

strategies developed in phase 2 for an actual demonstration.

While some attending the meeting had reservations about the ability of the plan to raise funds for transit, more felt it was a worthwhile concept and that the study should be pursued. Consequently, in September of that year a resolution introduced in the City Council by the mayor recommending endorsement of the first phase of the study was passed unanimously.

One month after the council vote, a newspaper article on the study appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle. The article was written with a very strong tone of mocking and skepticism about the study and even though most of the facts were accurately presented, they were buried under the journalist tone of "what are they trying to do to us now?" A lot of people in the community first heard of the study through this article which conjured up images of toll booths scattered around the city. Many people feared they would have to pay a high price for driving during all hours of the day and friends would have to pay to visit them. In other words, they felt that a basic right was being taken away.

News of the study spread rapidly through the community after the article appeared and, within days, the City Council started receiving calls from outraged citizens. At that time three major sources of opposition surfaced. First was the confused general public just described. Second, the business community was very upset because they were afraid pricing would damage the image of the city; even if one road was priced during morning peak hours they felt Berkeley would have the image of an armed camp.

A third source of opposition came from opponents of another transportation plan in Berkeley. This plan called for the construction of traffic diverters -- barricades which block through traffic -- as part of a plan to control traffic in residential areas. There had been one recent referendum in Berkeley to remove these traffic diverters. The referendum had been narrowly defeated, the diverters were still an issue, and a second referendum was scheduled for the upcoming local elections. The mayor and the members of the City Council who were most in favor of the pricing study also supported the traffic diverters. Consequently, opponents of the diverters realized the political gain that could be made by associating the two issues and, therefore, sought to increase confusion surrounding the pricing study. It appeared that most opposition to the study was expressed through phone calls to the City Council members. The City Council handled these calls in a variety of ways. One council member with the most interest in the study claimed an explanation of the study to those callers who misunderstood it had no impact at all because these callers were so irate that they refused to listen. This council member rather quickly abandoned all attempts to explain this study further. A second council member forgot about voting on the study and claimed that he had never heard of the whole thing; he of course could not answer any question about the study and this only made the callers more upset. A third council

member who received only a few calls said she was able to explain the concept and even got a few people to express mild support of the study.

The only vocal support for the study came from a neighborhood association in an area adjacent to one of the potential study areas. This group was well informed on Berkeley issues and was the only group that invited Tom Higgins, an Urban Institute consultant, to come and talk to them about the road pricing concept.

There appeared to be three major factors in Berkeley that led to the very abrupt halt of the pricing study. First, the study was misunderstood by the general public. Second, the City Council was surprised by the sudden negative reaction and didn't know how to handle it. All Council members were facing reelection in a couple of months. Many of those who supported road pricing were concerned about the upcoming referendum on the earlier transportation program they supported -- an issue of long standing in Berkeley. For these decision makers it was easy to sacrifice the road pricing study which has no long term history in the community. The third factor was that the study was being introduced by a non-local organization and, since many community activists were embroiled in another controversial transportation issue, the study did not have a chance to develop local grass roots support.

#### THE MADISON EXPERIENCE, Frank Spielberg

Madison is somewhat of an unusual community, probably not typical of the country. The current mayor is known, in part, for the fact that when he was first elected to the Common Council in Madison as a student of the University of Wisconsin, he was a member of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). The mayor he replaced subsequently ran for vice president on Lester Maddox's ticket, so there were some rather severe and abrupt changes in Madison from a very conservative to a very liberal government and there was a certain amount of local political conflict. But because of this atmosphere in Madison, there is also a history of a very active political process. The town is small enough so that people know each other. When we talked in our interviews about other transportation projects in Madison, we found that there was a long history of local involvement in projects which are now being implemented or have been implemented. Projects tended to go through a germination period that lasted anywhere from five to eight years with ideas - potentially controversial ideas - often being developed by neighborhood citizen groups. The project concepts were then able to drift up through the system. Very often someone from the neighborhood group would get elected to the City Council on the basis of the issue, thus providing a base and political structure to carry it through.

In response to an expression of interest by the city, we conducted a rather quick analysis of two road pricing and parking pricing concepts in the summer of 1976. The

report was basically an overview describing some of the impacts which a road pricing concept could have and some of the benefits. We recognized that this was just an overview and that we needed to do more studying in order to answer specific questions. When we finished that initial study, we made a presentation to a group that consisted of a transportation commission and the planning commission. In Madison, these commissions are made up of staff members from the technical agencies, political representatives, and also general citizens. At this point, we were not asking them to make any commitment to implementation of a pricing scheme but rather to go ahead with further studies. About a month later, the commissions met individually and voted not to continue with the study. They rejected it for a number of reasons which had to do with many of the same issues that were raised in Berkeley, such as the image of the city, questions of equity, concern about bus operating costs, and some comments the commission members had received from various constituents.

In September of 1977, approximately one year after presentation of our initial report, we interviewed a variety of people who had participated in the decision not to continue the study. We had some concern that going back a year later would be a problem -- that is, people would not recall very much about the concept. In fact, I think that it may have been beneficial to go back after a full year because most people had forgotten various details of the proposal but remembered the important things that influenced their decision to support or not to support further studies. The people we interviewed who had been involved in the decision to discontinue the study included political office holders, council men and women, the mayor, technical staff both at the city and county level, merchants, the vice president of a bank, and a number of other active citizens who did not hold official positions. We also interviewed representatives of the media (television, radio, and newspaper reporters) who had covered the study. One thing that I found interesting was that some of the media representatives refused to talk to us. They thought that this was not their role. However, those who did speak with us were quite honest and stated that when they heard about the concept they looked for what they considered to be the most newsworthy aspects. While the news media attempted to give a fairly accurate report of the concept, lead paragraphs often mentioned toll booths to get the attention of the people.

We found that the quality of information which the people received tended to vary quite a bit with the source of information they used. Those who talked directly to the city staff tended to get quite an accurate picture of what we were proposing. We had been concerned that, in part, the pricing demonstration study had been confused because the people could not understand what it was about. In fact, we found they turned it down because they did understand what it was about. We also found that some people did not obtain their information through standard sources. These people tended to ask their friends or use informal channels of communication which are strong and well

structured in Madison. Active citizens would meet politicians at cocktail parties or on the street and discuss the pricing concepts as well as other issues which were current at Madison. Much of the information about the pricing project was conveyed more through this informal network than in formal meetings. On the other hand, we also found that certain members of the community seemed to have been left out of this network. We got this perception very strongly from one of the major downtown merchants who felt that he did not know what was going on at City Hall and City Hall had not talked to him. These people who could have been very influential in swinging the decision regarding the pricing studies one way or the other were, in fact, outside of the system.

We also found that some of the local individuals were knowledgeable about the concepts of road pricing even before we started our studies. However, the people in the groups that conceivably would have supported the concept and would have derived some benefit, either in terms of reduced traffic in their neighborhood or better transit service, never took the steps that would have been necessary to build support. They never said "Hey we support that," nor did they try to get any community group to pass a resolution to say "We are in favor of that". Some of these people, when we talked to them a year later, indicated that they really wished the study had continued, that they now think it would have been good. Consequently, the opponents did not have to do very much in order to stop the studies; they only had to make a few phone calls to a local official or to an agency staff member to express their concerns - equity, the image of Madison, toll gates, etc. Almost any negative issue was enough to influence a negative vote. At any rate, our interviews indicated that support could have been built for the study

#### CONCLUDING COMMENTS ON THE BERKELEY AND MADISON EXPERIENCE, Tom Higgins

Speaking to the panelists for a moment, let me ask this question. Suppose I came into your city with some Washington consultants and analysts and said we would like to study three ways to ruin your economy and image, and then citizens and maybe certain interest groups and decision makers all interacted in such a way to throw us out. I wonder if any of us would see much sense analyzing variations in the citizen participation process which would have allowed us to stay and continue the study; or would you more likely say we got what we deserved? That is, the citizen participation process and the decision making process worked appropriately, didn't it? Isn't it because we believe our intended results would be good rather than disastrous for a city that we are so interested in citizen participation?

I wonder also if some of you in the audience today are probably saying "We got what we deserved in the road pricing study". Maybe the economists aren't, but some of the citizen participation types of people probably are. It's too bad, you might say, that