# Framework Supplement

### Cede Political

#### Status quo politics makes it try or die for our framework argument – several factors erode effective transportation policy – in round discussion of effective pragmatic solutions are vital to reverse trends and jumpstart beneficial reform

Lewis and Williams, 99 (David, Ph.D., President, Hickling Lewis Brod Economics, Inc., and Fred Laurence, Ph.D., United States Department of Transportation, “Policy and Planning as Public Choice Mass Transit in the United States,” Ashgate Publishing Company, pg. 27-33, <http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/Policy_and_Planning_as_Public_Choice.pdf>, Tashma)

**A primary goal** of the research reported in this book **is to engage** the national **policy debate over transit’s role in American society**. As discussed earlier, however, much of the policy debate in the United States has been led by professionals making arguments that are literally academic. The arguments have relied on a dissection of public policy goals in “technical” terms, characterized earlier as synoptic or “modeling” analyses. Instead of efforts to measure the monetary value of bundled transit outcomes to households and taxpayers, the technical collegium has persistently measured patronage, costs, mode split, and travel times. Alternatively, some researchers have compiled taxonomies of transit benefits, listing every conceivable intended or unintended consequence of transit: physical, economical or spiritual. 45 The transit goals so constructed denature the decision making process, substituting a fanciful “rational” decision making process with no counterpart in decision making. Colored in this way by largely unexamined assumptions about decision making (e.g., budgets correspond to opinion polls), the academic debate has had a largely detrimental influence on transit investments in the United States. As maintained above, **the academic debate is** largely **beside the point**. Even if transit were to achieve great gains in cleaner air, safer highways, more efficient urban development, and quicker journeys to work, an analysis reporting on these virtues alone would carry limited value for setting transit budgets in the public sector. Legislative bodies acknowledge “intended outcomes” of public policies. But these outcomes only have budgetary heft to the extent they have measured value to constituencies. Indeed, when monetary value to constituencies is not measured, other means of measuring value prevail, such as charity, vocalism and informal influence. For example, over the years, very few have quarreled with the transit goal of providing basic mobility for people who do not drive cars. Lacking a measure of their economic value, however, transit services for this market niche tend to be set according to what a largely disenfranchised constituency will tolerate. As a result, affordable mobility transit services in the United States tend to be “politically correct” without being as effective as they could be. With these considerations in mind, we contend that the genuine policy debate belongs at the bus stop, in the transit garage, and at the local transit policy board. Imperfectly, this grounded policy debate has reached legislative bodies in the form of policy goals that are more substantial than generally acknowledged in the literature. The three functions of transit are not new to transportation policy debates, just eclipsed in the academic literature. They were articulated in 1962 by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges and Housing and Home Finance Administrator Robert C. Weaver when they proposed enactment of Federal transit support: Increased emphasis on mass transportation is needed because only a balanced system can provide for: a. The achievement of land-use patterns which contributed to the economic, physical, and social well being of urban areas; b. The independent mobility of individuals in those substantial segments of the urban population unable to command direct use of automobiles; c. The improvement in overall traffic flow and time of travel within the urban areas; and d. Desirable standards of transportation at least total cost [our emphasis]. 46 The beginnings of Federal transit support had a very strong planning emphasis because transportation in general was recognized as a decisive influence on highway traffic, basic mobility, and land use patterns. Only with effective coordination was there optimism for new transportation investment to be effective in combating traffic congestion. Planning could help preserve and enhance neighborhoods disrupted by necessary transportation investments in their midst. Planning would incorporate the mobility needs of disadvantaged groups into transportation investment programs. **Left to markets and** ad hoc **political deals, development would** only **erode the urban landscape**. The early hopes for planning have not been realized. Instead, the planning process became a venue for convening political jurisdictions having stakes in transportation projects. Instead of intermodal coordination, transit, railroads, aviation, and highway agencies ignored each other. Instead of fostering coherence and access, planning bodies for the most part facilitated urban fragmentation while still denying access to disadvantaged groups and aggrieved neighborhoods. Excluded groups turned to the courts in the ensuing decades to achieve the access and coherence envisioned by Hodges and Weaver in 1962. Significant Congressional action responded intermittently to the many local conflicts incited by major transportation projects. For example, in 1973 Congress empowered local areas to “trade in” “interstate transfer” highway trust fund dollars for transit funding from general revenues. Federal aid highway dollars could be converted to transit grant purposes— with a higher local share. In 1982 Congress set up a transit account in the Highway Trust Fund. The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) consolidated and broadened these gains. ISTEA was a second run at bringing access and rationality to bear on local transportation investments. A model of Federal devolution, ISTEA lowered barriers to allow local authorities to use transit funds for highways and vice versa, depending on local needs analysis. ISTEA gave Metropolitan planning agencies new authority to influence State transportation plans. ISTEA opened the metropolitan planning process to “new partners” in transportation, including grass-roots associations. Since enactment of Federal transit legislation in 1964, transit has been viewed narrowly as a failing industry overtaken by economic and demographic forces. In the prevailing mood, reinforced after 1981 with no net growth in financial support, transit was considered to have little influence on traffic congestion in its immediate environs. With explosive growth in suburban residence and jobs, transit was considered a follower of land use trends, and hardly a force capable of exerting influence on land use patterns. The mobility transit afforded disadvantaged groups was considered an “inferior good” that would be abandoned as soon as people could afford a car. The only goal that seemed to have merit was to control transit operating costs. 47 Stung, perhaps, by transit’s perceived failure to attain the loftier goals set for it, efficiency became transit’s paramount goal in the early 1980s. This framework has been changed very little since adoption of ISTEA in 1991. In principle, the three public policy functions of transit in the United States often are mutually supportive. High density transit systems offer superlative affordable mobility while simultaneously supporting valuable residential and commercial areas. Less car ownership in livable communities means less traffic congestion. A significant share of commuters bypassing congested highways cannot afford cars, and are therefore not potential motorists. Instead, they are riding transit to save money rather than time, i.e., low-cost mobility. The overlap of functions is considerable. With decades of chronic underfunding in the name of efficiency, however, transit’s multiple functions have come into conflict. Transit’s greatest deficits are generated by congestion management peak-hour services to distant suburban residential areas. The shift of transit resources to congestion management has compelled transit managers to compromise services on relatively unpeaked crosstown, local, and radial routes that support low income and high density neighborhoods. Because these less peaked services tend to produce comparatively high fare revenues compared to costs, the shift of services to the commuter routes has driven up overall deficits. This is discussed more fully in Chapter 2 Neglect of transit infrastructure has followed the shift to commuter services and, together with poorer overall services, has eventually contributed to the central city blight that continues to drive middle income households to the suburbs. Where central cities have remained employment centers, the budgetary demand for commuter services has increased with suburban sprawl. Transit’s dependence on suburban tax dollars has grown with the size of the transit deficit, requiring more and more suburban commuter services and the cycle repeated. 48 As a consequence of this cycle, during the 1970s, daily transit journeysto-work within central cities declined by 533,000 to 3.267 million while suburban commutes to central city jobs on transit increased by 403,000 to 1.191 million. 49 Since the transit commuter flow from suburban residences to central city jobs was stable from 1980 to 1990, it appears that this pattern was arrested after 1980. 50 This “interchange” between central city and suburban transit services is reflected in the transit journey to work data presented in Figure 1.5. Unfortunately, urbanized area data were not available for 1990, so that it is necessary to compare the 1970s based on Urbanized Area (Urban) data with the 1980s based on Metropolitan Area (MSA) data. Nevertheless, the pattern described above is clear, decline of central city-based commutes versus increased suburban-based commutes. In public policy arenas like transportation, where taxes, subsidies, and regulation intervene between market supply and demand, it is extremely important to take careful measurement of value. Heretofore, in a policy environment dominated by the construction of transportation infrastructure, policymakers have been impatient with difficult measurement.

#### The 1ac facilitates a *training ground* for meaningful public participation in transportation planning – it’s a necessary counter to *big businesses* and *wealthy lobbies* that perpetuate anti-poor policies

Barter 98 – PhD, Coordinator, Sustainable Transport Action Network for Asia and the Pacific

A Rahman, UNCHS (Habitat) Regional Symposium on Urban Poverty in Asia, Transport and Urban Poverty in Asia: A Brief Introduction to the Key Issues, http://www.fukuoka.unhabitat.org/docs/occasional\_papers/project\_a/06/transport-barter-e.html

The Recife Declaration includes a strong emphasis on recognising the fundamental right of the poor to take part in decisions which impact on them. It states that the voices of the poor must be heard (United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), 1996). Some governments and experts fear that an openness to participation will hinder decisive policy making. There is a traditional mistrust in transport planning of all community involvement, let alone involvement by the poorest people. However, experiences are showing that such involvement can be constructive and make public policies more likely to be well-considered and enforceable. Meaningful participation in transport planning decisions by stakeholders, with a special effort to hear those who are usually voiceless and powerless, can lead to workable solutions to otherwise intractable conflicts. Poor communities have demonstrated that they can be reasonable when treated fairly and sincerely but are very vulnerable and their range of choices is extremely limited. When consulted in a meaningful way, with the help of experienced NGOs, groups of low-income people have demonstrated the ability to state their interests, to appreciate many of the wider issues and to seek reasonable compromises. Documented cases that illustrate these points include negotiations involving the inhabitants of settlements along Mumbai railway lines and consultations with pedicab (cycle rickshaw) drivers in Dhaka about potential changes to their operating conditions (Gallagher, 1998; Patel and Sharma, 1997). This year a number of NGOs have championed the rights of low-income pedicab drivers in Java who are seeking the right to ply their trade in Jakarta after having been banned since 1989, and have managed to open up a process of negotiation and debate with the relevant authorities. The chances of success appear to be high. These good examples are unfortunately isolated and the documents include a realistic assessment of the enormous effort that will be required to make official agencies more receptive and consultative. The norm is that many communities have seen insincere consultations that merely seek to legitimise unfair actions that harm their communities and which have left them justifiably suspicious and cynical. Hearing the voices of the poor requires proactive effort from the relevant agencies. Non-governmental organisations and networks need to develop a much larger role in this proactive effort in the transport sector as they already have in other sectors, such as in shelter issues (International Forum on Urban Poverty, 1998; Patel and Sharma, 1997). Most of the NGOs and CBOs in Asia that assist poor communities to organise and empower themselves have not yet established strong capabilities to tackle transport issues and to make the connections between transport and other urgent issues for the poor, such as shelter, employment and basic services. The organisations that champion the interests of the poor in higher level policy debates have also sometimes missed the key transport issues that affect low-income people the most. Environmental organisations have taken up transport more often but sometimes in ways that are not sensitive to the needs of the poor. Civil society organisations that specifically champion the modes of transport used by the poor are generally non-existent or weak in most Asian cities (although there are exceptions). If the voices of the poor are to be heard more strongly in transport then decision-makers will need to become more receptive AND civil society will need to develop its capacity to tackle transport issues in a well informed way (and be assisted to do so) (Hook, 1998). One of the key aims of the SUSTRAN network is to help community groups and NGOs get access to the information and assistance that they need to demystify transport issues and to tackle them in a pro-poor way. Without broad-based consultation, the main voices that tend to be heard by government on transport issues are the well-organised and wealthy lobbies for car users, the trucking industry, the motor vehicle industry, the oil industry, and the infrastructure construction industry. Categories of actors and stakeholders in urban transport are numerous and their interactions complex (Dimitriou, 1992; Rimmer, 1986; Townsend, 1995). Transport is one field where public policy clearly does have a major impact upon the outcomes even in low-income settings (Allport, 1995; Barter, 1998, in preparation; Cervero, 1995; Hook and Replogle, 1996; Newman, 1993). Political processes and public participation must occur hand-in-hand with technical planning procedures. Participation is essential in order to balance the effects of market and government failures (Hook, 1998). Hearing alternative voices can also help to overcome the "wind-screen view" of transport problems by many urban transport decision makers. Most politicians, senior planners and transport engineers have little personal experience of using non-motorised transport or public transport as adults. This is particularly acute in cities where there is a strong polarisation between rich and poor. The transport planning professions are also highly male-dominated in most countries. This is a serious obstacle to a gender-aware approach.

#### The alternative is expert-only planning – this is doomed to failure

Beal et al 4 Executive Director of Chicago Metropolis 2020, and a former executive with Ryerson International Inc. and Inland Steel \*\*\*Report from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration (Frank, 2002004, “Scenario Planning: A Framework for Developing a Shared Vision for the Future,” Department of Transportation, http://transportation.ky.gov/Congestion-Toolbox/Documents/Scenario%20Planning%20Brochure.pdf)

II How Scenario Planning Can Make a Difference Effective scenario planning begins with the recognition that transportation professionals cannot precisely predict the long-term future. The best they can do is to imagine a variety of possible, loosely-defined scenarios that represent a range of conditions, and then consider how well plans perform under the different conditions. However, the process of vividly imagining alternative stories encourages people—whether citizens, transportation professionals, or elected officials—to proactively shape their futures rather than simply responding to what comes. In this way, scenario planning can help influence land use, economic development, and infrastructure investments, both at the state level and in individual communities. Roundtable participants offered and engaged in a series of questions on the foundations and value of scenario planning. Contributing to the process were keynote remarks from Frank Beal and Robert Grow, who shared quite different though equally successful experiences with scenario planning. Chicago Metropolis 2020. It was private sector decision makers who first explored the idea of using scenario planning as a framework for making choices about the future. Frank Beal related his experience with a Fortune 100 steel company that, like many public-sector agencies, faced important investment decisions. Since forecasting can be unreliable, rather than focusing on a specific prediction, company executives considered all that might happen in the steel industry, and then tried to position the company to be prepared for multiple eventualities. Company executives had to identify what forces were important in shaping the future of the steel industry, and then address uncertainties. One possibility they considered was a total collapse of the industry. To company executives, this was a disastrous prospect that was hard to imagine, but it was a possible outcome. In the end, company executives chose not to invest, because it was not the most robust response to multiple alternatives. Scenario planning has proven to be an enormously successful way for the private sector to think about the future, but public-sector planners can also apply this strategy. For example, Beal guided scenario analyses conducted for the Chicago area in developing the Chicago Metropolis 2020 plan. The plan used economic, land use, and transportation models to help the project participants evaluate future conditions. Participants then considered how they might choose to respond to those future conditions, taking into account the existing situation, public preferences, expert opinions, experiences elsewhere, the results of computer modeling, and their own innovative ideas. They developed a plan that performed well against indicators such as total miles traveled during peak hours, tons of carbon monoxide, and transit use. According to Beal, one of the most useful aspects of scenario planning is that stories resonate with people, helping to fully engage the decision makers. Beal imparted several lessons about the process. He observed that most of the current planning processes focus on whether or not to build, and not on how to use existing resources more efficiently. On the importance of data to scenario planning, he noted that transportation models tend to penalize transit, and that missing data can make asset management difficult to model. Finally, Beal concluded with the warning that enormous structural impediments to making good decisions still remain. Envision Utah Like many regions, Utah faces serious challenges with rapid growth and infrastructure deficits. According to Robert Grow, the premise of the Envision Utah project was that the public has the right to choose its future, and that officials should serve that vision. However, growth issues have natural boundaries that are not aligned with existing political boundaries, Grow said. Since the Envision Utah group believed that the public would make good choices if presented with real options, they introduced a format to involve the public and to bridge the disconnect between those that control land use—local governments and the private sector—and those that control transportation planning—state and Federal governments and metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). According to Grow, it was important that no public or private stakeholder group control the partnership, whether in appearance or reality. At the same time, the project had to include all stakeholders that could affect, or would be affected by the outcome. The partnership had to be trustworthy, transparent, and inclusive, representing a broad scope of community interests, Grow explained. It was also important that funding come from multiple sources, including a balance of public and private funds. Whereas a typical approach to planning involves one forecast and one solution, Grow said, it was better to develop a range of scenarios. Envision Utah organized initial hands-on public workshops that allowed people to explore the options. Informed by the workshop results, participants developed four scenarios for future growth in Utah, and offered evaluation criteria with which to assess each scenario (such as total land consumption and average daily vehicle miles traveled). A major public outreach survey then had Utahans vote for a scenario. Including the media early in the process helped the public outreach effort, Grow noted. Another helpful strategy was to stick to a lexicon of words that the public had already selected to describe their values—Envision Utah used the same vocabulary to describe the attributes of the different options under consideration. Based on the scenario chosen, Envision Utah then generated a vision document, supported with 42 specific strategies. As a result of the Envision Utah project, there has been a sea change in attitudes toward transit, including support for sales tax increases for transit and more long-range plans, according to Grow. Sixty percent of communities have used Envision Utah tools in their plans and ordinances. Statewide, Utahans now aim to reduce the amount of land consumed by nearly 100 square miles by 2030. Discussion Topic: Can Planning Shape the Future? One question relevant to transportation planning that often goes unexamined is whether policies have the power to change behaviors and shape a future society. Experience suggests that people and businesses often resist what they perceive are government efforts to dictate outcomes and influence private life. With this in mind, participants debated the importance of transportation as a factor in people’s personal decisions and what role transportation policy can play. Overall, the discussion indicated optimism about the impact and value of scenario planning: • Participants pointed to the success of the anti-smoking campaign in the public sector, and everyday marketing in the private sector as evidence that it is possible for public information to effect large-scale change in individual behavior. This suggests that the process of educating citizens through scenario planning can meaningfully affect choices and collective outcomes. • In making planning decisions, decision makers can consider ways to harness market forces to move society in a desirable direction. Tax policy is one tool for effecting change. Our existing tax policies give us the shape of metropolitan America, pointed out one participant, but is it the shape we want? Providing incentives and disincentives can be an effective means of influencing the choices that both businesses and individuals make. • Demographic trends are clearly important in shaping our environment, and those trends may be influenced by policies relating to land use, immigration, and transportation. Those interested in implementing scenario planning should utilize the tools that are available. • Some participants doubted that transportation is a deciding factor in where most people choose to live and work, so transportation policy may have a limited effect on development trends. One participant argued that school quality, perception of personal safety, and housing costs are more important than commute considerations. Participants agreed that more research is needed on the influence of urban design on travel behavior. • In response to those who doubt the potency of transportation policy, one participant reminded the group that we do not yet know how large an impact transportation policy might have, if a comprehensive policy is executed since this has never been attempted. • Participants seemed to agree that transportation policy would be most effective if implemented in conjunction with complementary policies, across agencies and throughout all levels of government.

### Public Key

#### Complex debates about transportation planning are vital to creating an educated and involved citizenry – this is a pre-requisite to equitable transportation policy

Dunbar 11President at Dunbar Transportation Consulting\*\*\* Report published by the Transportation Planning Capacity Building Program, Federal Highway Administration/Federal Transit Administration (Julie, 19 January 2011, “The Transportation Planning Process Key Issues,” Department of Transportation, http://www.planning.dot.gov/documents/briefingbook/bbook\_07.pdf)

What is the role of public involvement in developing transportation policies, programs, and projects? Public involvement is integral to good transportation planning. Without meaningful public participation, there is a risk of making poor decisions, or decisions that have unintended negative consequences. With it, it is possible to make a lasting contribution to an area’s quality of life. Public involvement is more than an agency requirement and more than a means of fulfilling a statutory obligation. Meaningful public participation is central to good decisionmaking. The fundamental objective of public involvement programs is to ensure that the concerns and issues of everyone with a stake in transportation decisions are identified and addressed in the development of the policies, programs, and projects being proposed in their communities. Who is the public? The public includes anyone who resides, has an interest in, or does business in a given area potentially affected by transportation decisions. This includes both individuals and organized groups. It is also important to provide opportunities for the participation of all private and public providers of transportation services, including, but not limited to, the trucking and rail freight industries, rail passenger industry, taxicab operators, and all transit and paratransit service operators. Finally, those persons traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income or minority households (see section on Title VI/Environmental Justice) and the elderly, should be encouraged to participate in the transportation decisionmaking process. Federal, state, and local agencies with an interest in transportation issues play a particularly important role in the development of transportation projects. Many of those agencies have a statutory responsibility to review environmental documents or issue permits for transportation projects. FHWA and FTA encourage MPOs and state DOTs to aggressively pursue improved communication and collaboration with these partners, beginning early in the transportation planning process, to identify and address their concerns. What is the role of the MPO in implementing public involvement processes? The MPO is responsible for actively involving all affected parties in an open, cooperative, and collaborative process that provides meaningful opportunities to influence transportation decisions. Transportation has a profound influence on the lives of people. Decisionmakers must consider fully the social, economic, and environmental consequences of their actions, and assure the public that transportation programs support adopted land use plans and community values. MPOs must develop and document, in consultation with interested parties, a participation plan that details strategies for incorporating visualization techniques, using electronic media, holding public meetings, and responding to public input, among other things. What is the role of the state Department of Transportation in the public participation process? Similar to the role of MPOs in metropolitan areas, the state must have a documented process for engaging the public with the transportation planning process outside of metropolitan areas. The state DOT also should coordinate with MPOs for state projects within metropolitan areas. What are the indicators of an effective public participation process? A well-informed public can contribute meaningful input to transportation decisions through a broad array of involvement opportunities at all stages of decisionmaking. Useful elements in planning for effective public involvement are: • Clearly defined purpose and objectives for initiating a public dialogue on transportation issues; • Specific identification of the affected public and other stakeholder groups with respect to the plans and programs under development; • Identification of techniques for engaging the public in the process; • Notification procedures that effectively target affected groups; • Methods and measures for evaluating the effectiveness of the public involvement program; • Education and assistance techniques, which result in an accurate and full public understanding of transportation issues; • Follow-through by the MPO demonstrating that decisionmakers seriously considered public input; and • Solicitation of feedback from the public and stakeholders on the effectiveness of the public involvement process.

#### The public participation substantially increases VTL

Transportation Planning Capacity Building Program 7

Part of the Department of Transportation, "The Transportation Planning Process: Key Issues," 2007, http://www.planning.dot.gov/documents/briefingbook/bbook.htm#11BB

Public involvement is integral to good transportation planning. Without meaningful public participation, there is a risk of making poor decisions, or decisions that have unintended negative consequences. With it, it is possible to make a lasting contribution to an area's quality of life. Public involvement is more than an agency requirement and more than a means of fulfilling a statutory obligation. Meaningful public participation is central to good decisionmaking. The fundamental objective of public involvement programs is to ensure that the concerns and issues of everyone with a stake in transportation decisions are identified and addressed in the development of the policies, programs, and projects being proposed in their communities.

### Public Transportation Discourse Good

#### A vibrant public discourse can influence public policy –

Clemens 12Senior Associate Editor of The Cavalier Daily (University of Virginia Newspaper) \*\*\*Article quotes Heather Crislip (Special Assistant for Policy Programs at Miller Center, University of Virginia), Gerald Bailes (65th Governor of Virginia and is the director of the Miller Center of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia), Norman Mineta (David R. Goode National Transportation Policy Conference Co-Chair and former Secretary of Transportation), and Samuel Skinner (David R. Goode National Transportation Policy Conference Co-Chair, former Secretary of Transportation, and White House Chief of Staff under President George H. W. Bush) (Valerie, 24 April 2012, “Center gives report to D.C., The Cavalier Daily, http://www.cavalierdaily.com/2012/04/24/center-gives-report-in-d-c/)

Former Virginia Gov. Gerald Baliles, director of the Miller Center of Public Affairs, presented a report yesterday afternoon in Washington, D.C. which aimed to make Congressional lawmakers more aware of national transportation issues. The substance of the report came from discussions which took place last fall at a transportation conference the Miller Center hosted at its Washington, D.C. location. The David R. Goode National Transportation Policy Conference brought together about 60 of the nation’s top transportation officials, including five former Secretaries of Transportation and the chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. In his remarks yesterday, Baliles outlined four ways Congressional leaders could improve the way they approach transportation issues: framing the transportation debate around issues of economic growth; keying the conversation to the rhythms of an election year; using the media to increase public awareness; and linking local transportation investment opportunities to national policies. Published and presented in fall 2010, the Miller Center’s first transportation report contained “substantive” policy recommendations on which Congress has yet to take action, said Heather Crislip, special assistant for policy programs at the Miller Center. “Nothing has happened since,” Baliles said in his remarks yesterday. “We’re sitting still, if not moving backwards.” This second policy report, which Baliles presented, focuses instead on how to make transportation a significant issue for policymakers. “We hope to make transportation an issue in public discourse so that people are talking about how we [can] invest again in our infrastructure,” Crislip said. “[And] to gain some attention to the issue and gain some national attention in the coming months.” Federal policymakers will not take initiative in reforming existing systems “without a mandate from the broader public,” former transportation secretaries and conference co-chairs Norman Y. Mineta and Samuel K. Skinner wrote in the report presented yesterday. The report, titled “Are We There Yet? Selling America on Transportation,” is available on the Miller Center’s website.

#### Transportation advocacy lays the groundwork for *real world* public policy change – otherwise, policy-makers will continuously place infrastructure upgrades on the back-burner

Mineta and Skiner 11 David R. Goode National Transportation Policy Conference Co-Chair and former Secretary of Transportation; David R. Goode National Transportation Policy Conference Co-Chair, former Secretary of Transportation, and White House Chief of Staff under President George H. W. Bush (Norman; Samuel, 2011, “Are We There Yet? Selling America on Transportation,” David R. Goode Transportation Policy Conference Report, The Miller Center, http://web1.millercenter.org/conferences/report/conf\_2011\_transportation-Miller-Center.pdf)

Transportation keeps the American economy humming. For future prosperity, transportation policymakers must make strategic investments in smart projects with defined outcomes. There must be adequate funding, both for the maintenance of existing systems and for the further expansion and interconnection of new systems. Transportation experts, stakeholders, and users agree that change is needed. To set change in motion, however, there must first be public pressure for transportation investment and reform. Despite broad support in principle, however, active public engagement on these issues has been elusive. While many Americans experience the inefficiencies of our current transport systems on a daily basis, other impacts—such as the impact of lost productivity on the broader economy or the impact of high transportation costs on the price of goods—are less immediately obvious. Faced with other urgent concerns and economic challenges, many Americans believe we simply can’t afford to invest in transportation repairs and upgrades given our country’s current budget situation. Many also do not have faith that money allocated to transportation projects will be used in the most efficient and effective ways possible. Simply put, there is a lack of confidence and trust in the ability of policymakers to make good decisions in transportation policy and planning. And without a mandate from the broader public, most policymakers don’t want to risk reforming the current system in a political landscape fraught with many other challenges and competing demands.

#### The priorities of the 1ac don’t go unnoticed – demands for transportation policy influence policy-makers

Shanee et al 11 Visiting Fellow and Conference Director for the David R. Goode Transportation Policy Conference, previously Under Secretary for Policy and Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs, Department of Transportation and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Transportation Affairs (Jeffrey, 2011, “Are We There Yet? Selling America on Transportation,” David R. Goode Transportation Policy Conference Report, The Miller Center, http://web1.millercenter.org/conferences/report/conf\_2011\_transportation-Miller-Center.pdf)

Through asmart, aggressive, and coordinated new communications effort, transportation advocates and stakeholders can elevate their issue to a level not experienced since President Eisenhower’s era. A campaign of sufficient scope and with the appropriate mix of tactics and messages can move national elected officials to take note of stakeholder priorities and incorporate these priorities into transportation policy proposals and discussions. An effective campaign can also generate a swell of grassroots and traditional engagement efforts that helps national stakeholders maintain advocacy pressure, generate new content, and build a broader base of support for meaningful transportation reform. It is our belief that once citizens become aware of the significant costs and risks associated with a compromised transportation system operating at less than optimal capacity, they will feel more compelled to demand calls for action that will, in turn, prompt policymakers to act. Experts studying transportation needs have long stated the importance of the one to energize the other; the way in which this plan differs from other well-established and well-received studies is the means that we propose for capturing the attention of citizens. Whereas past efforts focused on the traditional messengers and messaging techniques to publicize their message, this new advocacy and messaging plan turns to a new group and new techniques to catalyze change. We believe this can work.

### Policy Key

#### Discussion of political solutions for transportation is vital to confront the major issues of the 21st century

**Eberts, 4** (Randall, President of W. E. Upjohn Institute, “Understanding the Impact of Transportation on Economic Development,” pg. 1-5, <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/millennium/00138.pdf>, Tashma)

Whereas there is no doubt that transportation is essential in the operation of a market economy, much still needs to be understood about ways in which an efficient transportation system can improve the productivity of the economy. Transportation also has a broader role in shaping development and the environment. Policy concerns in the next millennium will increasingly focus on the effects of transportation on where people live and on where businesses locate; and on the effects that these location decisions have on land use patterns, congestion of urban transportation systems, use of natural resources, air and water quality, and the overall quality of life. **Issues of urban sprawl**, **farmland preservation**, and **air and water quality have** already **pushed their way to** the **forefront of policy debates** at both the national and local levels. To make prudent decisions, policy makers must be equipped with the best information and analysis possible about the interactions among these various factors. The questions asked by policy makers are two sided. Not only do they want to know the effect of transportation on additional economic development, they also want to know the transportation needs of future growth. Transportation analysts must tackle more complex questions than they did in the past. As the nation’s transportation system has matured and competition for government funds has intensified, the issue is not simply where to build another segment of highway or which airport needs to be expanded. The questions have become more complex. What mode of transportation is most cost-effective in meeting a region’s transportation needs? How should a state department of transportation prioritize its highway dollars to maximize economic growth? What is the trade-off between additional growth in an urban area and the cost of expanding transportation systems to accommodate greater growth? What effect does the expansion of transportation systems have on the need to invest in other types of infrastructure? Four factors are important in examining the relationship between transportation and economic development: (a) relevant type of transportation investment, (b) data necessary to analyze the economic effect of the investment, (c) appropriate methodology to analyze the economic effect, and (d) the proper dissemination of the results and education of professionals as to the economic effects of transportation investment. FUTURE DIRECTIONS Types of Transportation Investment Future directions in transportation investment can take several paths. Basically, transportation investment encompasses two forms: capital expansion and capital enhancement. Expansion includes the construction of additional highway segments; rail lines; runways; or additional sea, air, rail, or bus terminal capacity using traditional technology. Highway examples include the addition of lanes to an Interstate highway system, the conversion of an existing two-lane road to a four-lane limited-access highway, replacement or widening of bridges, and the extension of an existing road. Airport examples include runway lengthening, apron (tarmac) expansion, and additional terminal gates. Enhancement refers to new technologies that can enhance the efficiency of the existing highway system. Examples include intelligent highway systems, congestion pricing, intermodal freight facilities, geographic positioning systems, and instrument landing systems, to mention a few major innovations. Within each of these areas, numerous innovations are being developed. **Policy makers** and practitioners **need to gain a clear understanding** of the effects **of these innovations** on economic development through enhanced delivery of transportation services and a more efficient use of scarce resources. Scarce resources may extend beyond transportation investment dollars to include land use, air quality, and noise pollution. Moreover, highways, rail lines, airports, and seaports should and are being considered as a system, where the system goes beyond the fixed infrastructure, such as a stretch of highway or a rail line, to include the vehicles that use the infrastructure. The concept of intelligent highway systems underscores this trend. Simply put, vehicles are being linked to each other and to traffic control devices to improve the efficiency of the total highway system. Similar types of innovations in intelligent traffic management are emerging for air, sea, and rail systems. One important area of research is to explore the productivity-enhancing innovations that are being introduced into existing transport systems. A framework should be provided and benchmarks should be established for understanding the broad economic consequences of these innovations. To be assured that research encompasses the issues important to decision makers in the new millennium, a systemwide and regional economic perspective will have to be maintained. Researchers must be mindful of the direct social effects of transportation investment as well as the economic effects. Researchers should not neglect the more fundamental issues of understanding the effects of different attributes of highways on economic development. That is, do we know anything about the effects on productivity of reducing highway congestion or improving pavement condition? These attributes are what new technologies are attempting to address. Yet, we do not have solid empirical evidence of the effects of these attributes. Exploring the economic effects of components or attributes of highway systems is essential in informing the policy debate and in aiding the efforts of local decision makers.

### Transportation Education Good

#### Transportation education is key to create an informed citizenry – substantially influences policy planning

Beal et al 4 Executive Director of Chicago Metropolis 2020, and a former executive with Ryerson International Inc. and Inland Steel \*\*\*Report from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration (Frank, 2002004, “Scenario Planning: A Framework for Developing a Shared Vision for the Future,” Department of Transportation, http://transportation.ky.gov/Congestion-Toolbox/Documents/Scenario%20Planning%20Brochure.pdf)

III Public Involvement in Scenario Planning Public involvement is an essential part of any planning process, whether for transportation or land use. Scenario planning is particularly well-suited to public participation, because the process centers on constructing and exploring stories about the future. And these are stories about citizens’ immediate environment— neighborhoods, districts, and towns. Thus, people respond energetically to the task. Moreover, participants agreed that citizens can do an effective job if given the proper tools and background. Public involvement is critical to the ultimate success of scenario planning, in part because participation gives citizens a sense of ownership in the outcome of the planning process. That sense smoothes the path to building consensus and obtaining buy-in from stakeholders. Participants also observed that public involvement can get a scenario planning effort back on track, in situations where the usual players may have reached a stalemate. The roundtable received two presentations that centered on effective practices for public involvement in scenario planning. The presentations fed a discussion of several issues relating to public involvement. Citizen’s Leadership Commission Jacky Grimshaw explained that the opportunities for engaging people in the public process are as varied as the people you want to involve. In organizing the Citizen’s Leadership Commission, which was charged with developing public consensus for a Regional Long-Range Transportation Plan in the Chicago area, Grimshaw started with eight focus groups. The focus groups were asked who the stakeholders were, and they came up with a list of 152 organizations or representatives as a basis for learning about what citizens valued. Another method Grimshaw has implemented is to select groups by geography, dividing the region into 11 areas. In each case, Grimshaw explained, community members helped to plan the meeting, including important logistical details such as location and time. Including a review cycle, generating the final report was a 21-month process. Grimshaw recommended that any public recruitment process must begin with an understanding that there are a lot of issues, and that it will be necessary to build trust and credibility. Identify special specific populations, such as youth, older people, couples with or without children, and disabled people, and find a way for your message to resonate with each of those groups, she suggested. You may need to spend time building the educational background needed for participation. Then cultivate long-term involvement with continuous renewal. As a result of public participation, Grimshaw advised, participants receive an education, they feel like their voices matter, and the plan is better than it otherwise could have been. Metro Vision 2020 Sharon Richardson explained that when Denver-area planners put together a composite map of all of the local plans of the municipalities in the region, they realized they needed a regional vision. The composite map indicated more growth than was expected, and an imbalance of residential and non-residential uses. Over several years, task forces and committees comprised of local governments, business interests, and environmental groups cooperatively developed the Metro Vision 2020 plan to serve as a guide for local planning efforts. In the process, several different scenarios were developed. In order to involve citizens in the decision-making process, each alternative was publicized by way of fliers and public displays. In the end, the best features of the various scenarios culminated in a final plan. Richardson reported that some of the major challenges along the way were “not in my backyard” attitudes among the public at large, and the difficulty for business representatives to devote a lot of time to the effort. Interest groups proved to be a key component in connecting to the regional community.

### Scenario Planning Good

#### Scenario planning is the best method for transportation policy – it’s not exclusive, and can successfully account for diverse stakeholder interests

Beal et al 4 Executive Director of Chicago Metropolis 2020, and a former executive with Ryerson International Inc. and Inland Steel \*\*\*Report from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration (Frank, 2002004, “Scenario Planning: A Framework for Developing a Shared Vision for the Future,” Department of Transportation, http://transportation.ky.gov/Congestion-Toolbox/Documents/Scenario%20Planning%20Brochure.pdf)

Scenario planning is a process in which transportation professionals and citizens work together to analyze and shape the long-term future of their communities. Using a variety of tools and techniques, participants in scenario planning assess trends in key factors such as transportation, land use, demographics, health, economic development, environment, and more. The participants bring the factors together in alternative future scenarios, each of these reflecting different trend assumptions and tradeoff preferences. In the end, all members of the community—the general public, business leaders, and elected officials—reach agreement on a preferred scenario. This scenario becomes the long-term policy framework for the community's evolution, and is used to guide decision-making. Scenario planning expands upon traditional planning techniques by focusing on major forces or drivers that have the potential to impact the future. By developing scenarios to tell a story of the future, planners are better able to recognize these forces and determine what planning activities can be done today and be adapted in the future. Scenario planning is not intended to replace traditional planning practices. It is a tool that can be applied to recognize the range of outcomes in the future, beyond what traditional planning can create. On September 25, 2003, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) brought transportation leaders and other specialists together for a one-day roundtable exchange on scenario planning. The roundtable included experts’ views on trends that are the focus of scenario planning, discussion of how to do scenario planning effectively, presentations of successful experiences with scenario planning, and a description of available technical tools. Denise Bednar of the FHWA facilitated the roundtable, which concluded with the identification of next steps that can promote and support effective scenario planning. The Need for Scenario Planning Planning for the future is a daunting task. However, experts do have some notions about what might be in store. FHWA Associate Administrator Cindy Burbank opened the Roundtable by likening the dilemmas that transportation planners currently face to those of the commercial fishermen who encountered what has become known as the “perfect storm” on the Atlantic Ocean in October 1991. Population growth, changing demographics, a growing interest in environmental quality, and fiscal pressures at all levels of government are among the forces that may converge to create demanding conditions for the transportation industry. Regional leaders should keep an eye on transportation and land use forecasts, and engage in thoughtful planning in order to weather any “storm” that may hit. By considering the various factors that will shape the future, scenario planning analysis can help inform decision makers who must accommodate future transportation needs, ensure a quality environment, and provide for an aging population. A number of jurisdictions have used scenario planning successfully already. To encourage others, Burbank proposes that the Federal government help identify opportunities for using scenario planning and provide technical assistance for transportation planning. Roundtable participants brainstormed a number of other specific actions to help improve the planning process, which are summarized at the end of this report.

### Legal Education is Good

#### Legal education is important – lets us change the system for the better

Coper 6 - Professor of Law at the Australian National University and Chair of the Council of Australian Law Deans

Michael, Dean and Robert Garran Professor of Law at the Australian National University and Chair of the Council of Australian Law Deans, "LEGAL KNOWLEDGE, THE RESPONSIBILITY OF LAWYERS, AND THE TASK OF LAW SCHOOLS," 2/11/8, http://law.utoledo.edu/students/lawreview/volumes/v39n2/Coper%20II%20Final.pdf

I like, in any event, to think of lawyers as members of a profession. True, the possession of specialized knowledge, one of the hallmarks of a profession, has all the potential to be highly exclusionary and to allow a legitimate concern about standards to transform, sometimes almost imperceptibly, into the covert protection of vested interest.6 It is exactly 100 years since George Bernard Shaw made his famous observation that “all professions are conspiracies against the laity.”7 But it is the other great hallmark of a profession on which I want to focus: the idea that the members of a profession have not simply won the right to exploit their specialised knowledge for their own personal material gain, but that they have a higher duty of public service.8 Although this is standard learning in much legal writing and many law school courses, from basic courtroom ethics to more sophisticated and more amorphous notions of professional responsibility, it is surprisingly elusive. I want to try to tease out a few strands of the idea, and give it a bit of an admittedly personal stamp. I have written elsewhere9 about the responsibility of the legal profession, from individuals to organizations, to contribute to the continuous improvement of the law and the operation of the legal system; to have a pervasive ethos of the promotion of law reform and the advancement of social justice; not to allow this ethos to be quarantined and owned exclusively by professional law reform agencies and the like, but to take every opportunity in the course of a life in professional practice to use one’s special knowledge and skills for the common good; and, hopefully, at the end of a career of altruistic service to the community, to leave the law and the legal system in better shape than one found it. I do not pause to defend this view, which, when stated in summary fashion, probably sounds hopelessly idealistic, if not off-puttingly evangelical. However, I do believe that it has significant implications for how we think about legal education, and about the formation or acquisition of this law reform and social justice ethos. In my experience, significant numbers of beginning law students bring to their law studies a high degree of idealism and aspiration to use the law, in ways unknown to them, and, at that stage, unknowable by them, to make the world a better place. At my law school, this correlates highly with an aspiration to gravitate to the international stage, but is by no means unique to the seekers of world peace. The challenge for us is, in my view, to harness that idealism, to nurture it, and to channel it into practical pathways—not, as often seems to be the case, to kill it. This brings me to one of my favourite dilemmas.

### Politics Debates Good

#### Politics debates provide a key training ground for navigating public policy – impacts transportation planning

Bipartisan Policy Center 11

[think tank that actively promotes bipartisanship, BPC works to address the key challenges facing the nation, "Highway Trust Fund Battles," 1/11/11, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/blog/2011/01/highway-trust-fund-battles]

Posting his most recent entry on the National Journal Transportation Expert blog, BPC’s Director of Transportation Policy, Emil Frankel took the opportunity to reinforce the strength and applicability of the NTPP performance-driven framework. The framework put forth by NTPP in 2009 is not only applicable in today’s discussions about how to most effectively and efficiently address national fiscal and economic challenges, but is a useful guide for how to both generate and clearly demonstrate maximum return on investment. Emil highlights the importance, and in fact necessity, of tying transportation policy and funding decisions to the current domestic policy debates around budget deficits, national debt, and economic growth. Our nation faces huge fiscal challenges and, as Emil points out, the transportation sector will not, nor should it, be immune from having to grapple with these realities.

#### Key to justifying public spending in the face of deficit concerns

Frankel 11

[Emil, Director of Transportation Policy for the Bipartisan Policy Center in Washington, DC, and an independent consultant on transportation policy and public management issues, "Austerity and Investment," 1/7/11, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2011/01/highway-trust-fund-battles.php#1851927]

The clash between enormous budget deficits and a ballooning national debt, on the one hand, and the need to promote growth in a fragile economy, still facing unacceptable levels of unemployment, on the other, will dominate domestic policy debates over the next few years. Transportation policy and funding decisions will not, and should not, be immune from the need to balance these competing values. The new rules for spending, proposed by the House Republican leadership and adopted earlier this week, should be analyzed in the context of the need to balance these interests. Specifically, the elimination of the highway spending guarantee and the so-called "firewall," adopted in TEA-21 and re-enacted in SAFETEA-LU, make the decisions of the authorizers subject to limits established by appropriators and by the overall budget process. So, while the debate over this issue is one between competing national interests and values, it is also another chapter in a long struggle between authorizers and appropriators.

### Random T Stuff

#### We meet - Public just means concerning people

Free Dictionary.Com No Date (http://www.thefreedictionary.com/public)

Public: 1. Of, concerning, or affecting the community or the people: the public good.

#### Energy policy is a completely different political sphere

SAFE no date

[Securing America's Future Energy, "Strengthening US Transportation Infrastructure," http://www.secureenergy.org/priorities/strengthening-us-transportation-infrastructure-policy]

Transportation infrastructure and energy policy have historically been debated in two entirely separate spheres in American politics, and a coherent, unified strategy for the federal surface transportation system has largely been absent since the construction of the interstate highway system.