

identification of goals and measurable objectives for individual units in the department, which, hopefully, will increase public support and understanding of the department's operation, achieve common direction within the department, and allow us to manage performance and products rather than activities. The successful implementation of the system requires intensive collection of information to support analysis of goals achievement. Some typical goals recently adopted for FY 1979-1980 by the highway division within the department include the following:

1. Minimize the degradation of the highway systems;
2. Reduce maintenance costs per kilometer by a certain predetermined percentage;
3. Reduce transportation-related accidents, injuries, and fatalities by a predetermined percentage;
4. Use more energy-conserving construction and maintenance methods and materials and reduce motor fuel consumed per hour worked;
5. Increase the number of high-occupancy vehicles on the highway system;
6. Improve travel efficiency by reducing travel time between predetermined major community points; and

7. Reduce the period of time that the urban freeway system operates at less-than-tolerable levels of service.

It is evident that the system will be extremely data-hungry and will require the active and constructive participation of the planners in terms of providing the surveillance and data that undergird the measurement of objectives.

#### CONCLUSION

The planner's role in a transportation agency is probably more essential now than it has ever been before, but the function of a planner must be more sharply defined. In summary, it is to address specific issues and problem areas, to evaluate different policy options, to identify how existing and reasonably anticipated revenues can best be invested, and to help measure the effectiveness of the program.

#### REFERENCE

1. Issues in Statewide Transportation Planning. TRB, Special Rept. 146, 1974, 262 pp.

---

# Transportation Planning and Programming: A Legislator's Perspective

*Louis R. Nickinello, Massachusetts House of Representatives, Natick*

Legislators are people who are elected to represent their respective communities and who have different interests and different concerns. Sometimes these concerns are reflective of personal concerns; most of the time, they are reflective of the people who sent us to our respective state capitals. Trying to reflect those concerns through one collective voice is very often difficult at best. Trying to develop an expertise in fields that we heretofore knew nothing about is difficult at best, as is listening to the bureaucrats, as we legislators like to call them, and to the planners with expertise in a particular field.

These days, it seems, politicians are not held in great respect. But some of us still think that it is pretty good to be a politician—a legislator—and we are fighting to upgrade our image in the people's minds. Even people such as yourselves—planners, government officials, and so forth—see us as obstacles to overcome.

Most legislators know what people think about the legislative process—good and bad. We also know that there is an education process going on that, until now, has been one-sided and that is the point of my talk to you. We in the legislature resent you, whether you are bureaucrats or planners, because you do not educate us.

You do not plug us in to the planning process before the process begins. You go to the public sector, to the citizens, but not to us.

Our beef as legislators is that we feel very much left out of the planning and decision-making processes, especially since the U.S. Congress wants to reach down to the local level to deal with the local community about transportation matters. As a result, the state and its legislators are being bypassed. Even when Congress speaks of state government, it is interpreted to refer only to the governor. When the governor says "yes," it is what state government is saying, regardless of whether the legislature in that state knows what is happening. However, it is the legislative branch that is later told it has to come up with money, because the governor of the state has obligated the legislature to do so.

Now, I ask, how would any of you feel after being placed constantly in that position?

I take great pride in being able to say that I am a partner in government with the people who elect me and that I have a right to be educated about and be a part of the process of planning. Thus, I am dismayed that the

federal government constantly bypasses state legislative bodies when it requires metropolitan planning organizations at the local level, when Congress does not recognize our rights and responsibilities on behalf of the people we represent, and when our function as a sounding board of the public is ignored.

Give us the tools to help do the job of planning in our respective states. Massachusetts is not like Arizona, and standards for Washington will not apply equally across the country.

State legislative bodies want to act in partnership with the federal government. It should establish the guidelines for us but should allow us to use our resources to follow through on the mandates we have been demanding on behalf of the general public of this country. Unless we change the current outlook, we are never going to get anything done.

And with that in mind, I would like to urge you to involve us earlier in the planning process, not after the fact when all planning has been done and you just want us to allocate funds. Unless this occurs, every state in this country through its legislative process will refuse to appropriate and authorize spending for the necessary things. Why? Because it is getting harder and harder to convince the public at large to support those expenditures, even from dedicated funds like the highway funds. So, I appeal to all of you to go back to your respective states and educate your legislators. Help your legislators to do the work necessary to serve as a partner in government.

*This report was extracted from remarks made by L. Nickinello at the conference.*

## Energy, Regions, and Highway Finance

*Irving Hoch, Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.*

This paper considers the impact of increased energy prices on the distribution of U.S. economic activity and population. It then draws some implications for highway finance.

The paper is organized into three main sections. The first is entitled World View: International and National Patterns because it not only presents and considers some of the major indicators on the world and national energy economy but also makes my particular policy stance evident. The section primarily provides background information and furnishes necessary underpinning to arguments and interpretations in the rest of the paper. The second section, Energy and Population Distribution, contains the core of the paper. It focuses on both production and consumption responses to higher energy prices and how these are traced out geographically. The geographic focus involves both (a) state and region and (b) local settlement. My thesis is that higher energy prices are likely to intensify the shift to the sunbelt, from both the production and the consumption side, including impacts on both the household consumer and the industry. The evidence that I have developed here tends to support my thesis. I also consider local impacts, and here the patterns do not seem so clear-cut; however, I believe it likely that higher energy prices will cause higher urban densities and will intensify the shift from larger to smaller places. The third section draws some implications for state transportation and focuses on state highway finance.

A basic message throughout is that much of our energy trouble is self-inflicted because of our reluctance to allow domestic prices to rise to world levels. OPEC sets oil prices and, in effect, sets all energy prices

because an oil price increase is quickly translated into energy price increases across the board. In part, the OPEC price increase may well have reflected changed conditions. Because of increased worldwide automobile ownership and environmental regulations that fell heavily on energy production, some energy price increases would likely have occurred even in a competitive market. It is also possible that multinational oil companies pumped OPEC oil at a faster rate than was economical—if they perceived the risk of nationalization or expropriation of their holdings. Despite these qualifications, it seems clear that most of the OPEC price increase indeed involves the action of a cartel. Now, the way to break a cartel is by increased production, but domestic energy price controls set below market price do the opposite. Because higher prices are perceived as unfair, we end up by helping OPEC and hurting ourselves. If we produced no energy and if we believed that higher prices were unfair and set lower domestic prices by controls, OPEC would still demand payment at its price; the lower domestic prices could only be paid for by subsidies and, behind those subsidies, by taxes. Moreover, consumers would not get the signal to consume less. Because we produce energy, we can force U.S. producers to do so at the lower, "fair" price for a while. But eventually those low prices tend to dry up domestic supplies, and we are forced, more and more, to rely on OPEC.

Our reluctance to raise prices seems to carry over into a reluctance to raise taxes and, in particular, to raise highway motor fuel taxes. Real expenditures on highways have fallen in most states, and the disinvestment that seems a likely consequence appears to me to