transportation agencies shall

1. Analyze costs, economic effects, and environmental impacts of alternative service concepts within corridors to the degree necessary to establish a fully supportable corridor plan from the standpoint of costs, benefits, and environmental impacts,
2. Compare concepts utilizing other corridors or no corridors where applicable,
3. Select and fully document corridor plans from the standpoints of service effectiveness, social benefits, cost-effectiveness, economic impacts, and other environmental impacts,
4. Consult, during the analytical phases, with government and private agencies having responsibilities related to the potential impacts of the corridor development,
5. Conduct meetings at appropriate stages in the development of corridor plans with local officials, special interest groups, and the affected public, and
6. Develop environmental impact statements on the basis of documented decisions arrived at during the corridor planning process.