

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

the media wasn't precisely right in portraying what we were doing, that supportive citizens were not as active as the opponents, that other issues intervened, that certain parts of the concept were not heard, and that we didn't have the opportunity for more communications (particularly with the grass roots groups). But life isn't always fair - we have that now on authority - we got the road pricing concept across pretty well, as Frank was saying, so aren't we really interested in citizen participation only because we didn't get the outcome that we wanted?

I think that's precisely right. I'm convinced that we would not be so interested in citizen participation and we wouldn't be having this presentation here this morning if the outcome had been to bring something like the road pricing demonstration we hoped for. In fact, the road pricing study team knows this because we now spend more time looking at more palatable variations of the road pricing idea than we spend thinking about citizen participation information channels and the like. However, I also want to say I don't think this means we haven't learned anything about citizen participation. I would bet many of you in the audience have been in a situation of pressing for politically unpopular concepts and have drawn some good lessons about citizen participation as a result. I would argue any analyst worth his or her salt will find an idea he or she believes might save some part of the world and will want to know about ways to ensure that it gets its best chance at generating support and its best chance of being tried. So, from the admitted position of someone trying to see a particular transportation concept tried, I've drawn five seemingly simple ideas for discussion -- ideas I wish we had tuned into earlier in our work with the cities. I hope they might help anyone interested in citizen participation, because you want to see certain controversial and promising ideas implemented whether they are your ideas, the ideas of citizen groups, economists, or otherwise. Hopefully, the lessons apply whether you are working from the top down through governmental agencies, as we tended to do, or from the bottom up at the community level. A case where the lesson may not apply is where your particular idea is not controversial.

Lessons Learned

First Lesson: Discuss the concept with decision makers, citizens' group representatives, and interest group leaders on a one to one basis and get their reaction before holding larger meetings to explain the concept. I think we learned that large meetings risk a certain amount of misunderstanding and don't necessarily elicit the most frank responses from public figures. This step would give you the first outline of a kind of "map" that tells you where different actors and interests stand and whether or not it is worth going ahead.

Second Lesson: This one was taught us directly by a very savvy decision maker in Madison. Ask people you know in the community to name media representatives who are good at the job of communicating potentially

controversial ideas. Then seek out the best people before any large meetings and discuss the concept with them and answer questions. The media obviously can't and won't be co-opted, but trying to get the story as straight as possible is worth some effort.

Third Lesson: Be sure you have got a good "lightning rod person". In our case where we were working with cities to study and implement the concept, we needed someone to answer the citizens' questions, set up informational meetings, perhaps answer a hot line, and prepare our newsletters. Washington analysts can't do this unless an office is set up on site. Local consultants trying to play this lightning rod role find that they can get burned doing it. The citizens see the consultant coming to represent the cities' viewpoints and simply cuts him or her off as soon as the heat is on. I don't know if that reaction of the city is more or less ethical than the consultant himself trying to play the lightning rod role. Whatever the case, there is a risk that the consultant will appear to speak with the city. Perhaps in our case planning funds should have been available for this lightning rod-type person to be within the city structure.

Fourth Lesson: Be sure that the concept itself is capable of variation. Whether your concept is likely to generate heat, resistance, or conflict, you need to be open to making changes within it, both for your sake and for the sake of the area you are in (though I once couldn't imagine how our sacred road pricing concept could be altered). We have now spent a considerable amount of time trying to think about variations on the theme, thanks to the citizens of Berkeley and Madison.

Fifth Lesson: Watch more than just the citizen participation and the transportation literature when you are thinking about citizen participation. I would suggest particularly that you look at policy analysis journals like Public Interest and Policy Analysis. These journals are giving more attention to frustrated studies and demonstration attempts. These cases come from health, education, housing and other issue areas. There are very good lessons in this literature about implementation and about the role of citizen participation in implementation. There is some particularly good material on why Washington-based ideas flounder at the local level. I'm thinking of a recent article in the Public Interest on educational vouchers, where one could have taken the word "road pricing" and inserted it for "educational vouchers" and come up with our particular story.

A POLITICAL SCIENTIST'S COMMENTARY ON THE BERKELEY/MADISON EXPERIENCE, Arnold M. Howitt

We confront a troublesome dilemma. For years some transportation economists and planners have advocated the use of pricing schemes to allocate road space more rationally in congested urban areas. Yet, despite the enthusiasm reflected in professional journals and conference sessions, they have been deeply disappointed that these schemes have not been implemented.