

surprisingly positive experience with a state-required CAC. Although its members are appointed, it is reasonably representative of the population served and has contributed to SEPTA's recent gains in service quality.

Eight important "lessons learned" are identified in Alan Wulkan and Julie Hoover's paper describing how Austin's hard-working CAC and subcommittees helped develop a transit service plan and win voter passage of a measure creating a regional transit authority and a one-cent sales tax totally dedicated to transit. Finally, Diana Scott describes a very successful "rider's advisory council" in Fort Wayne where citizens worked constructively both to plan and gain acceptance for major route changes, and to increase transit ridership generally through an interesting variety of programs and activities.

Wendell Cox next describes three different CACs in the Los Angeles area, all focused on one specific issue and all established on a temporary, ad hoc basis. In each, a small group of committee people developed a substantial understanding of the technical constraints and opportunities, mobilized local political support, and followed the issue through the appropriate public agencies. Concluding the session is a description by Al Gallo of Toronto's experience with a variation of the CAC -- focus groups.

INTRODUCTION Marilyn Skolnick Moderator, Port Authority of Allegheny County Board of Directors.

After many years of hard work on the part of many citizen activists, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) in 1981 adopted guidelines on Citizen Participation in Local Transportation Planning. These guidelines were preceded by the adoption of DOT's Consumer Program. These two programs made it possible for citizens to become directly involved in every aspect of transportation, primarily because U.S. DOT encouraged agencies to provide opportunities for them to do so.

With a changed administration came a change of philosophy, including the idea that less government was a better government, and the thought that the guidelines for citizen participation in local transportation were not necessary. As a result they were immediately rescinded.

There are, as a result, few if any references to citizen participation in the few regulations that have come forth from U.S. DOT since then.

A cloud was cast over the citizen participation movement. Had the concept that evolved over years of hard work come to a screeching halt? Had the entire concept of citizen participation come and gone, even before it could be tested?

The reported death was premature. It is hard to kill a valid process. Citizen participation is alive and well, but has surfaced in many different ways.

Our speakers will address citizen participation and their experience with it as staff members. You will note that the forms of participation are as varied as the agencies they advise.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE AMERICAN FEDERAL SYSTEM, by Dr. Bruce D. McDowell, Senior Analyst, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

The American federal system of government is based fundamentally, but not exclusively, upon the concept of representative democracy. That is, we generally elect our leaders and then expect them to govern.

However, there are two significant departures from this general concept. The first is that we reserve certain important opportunities for direct democracy: referendum, initiative, and recall. The second is that we increasingly have developed formalized methods of influencing the actions of our elected representatives and the administrators who work for them, in between elections. It is this latter set of continuing influence mechanisms that is generally referred to as "citizen participation."

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) prefers to encompass all the electoral options, and the formal influence techniques, and even the more informal or outside-the-system influences, in its definition of citizen participation. Using this expanded definition in its 1978 study of citizen participation, 1/ ACIR identified 31 different means by which citizens get involved with their governments, and eight different purposes for this involvement. Some of the purposes are strictly informational, while others actively support and constructively seek to improve governmental activities, and still others resist or attempt to overthrow current directions in government activities. Figure 1 lists the 31 forms of citizen participation identified by ACIR.