

come to a gridlocked circumstance. So think about the ways in which, as you look at the statewide planning process, we get these potential gridlock components and don't let them come to gridlock. Focus on process, a process that allows partners to get involved, to find solutions before they come to a point of gridlock.

My last thought could be called the ISTE A elephant. Some of you may remember this poem, *The Blind Man and the Elephant*, from someplace back in your childhood. I will read just a little bit of it. "It was six men of Indostan, to learning much inclined, who went to see the elephant though all of them were blind, that each by observation might satisfy his mind. The first approached the elephant and happened to fall against his broad and sturdy side and at once began to bawl, God Bless me, but the elephant is very much like a wall." Well, it goes on but the last two verses of this rather long doggerel I think are useful. "And so these men of Indostan disputed loud and long, each in his own opinion exceedingly stiff and strong, though each was partly in the right and all were in the wrong. So often theologic wars or disputants utter ignorance of what each other

means and prayed about an elephant not one of them has seen."

It seems to me that ISTE A is in fact kind of an elephant and we are struggling as partially blind men and women to define this thing. I would like us not to jump to conclusions. Just because you feel this tail, don't conclude that ISTE A is a rope. ISTE A is a very complex thing and it has to be defined with care and attention over some number of months. It's happening. The good news is that again people like Duane Berentson here in Washington, people like Hal Kasoff back in Maryland and Larry Dahms in San Francisco, and others are finding creative ways to define what this legislation can do to advance things in which you're interested. ISTE A has that potential. Don't settle on an ISTE A that is nothing more than a rope, when in fact it has so much potential.

If we use it creatively, you can help us move America into the next century and that's what it's all about. We want to be able to move America to jobs, to homes, to market, etc. That's the intention of the Surface Transportation Legislation.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND DECISION MAKING: A LOCAL PERSPECTIVE

James Street, Seattle City Council

In addition to being a member of the City Council, I'm President of the Puget Sound Regional Council which is the planning agency, the MPO, for the four counties that circle Seattle. And I'm a member of the King County Growth Management Planning Council which is a group that's been brought together to develop for the first time in the history of the State of Washington county-wide policies that have to be consistent with all of the local comprehensive plans.

You've arrived in our city in what I consider, and I think most of the people who live in the State of Washington consider, to be revolutionary times. Revolutionary in terms of transportation planning, and certainly what's happened at the federal level has contributed in a major way, and also revolutionary, and perhaps even more revolutionary, in terms of growth management. We've had in the last several years legislation that has dramatically transformed the way we plan, the way we work together in this state, and I think it really does fit into sort of the revolutionary category.

I've had in my household in the last month several visitors from Russia who were here as part of an

exchange program. And as I thought about preparing these remarks for this morning, I couldn't help comparing what they described in terms of the revolution and/or counter revolution going on in Russia and what may or may not evolve as we look at the revolutions going on in transportation planning, decision making, and growth management in Seattle and in the United States. After all, if you look at some of the things that happened there, you had perestroika and glasnost which had at the beginning a tremendous stimulus to creative spirit, thinking, hope, a belief that things would be different and would be approached differently. But you also had what I would call a half-baked revolution, one in which the leadership was tentative and not sure how far to go, one in which the institutional changes that occurred only went part of the way, one in which many of the old guard remain in power and share power with those that would aspire for major change, and therefore a bitter battle continues over who controls the decisions and on what direction funding will go. In other words, you did not sweep away with that revolution either the institutions or all the people that had made decisions in the past. And then you have forces pro-Soviet and anti-Soviet, and finally you have forces in terms of counter revolution and economic depression that tends to undercut the spirit and the optimism and the direction of that revolution.

Now what do we have here in Washington State? I don't think it's quite that grim as I think you will see, but I think it's interesting to see some of the things that are going on. First, in terms of glasnost and perestroika, as I mentioned, in 1990 and 1991, our state legislature, I think after a tremendous amount of very positive thinking and good politics, passed new growth management legislation. The origins of that legislation were in citizen action. Some of you may be aware that in the City of Seattle we had an initiative that basically established a cap on the size of buildings and on the amount of office development that could occur in our city each year. That was a reaction to the tremendous amount of growth and the very rapid change that was occurring in our city and people's reactions against that change. We also had several key suburban officials defeated in their elections, and in the state legislature, the Speaker of the House and several other elected folks down there, believed that they saw the winds of change. They believed that it was important to get out ahead of that change and to initiate positive affirmative reform in our state and they began the work that led eventually to this growth management legislation. It was helpful also that the Speaker of the House was interested in becoming Governor. He comes from a place other than the central metropolitan area and I think he was looking for a way to lead reform that would appeal to the people that lived in and around the City of Seattle and its suburbs.

So the basic building blocks of that reform are really I think quite positive and quite classic. The basic concept of urban boundaries, which is something that Oregon has had in place for many years, was adopted for the major growing areas of our state. The concept of concurrency, between infrastructure development and the growth and development in terms of land use, was a principal means by which we hoped to link in a mandatory way for the first time in our history land use and transportation so that they become coordinated and work together.

And then perhaps the most powerful of the various principles on which this growth management legislation is built is the concept of consistency. And while it seems too simple and fundamental in our state as I think the great majority of states of this country, there has never been until now a requirement that the City of Seattle's comprehensive plan be consistent with its neighbor next door, much less the county as a whole and the region. And this legislation requires the development of county-wide policies, followed by local comprehensive plans and consistency among all of those. So the County Council, after a tremendous intergovernmental exercise, passed county-wide policies. Many people who were not deeply involved are somewhat shocked by how aggressive

the policies are and how ambitious they are in their attempt to implement the various principles that I previously indicated.

During the next 12 to 18 months, the local governments will continue to work on their comprehensive plans and then will go through basically an iterative process, coming back with those plans to the county level and saying are we consistent, are we not consistent, what changes need to be made, do changes need to be made at the county level or should the comprehensive plans of localities be brought into consistency.

The most powerful metaphor that represents the vision that we have in this city and in this region is captured by the concept of the urban village. It's a term that was coined by our mayor, Mayor Rice, as part of his proposals for the City of Seattle, but it really does capture the spirit of our overall planning exercise. The basic concept is that we want as many people as is possible within our region to live within a reasonably short distance of a vital, mixed, dynamic urban center that combines the qualities of vitality that you find with an urban center, and neighborhood, i.e., the sense of ownership and involvement of people that live there and work there together. We're trying for that in our city. It's the central theme of our city planning, and it's also a central theme of the county-wide and regional planning.

Also, we want people to live as close as possible to green space, to mountains, to lakes, to streams, to natural areas. And so what we've developed basically is a concept of multiple urban centers with as much of our growth as possible being concentrated in those centers served by rapid transit and then preserving our natural areas, our agricultural and forest lands, and open space between those centers. It's a classic planner's vision. So far we're still on the track, but the controversy is starting to come about.

On the transportation side, you're well aware of the many things that have happened. Part of it is happening because transportation is a vital part of our county-wide policies, but certainly ISTEA and the new apparent discretion that it gives to regions particularly to MPOs, is a very important factor. Within our state just several years ago, we had major new transportation funding legislation that established the basis for local option taxes to fund a new rapid transit plan involving high capacity transit. So there's an enormous amount of work going on right now to develop a proposal to put before our voters one year from now, the fall of 1993, that would involve about \$6 to \$10 billion to be spent between now and the year 2015 on a combination of high capacity transit, HOV lanes, diamond lanes, increased bus service, and various other amenities and transit service to go and support that overall system.

Inside the county-wide policies, I want to mention a few things that are emerging and which many people are very, very excited about. First at the county level, we recognize that the primary prioritizing mechanism for allocating total transportation dollars will be the Regional Transportation Improvement Program, the six-year TIP which is to be prepared, developed by the Puget Sound Regional Council in a collaborative effort with its own local governments as well as with the state and other agencies.

Secondly, the county-wide policies call for a program of consistent demand management strategies and we're specifically addressing things such as limits on parking supply and parking pricing.

Thirdly, we have striven mightily to combine and make consistent and concurrent our growth management planning and our transportation planning. The key being the urban centers which are basically the spine of a regional high capacity transit. An urban center needs to be a part of that regional network of centers and must be served by the high capacity system.

One of the most important concepts evolving, which is quite relevant to the thinking that's going on nationally, is how to address these issues and how they relate to levels of service. Our state law requires consistent level of service policies, but where we're not going so much to the traditional approach based on the amount of traffic and congestion on a given street. Instead our county-wide policies and our regional policies provide the basics. Our local city policies call for every jurisdiction to develop a series of mode split targets for all of its major activity centers within the region, basically establishing goals based on consistent criteria across the county for what proportion of the traffic will be served by means other than the single occupancy vehicle. It's a very powerful concept for us because up until this point, to the extent to which we thought about level of service at all (Seattle for example has no policies about level of service), we thought about the question—how can we control the effect of everything that's happening on this neighborhood, on this street, on this arterial. And as looked closer and closer, we realized that that's a hopeless battle. Most of the traffic being generated is generated somewhere entirely different and anything we do to control the situation on that street will be overpowered by what happens away from it.

So instead we're developing this concept of mode split. The whole thrust is, to determine what set of policies in this neighborhood, in this community, will contribute most effectively to the solution of the region's transportation problem. What can we contribute in terms of transit use, bicycle use, pedestrian activity, restrictions

on parking, to the overall solutions of the overall regional problem. It's a much more practical and realistic and I think in the long term effective means of looking at the transportation problem. So that is the revolution and those are the things that I think involve the positive thrust. Now what is the substance of the counter revolution? Well certainly we have our counter revolutionaries. I'm discovering as I go out into the suburbs that there are actually pro-highway advocates in our region. And obviously coming from the central city, that's a major shock. I'm discovering that there are very serious and sincere advocates for sprawl. I was over in Bellevue just a couple of days ago and one developer got up and said, sprawl is the American way and he was right. We have a major growing property rights movement within our state that intends to go to the legislature next spring and seek amendments to the growth management legislation to reverse the direction we're going. Have people in the rural areas that are outside that urban growth boundary that believe they've lost property rights. We have people in the City of Seattle that are worried about this urban centers concept because it may mean significant increases in density within the central city. So there's plenty of ground for counter revolution. We also have economic recession, and as you know, while the thrust for environmental protection and growth management occurs during times of growth, when growth stops and recession sets in, then the energy often is dissipated. And people start to worry understandably much more about jobs and how they can be protected at whatever expense. I think all of us in this room understand how crucial it is that we develop a long term vision for what we want our region to be, which we stick with whether it's good times or bad times. We cannot afford to constantly reverse course as the economy reverses course because we cannot guarantee what the outcome will be.

We also have half baked institutional change, or at least the potential for it. A great deal will depend on the spirit brought by you and people like you and people in positions to make decisions, not only elected officials but probably even more important the leaders of our bureaucracy at the state and local level. It's incredibly important what attitude and spirit they bring to this because there's a tremendous amount of turf involved. There's a tremendous amount of old way of doing things that is tied to this whole current situation and they have not been swept away. Our State Department of Transportation is still very powerful and absolutely central to the decisions we will be making. Our own Public Works Directors are concerned with preserving what little piece of that turf and pie they still have and they're very, very concerned about whether all this new

discretion and flexibility will drain resources away from fixing pot holes and keeping the streets repaired. And a fundamental question is whether or not the basic funding additions are there to basically grease the friction that will otherwise occur between the forces that want to keep things exactly the way they are because they would rather have the fears they have than fly to others they know not of, and those who don't understand, like me, do not understand all the specifics of fixing pot holes, but are quite excited about what we can do in terms of improving mobility. There are some other basic problems. One, no one has all the reins for making decisions in his or her hands.

There's ambiguity in ISTEA. And we're still trying to figure out what those various little key words in terms of cooperation, coordination, collaboration mean. As a decision maker in this region, I'm having an incredibly difficult time just finding out what are the total dollars being spent and who spends them and how do they relate to each other. We spent so much of our past focusing in on just a small piece of the total pie that it's almost impossible to find out what the total pie looks like.

We have inadequate criteria. I think all of you are struggling on this issue now. What criteria actually works for deciding whether to allocate dollars to preservation of the existing system or on the other hand to mobility? I have seen a number of papers already, but none tell you how to compare these apples and oranges in some rational compelling way, particularly when there's not enough money. And then within our own city and our own region, we have major problems with our regional transportation plan and it's partly institutional, it's partly the incredibly fragmented decision making. The voters are going to be given one vote on whether or not to do high capacity transit and some related issues. And yet they look at a problem that's much bigger, that involves highways and their local arterials, and they're going to have to put all of their energy, all of their protest, all of their dissatisfaction into that narrowly focused vote that does not in fact solve all their problems. And so as we try to make this decision we are really torn in many different directions trying to figure out how to put on the ballot something that actually has hope of appealing to 51 percent of our electorate. And personally I'm quite pessimistic at this time about whether or not we're going to do that. Part of the problem is the fragmented decision making structure. We can't put the whole pie in front of them so that they can see the full range of benefits that they might get through all of the spending that occurs in our region.

In the area of growth management, one of the fundamental institutional problems is that the basic way we pay for local government is a disincentive to cooperation. Every local jurisdiction recognizes that if they are not the urban center, the potential is for the jobs to be drained away and therefore the revenues and taxes to be drained away to some other location. And as much as we have raised our consciousness tremendously in this region regarding the importance of cooperation, that disincentive is lurking in the background in terms of whether we actually agree on the kinds of incentives for the urban centers that are necessary to make them successful. Everybody is for fiscal reform. The central cities believe that fiscal reform will mean that more of the region's resources are spent where the problems are and where the urban centers are and where the densities are and where the amenities are needed. And the suburbs believe that if all the jobs are going to be in the urban centers, then of course the urban centers are going to have to subsidize the services of the rural and the suburban areas. And both of them have logical arguments and no one has figured it out, so it's a major institutional problem.

So what is the answer? I would list three things that I think offer particular hope. One, we must have a strong regional vision and I think that's happening in this region, a growing recognition that the building block of our economy is not the City of Seattle, it's not the City of Redmond, it's not the County of King, it's at least a three or four county area that has tentacles that reach out into other parts of the region in Oregon, Canada, Eastern Washington, Idaho, and Montana, but it's a region that is the building block. It's on a regional basis that we must plan our transportation system and allocate our growth. Secondly, we have to realize that we must focus on the whole pie of funding. We started looking at the MPO level about what we had as discretionary decision making. It was very tempting, because we hadn't had it before, to focus all of our energy there. And very quickly, I and others realized that that's a big mistake. We're talking about a billion dollars being spent in our four county area each year and the amount that's a discretionary resource for decision making for the MPO is a very, very small fraction of that. We have to develop a decision making system that takes into account all the funds being spent.

And that leads to the third and last point. There is never going to be a day when any one entity, either the Department of Transportation or the City of Seattle, the MPO, our Metro has all of the decision making reins in one hand. It's not going to happen. And therefore the only way that we are going to make wise decisions is

through the fundamental process of collaboration, of sharing turf, of sharing space, of acknowledging other people's role, of including them in our process and of being included in theirs. That is a tremendous challenge. It's a lot simpler if you're a parent and you can simply tell your kid what to do, but we know we can't even do that with kids, much less with Departments of Transportation and vice versa. They can't tell us what to do. It's a far more complex political process involving far more important and difficult skills to achieve that concept of collaboration.

So that's the challenge to you. You're going to have to be more than planners. You're going to have to help elected officials see that. You're going to have to help yourselves see that and your colleagues. And only if that occurs, I think, do we have the prospect of caring for the revolution that we're involved in, of avoiding the collapse of it, the withdrawal, the retreat or the delay of the benefits of the reforms that have occurred at all levels. I look forward to working with all of you in the years ahead. Thank you very much.