

New Frontiers in Regional Science: Asian Perspectives 2

Hirotsada Kohno
Yoshiro Higano

Public Investment Criteria

Using an Interregional Input-Output
Programming Model

 Springer

New Frontiers in Regional Science: Asian Perspectives

Volume 2

Editor-in-Chief

Yoshiro Higano, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/13039>

Hirotsada Kohno • Yoshiro Higano

Public Investment Criteria

Using an Interregional Input–Output
Programming Model

 Springer

Hirotsada Kohno
University of Tsukuba
Professor Emeritus
Tokyo, Japan

Yoshiro Higano
University of Tsukuba
Tsukuba, Japan

ISSN 2199-5974

ISSN 2199-5982 (electronic)

New Frontiers in Regional Science: Asian Perspectives

ISBN 978-4-431-55220-8

ISBN 978-4-431-55221-5 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-4-431-55221-5>

© Springer Japan KK, part of Springer Nature 2022, corrected publication 2022

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Japan KK part of Springer Nature. The registered company address is: Shiroshima Trust Tower, 4-3-1 Toranomon, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-6005, Japan

*This book is dedicated to the memory of
Professor Dr. Yasuhiko Oishi*

Preface

When we were attached to the Institute of Socio-Economic Planning, University of Tsukuba, we desired to have a platform, with which our research results could be published without limit of pages. In that time, an article was generally forced to be published within 15–20 pages and we needed more than 40 pages because our works were based on an innovative simulation model of huge scale and their inputs as well as outputs were massive. It was a general current in regional science and related fields that scholars wrote shorter articles rigorously and published them in main stream of regional science journals. The implicit or explicit restriction set by journal editorship in that day was prohibitive for publication of the research results based on the philosophy, on which The Institute was newly established in the University of Tsukuba. It said that scholars do inter- and multi-disciplinary studies and return their research results for the society in order to, e.g., fix real issues and conflicts, make policy proposals, and eventually contribute for development of society. For this, we had requested Professor Dr. Jan Tinbergen to write a foreword through the good offices of Professor Dr. Peter Nijkamp. Then, a title of illusory journal ought to have been launched is *The Tokyo Journal of Large-scale Regional Modelling*.

It is a felicity for us that the monograph series *New Frontiers in Regional Science: Asian Perspectives* had been launched by the innovative undertaking of Springer Nature (Co.) in cooperation with the Japan Section of the Regional Science Association International (JSRSAI), having been admitted of the amazing conspicuous developments of JSRSAI during those 50 years.

In this volume of seven chapters, several studies which were kept within doors for more than 30 years now have been published to be able to see the light of day in the right way. Here, we express our sincere gratitude to Springer Nature above all.

During the 10 years from the latter half of the 1950s to the early 1960s (1957–1967), H. Kohno (one of the authors) had been attached to the Japan Highway Public Corporation and engaged mainly in the preparation of Loan Materials which had been submitted to the World Bank with the project of the Mei-shin (Nagoya-Kobe) Expressway and To-mei (Tokyo-Nagoya) Expressway. In other words, the

preparation work was “Measurement of economic effects of public investment and the derivation of public investment criteria.”

The former was dealt with in the first volume in this series, so this volume deals with topics focusing on the latter. What is public investment criterion? It is apt to be taken as a benefit–cost analysis in a conventional sense, which is still nowadays adopted by practitioners. However, it had been so often pointed out that the conventional benefit–cost analysis has many essential rudimentary defects and limits. For example, the conventional benefit–cost analysis neglects: the scarcity of allocated public fund, which means that the analysis has no idea of the opportunity cost of public fund; dynamic optimization of the streams of returns through re-investment of returns in the future, the scope of the economy by implementing several related projects, etc. So, from the first, our concern had been shifted to fix those defects inherent to the conventional benefit–cost analysis and to develop a more elaborate and sophisticated model, the second generation, based on what was initiated by Steiner=Marglin. It is dealt with in Chap. 3. The model is formulated as the maximization of an objective function being subject to resource fund allocation constraints.

Nevertheless, in Chap. 1, various themes are dealt with, i.e., superiority or inferiority of the benefit–cost *ratio* criteria vs. benefit–*less*–cost criteria, the present value method vs. internal rate of return method (Hirshleifer), and standardization of various criteria (Mishan). Chapter 1, in a sense, makes a comprehensive survey of the past studies on the benefit–cost analysis.

In Chap. 2, we will explain a typical process of applying the conventional benefit–cost analysis to the evaluation of Mei-Shin and To-Mei Expressway in the 1960s. It is still useful for readers who are in charge of the proposal of public investment projects of huge scale.

In Chap. 3, as mentioned above, the application of sophisticated Steiner=Marglin model to the public investment criteria of expressways in Japan is dealt with, in which built in are technical constraints such as preemptive right of public sector, incompatibility of location and transport modes, indivisibility, lumpiness, reflection of various opportunity costs of investments on the objective function (named as—supra-marginality), scheduling project implementation on the time horizon of multi-periods (evasion of fault due to myopic policy). The mode is formulated as an integer programming model. The solution to the model is obtained by application of the usual LP algorithm with the *combinatorial method*. In Chap. 3, however, the measurement of economic effects must be completed in advance and the values are given to the model that solves the optimal public investment criteria, on which investments shall be implemented with a scarce investment fund.

In the late 1960s, one of the urgent topics in the business world was how to determine optimal shares between investments into the public sector and the private sector. It was raised by the economic community because they realized that the social infrastructures, especially transportation infrastructures at that time were out-of-date, and the lack of social infrastructures of high quality would be serious bottlenecks for the economic growth which were expected in the 1970s. Also, motorization was

about to start and optimal shares between investment into transportation infrastructures of railways, maritime, and roadways were urgent topics in the transportation economics association as well as among related departments of the central government.

In Chap. 4, the simulation model based on interregional input–output model of competitive-import type is formulated as a linear programming model. It was a cutting-edge model with the following features: “shipment activities” are formulated in order to simulate interregional trade patterns reflecting impacts of public projects such as expressway construction while it is different from Moses’s model that transportation sectors explicitly specified in the input–output structure; and the public investment criteria is rightly embodied in the model to take into account imputed prices (or, opportunity costs) of injecting scarce public funds to possible investment targets. Imputed prices are critical indicators in order to pursue the optimality of solutions to a linear programming model based on the simplex algorithm. The model is applied to the above practical agendas. It is yet a static and prototype model, but the above-mentioned critical defects inherent to the conventional benefit–cost criteria were completely and consistently fixed. The measurement of economic effects and the identification of optimal investments targets are simultaneously solved by taking into account their impacts on the whole national economy through changes in interregional trade patterns. It was the first work in which the optimal investment shares are shown between the public sector and the private sector as well as between transportation infrastructures of railways, maritime, and roadways, based on the economic rationality of opportunity costs. Readers will confirm that the economic rationality is presented as the equalization of imputed prices that are associated with constraints, such as transportation infrastructure constraints, production capacity constraints, and scarce public fund allocation constraint, which could become bottlenecks for the economy to further grow, and can be directly fixed by the injection of scarce public funds, or indirectly fixed by, for example, changes in interregional trade patterns.

It can be said that the models developed in Chaps. 3 and 4 had achieved some success in that they are applicable to practical agendas of that day, and have shown quantitative (and objective) answers to the debated matters among related stakeholders qualitatively (and subjectively). However, the models had space for further improvements and developments. In Chap. 5, subjects for possible development and improvements of the models are discussed.

In Chap. 6, as one of the directions discussed in Chap. 5, the small-sized model of five regions, five industries, and three transport nodes developed in Chap. 4 is enlarged to incorporate ten regions, ten industries, nine means of transport. This was a practically useful model by taking advantage of the rapid development of computer architecture and software of the linear programming model. More minute and informative results can be obtained for policy proposals.

In Chap. 7, the dynamic interregional input–output programming model is shown, which is, however, a simple discrete linear model (not nonlinear). It looks like an extension of the DOSSO model, but the malleability of capital is completely denied (at least, it is not a sausage model); it is not focused on a steady-state rather on

the transitional phase of transforming the economy in order to reply to practical agendas. It is applied to the evaluation of Asian Expressway construction investment project as a strategic variable for the Chinese economy to take off.

We owe many people who have assisted us in copywriting and preparation of materials, some of which laid gathering dust for a long time in a stockroom. Without their devotion, this book would not have been completed at this time. Firstly, to be praised is secretary to Dr. Takeshi Mizunoya' study room (and, to former Higano's study room), Ms. Hatsumi Uchimura, who has contributed to make a fair copy of manuscripts. Sasaki Publishing Printing Co. Tokyo Branch Office Editorial Adviser, Mr. Tatsuya Shimatai, contributed by advising us on how to compose difficult troublesome graphs; to publishing editor, Mr. Yutaka Hirachi, and editorial staff, Ms. Misao Taguchi, we express our deep and sincere gratitude.

Tokyo, Japan
Tsukuba, Japan
March 31, 2021

Hirotsada Kohno
Yoshiro Higano

Contents

1	Public Investment Criteria: A Tentative-Specific Survey on the Benefit–Cost Analysis in the Early Years	1
1.1	Underlying Fundamental Concepts of Public Investment Criteria: Significance and Necessity	1
1.1.1	Definition of Investment Criteria	1
1.1.2	Significance of Public Investment Criteria	3
1.1.3	Adjustments with Product Quantity and Investment Quantity	4
1.2	Benefit–Cost Criteria	6
1.2.1	Several Variations in Basic Benefit–Cost Criteria	6
1.2.2	Present Value Criteria vs. Internal-Rate-of-Return Criteria	10
1.3	Normalization of Various Benefit–Cost Criteria	15
1.3.1	Mishan’s Theory of Normalization	15
1.3.2	Elucidation by the Example	20
1.4	Concluding Comments	24
1.4.1	Further Examination of the Grave Shortcomings of the Benefit–Cost Analysis	24
1.4.2	Organization of the Chapters	26
	References	28
2	Economic Effects of Mei-Shin and To-Mei Expressways Based on the World Bank Formula of 50 Years Ago	29
2.1	Preliminary Consideration	30
2.1.1	Concept of Economic Effects of the Expressway	30
2.1.2	Direct Effects of Expressway Construction	31
2.1.3	Indirect Effects of Expressway Construction	32
2.1.4	Impacts of the Expressway on the Whole National Economy: Observed Reality in 1970s Through 1980s in Japan	34

- 2.2 Basic Data of Various Reduced Direct Costs 36
 - 2.2.1 Basic Data for the Calculation of Saved Running Costs 36
 - 2.2.2 Basic Data for the Calculation of the Reduction in the Traveling Time 39
 - 2.2.3 Basic Data for the Calculation of Decrease in Traffic Accident Rate 40
- 2.3 Traffic Volumes of Mei-Shin Expressway 40
- 2.4 Measurement of Direct and Indirect Effects of Mei-Shin Expressway 47
 - 2.4.1 Direct Effects 49
 - 2.4.2 Indirect Effects 51
- 2.5 Appraisal of the Mei-Shin Expressway Construction Project With the Estimated Direct and Indirect Effects 58
 - 2.5.1 Profitability of the Mei-Shin Expressway as a Toll Road 58
 - 2.5.2 The Appraisal by Taking into Account Direct and Indirect Effects of the Expressway: The Viewpoint of the Whole National Economy 59
- 2.6 Consideration of Public Investment Criteria of Mei-Shin and To-Mei Expressway: Benefit–Cost Ratio and Difference Criteria 62
 - 2.6.1 Benefits (Economic Effects) of To-Mei Expressway in the Year When it was Opened to Traffic 62
 - 2.6.2 Benefit–Cost Ratio Criteria 63
 - 2.6.3 Benefit–Less–Cost (BLC) Criteria 66
- 2.7 Summary 68
- Appendix 1 Estimation of the Traffic Volume on Mei-Shin Expressway 68
 - Opening the Door of Traffic Volume 68
 - Method and Practice of O.D. Survey 80
 - Estimation of the Traffic Volumes on the Generation Basis 83
 - Forecast of the Traffic Distribution on O-D Basis in the Target Year 85
 - Estimation of the Allocated Traffic Vehicles 89
 - Estimated Traffic Volumes on Mei-Shin Expressway at the Opening Year 90
 - Closing Comments 90
- References 93
- 3 Generalized Benefit–Cost Criteria: Public Investment Criteria When Benefits Are Previously Measured 95**
 - 3.1 Genealogy of the Public Investment Criteria in the Field of Development Policy of Developing Countries 95
 - 3.1.1 Public Investment Criteria: Definition 2 95

- 3.1.2 Lineage of Typical Public Investment Criteria 95
- 3.2 Generalized Benefit–Cost Criteria Which We Should Rely On 96
 - 3.2.1 Investment Choice Model of Steiner 96
 - 3.2.2 Investment Choice Model Over the Multi-Periods: Marglin’s Model 104
- 3.3 Application of Generalized Benefit–Cost Criteria 111
 - 3.3.1 Setting Up of Our Problem to be Solved 111
 - 3.3.2 Code of Activity Variables 112
 - 3.3.3 Restrictions by the Computer Capacity Constraints 121
 - 3.3.4 Confining the Investment Targets 121
 - 3.3.5 Valuation Coefficients 123
 - 3.3.6 Budget Constraint 125
- 3.4 Solutions for the Optimization Problem 125
 - 3.4.1 Computer and Algorithm 125
 - 3.4.2 Image of the Integer Programming Format 126
 - 3.4.3 Optimal Solutions by the Two Methods 128
- 3.5 Discussion on the Results of the Optimization 128
 - 3.5.1 Case Setting and Characteristics of Target Expressway/ Highway 128
 - 3.5.2 Meeting Vehicle Traffic Demand in the Suburb of Tokyo 131
 - 3.5.3 Strategic Investments in the Developing Regions 132
 - 3.5.4 Tokyo-Gaikan Expressway 132
 - 3.5.5 Comparison with Physical Planning of the Ministry of Construction 133
 - 3.5.6 Total Benefit–Cost Analysis 133
- 3.6 Closing Comments 134
- References 135

- 4 Optimum Allocation of the Capital Funds to the Transportation Infrastructures Using the Interregional Input–Output Programming Model (Part I): Specification with Five Regions, Five Industries, and Three Transport Modes 137**
 - 4.1 Public Investment Criteria Incorporating the Endogenous Measurement of the Benefits—Two Subjects 137
 - 4.2 Basic Assumptions and Model Structures with the Economy 139
 - 4.3 Model 142
 - 4.3.1 Explicit Specification of the Transportation Sector Using Shipment Activities of Moses Model 142
 - 4.3.2 Capacity Constraints and Modes of Transportation 149
 - 4.4 Interregional Input–Output System of Noncompetitive and Competitive Import Types 158
 - 4.4.1 System of Regional Account and SNA 158
 - 4.4.2 Treatment of Interregional Shipments of Goods: Isard type 159

- 4.4.3 Interregional Input–Output System of Chenery=Moses Type 160
- 4.4.4 Explicit Specification of the Transportation Sector Using Shipment Activities of Moses Model (Again). 163
- 4.5 Optimality Criteria Built in the Model 166
 - 4.5.1 Problem Presentation 166
 - 4.5.2 Bottleneck of the Development and the Measurement of the Investment Effects 167
 - 4.5.3 Description of the Elimination of Economic Bottlenecks 178
 - 4.5.4 The Model with Capacity Constraints and the Funds Allocation of Lefebvre’s Type 184
 - 4.5.5 Concrete Image of the Matrix A 185
- 4.6 Preparation of Basic Data 188
 - 4.6.1 Ad Hoc versus Proactive prescriptions 188
 - 4.6.2 Calculation of Input–Output Coefficients of the Competitive Import Type 189
 - 4.6.3 Birdseye View of Interregional Input–Output Model of Shipment Activities: Illustration by Three Regions, Three Sectors, and Three Transportation Modes (Again). 198
- 4.7 Simulation Model: Interregional Input–Output Programming Model of Five Regions, Five Industries, and Three Transport Modes 202
 - 4.7.1 Coding 202
 - 4.7.2 Simulation Results 204
- 4.8 Conclusion 233
 - 4.8.1 Superiority of the Model with the Endogenous Opportunity Cost Criteria 233
 - 4.8.2 Historical Background and Sprit of Our Main Theme 234
- Appendix 1: BirdEye View of Interregional Input–Output Model of Shipment Activities: Illustration by Three Regions, Three Sectors, and Three Transportation Mode 235
- Appendix 2: Input–Output Table at Purchasers’ Price and Shipment Activities 253
 - Input–Output Table 253
 - I–O Tables at Purchasers’ Price and Producers’ Price 256
 - I–O Table at Purchasers’ Price Versus Producers’ Price 266
 - Treatment of Distributional Costs in the Interregional Input–Output Programming Model 270
- Appendix 3: Parameter of $\theta(v, k, q)$ 306
- Appendix 4: Simplex Criteria 307
- References 309

- 5 Optimal Comprehensive Transport System and Development of the Model** 313
 - 5.1 Principle of the Comprehensive Transport System 313
 - 5.2 Points of the Development 314
 - 5.2.1 Practical Usefulness 314
 - 5.2.2 Comprehensiveness 314
 - 5.3 Possible Development of the Model 315
 - 5.3.1 Incorporation of Leisure Trips and Social Overhead Capitals into the Objective Function 316
 - 5.3.2 Assignment of Loads Generated by Passenger Trips 317
 - 5.4 Endogeneity Treatment of Investment 317
 - 5.5 Nonlinearity 318
 - References 319

- 6 Optimal Allocation of the Public Funds to the Transportation Infrastructures Using the Interregional Input–Output Programming Model (Part II): Specification with Ten Regions, Ten Industries, and Nine Transport Modes** 321
 - 6.1 Achievements with the Minute Specification of the Model 321
 - 6.1.1 Coding of the Expanded Specification 321
 - 6.1.2 Model Specification 324
 - 6.2 Summary of the Main Results 326
 - 6.2.1 Scale of the Linear Programming Model 326
 - 6.2.2 Simulation Results 332
 - 6.3 Conclusion 370
 - References 370

- 7 Optimal Planning of Asian Expressway Network with Dynamic Interregional Input–Output Programming Model** 373
 - 7.1 Introduction 373
 - 7.1.1 Characteristics of the Model 373
 - 7.1.2 Public Investment Criteria Endogenously Built in the Model 374
 - 7.1.3 Subjects to be Solved 375
 - 7.1.4 Economic Philosophy of Regional Development in Asia 377
 - 7.1.5 Shipment Activities and Transportation Infrastructures 377
 - 7.2 Skeleton of the Planning and Framework of the Model 388
 - 7.2.1 Target Area, Planning Horizon, Industrial Classification, and Network of Expressway 388
 - 7.3 Structural Equations 394
 - 7.3.1 Flow Conditions 395
 - 7.3.2 Conditions of Stock Variables 400
 - 7.3.3 National Income Accounting of China 408
 - 7.3.4 Objective Function 413
 - 7.3.5 Boundary Conditions for the Differential Equations 415

- 7.4 Simulation Cases 415
 - 7.4.1 Presumptions 415
 - 7.4.2 Variants for Cases of Analysis 418
- 7.5 Simulation Results 421
 - 7.5.1 Optimal Allocation of Funds to Expressway Links by Period 421
 - 7.5.2 Commodity Flow 425
 - 7.5.3 Macroeconomic Indicators 439
- 7.6 Takeoff Accelerating Effects of Asian Expressway Network on the Chinese Economy 445
- Appendix 1: Mathematical Expression of the Model 447
 - Index, Set of Indices, and Index Function 447
 - Variables 448
 - Parameters 449
 - Structural Equation and Objective Function 451
- Appendix 2: Dynamic Programming Model and Roundabout
- Production Through Space and Time 458
 - Production Function 458
 - Flow Condition of the Markets 459
 - Stock Formation 459
 - Dynamic Equation 460
 - Highway Capacity Constraint 460
 - Definition of Vector Variable 460
 - Feasible Trajectory of the Economy 461
 - The Objective of the Planning 462
 - Necessary Conditions for the Optimality 462
 - Dynamic Optimality and Dynamic Model 469
 - Dynamic Programming (Optimization) Model 470
 - Bang-Bang Solution 470
 - Expanding the Production Possibility Frontier 472
 - Balanced Development 472
 - Positioning of the Dynamic Programming Model 473
- References 474
- 8 Correction to: Optimal Planning of Asian Expressway Network with Dynamic Interregional Input–Output Programming Model C1**
- Postscripts 475**
 - Connection with the Monograph by Leon N. Moses 475
 - Argument for Optimal Composite (Comprehensive) Transport System 476
 - Relationship with PPBS 477
 - Shipment Activities Initiated by Moses 479
- Acknowledgments 482**
 - Colleagues with Whom We Had Broken Bread 482
 - Gratitude to My Family 483
 - Two Teachers to Whom I have Been Greatly Indebted 483

List of Figures

Fig. 1.1	Sketch of present value (C) of the option –1, 2, 1. Source: Hirshlifer (1958), p. 348	11
Fig. 1.2	Two alternative options. Source: Hirshlifer (1958), p. 348	12
Fig. 2.1	Calculation of travelling distance: expressway vs. existing road. Source: The Japan Highway Public Corporation, Materials submitted to the World Bank – Written reply to the questionnaires related to the Second Loan, August 1961	39
Fig. 2.2	Mei-Shin Expressway influence sphere block. Source: The Mei-Shin Expressway Construction Archives Editing Committee (1967c), pp. 63–64	73
Fig. 2.3	Cordon station Note: (1) i, j : inner zone indices where the proposed Expressway goes through (2) k, n : indices for the cordon station, through which the traffic vehicle having the origin in the influence sphere (e.g., S or M) may get on the expressway wherever the destination is or the traffic vehicle on the expressway may come off to go to the destination in the influence sphere wherever the origin is Source: Drawn by the author making reference to the figure in Sasaki and Kobayashi (1962), p. 67	81

Fig. 7.10 Commodity flows along the north-south development axis
(case 1: period 5 ($t = 4$)). unit: billion tons/period (5 years) 438

Fig. 7.11 Commodity flows along the east-west development axis
(Case 1: period 5 ($t = 0$)). unit: billion tons/period (5 years) 438

Fig. 7.12 GNP and statistic of GDP in 1985 price 441

Fig. 7.13 Cumulative discounted sum of GNP 442

Fig. 7.14 Net investment 443

Fig. 7.15 Cumulative discounted sum of net investment 444

Fig. 7.16 Value of objective function 445

Fig. 7.17 Accelerating takeoff effect of expressway. (a) planning economy
with expressway, (b) planning economy without expressway,
(c) trend with expressway 446

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Summary of discussion in Sect. 1.1	5
Table 1.2	Numerical examples (1) and three criteria: without normalization	20
Table 1.3	Numerical examples (2) and three criteria: without normalization	20
Table 1.4	Normalized numerical example (3)	21
Table 2.1	Outline of Mei-Shin expressway construction	30
Table 2.2	Decrease in traveling distance gained by utilization of the Mei-Shin expressway (unit: km)	37
Table 2.3	Comparison of running costs of the ordinary road and the expressway (unit: yen/vehicle-kilometer)	41
Table 2.4	Saved time by section between interchanges (passenger car) (unit: minute)	42
Table 2.5	Saved time by section between interchanges (bus/truck) (unit: minute)	44
Table 2.6	Comparison of the traffic accident rate per 100 million vehicle × kilometer between the route via the expressway and the route using only existing roads	46
Table 2.7	Supposed traffic volumes of Mei-Shin expressway by section and types of vehicle (1964). Unit: vehicle/day	48
Table 2.8	Time saved amounts by utilization of the Mei-Shin expressway (1964)	50
Table 2.9	Effects of decrease in traffic accidents on Mei-Shin expressway	51
Table 2.10	Decreases in inventory stock and saved interest (unit: million JPY)	52
Table 2.11	Land acquisition with industrial use around interchanges of the expressway with the years from 1956 to 1961 (unit: ha)	52

Table 2.12	Land acquisition around interchanges of the expressway by industrial sector with the sum over the years from 1959 to 1961 (unit: ha)	53
Table 2.13	Industrial development effects in the area along the Mei-Shin expressway (1959–1961) (unit: tsubo)	54
Table 2.14	Estimates of moving-in population to the area along the Mei-Shin expressway	56
Table 2.15	Residential land development and the number of houses in the area along the Mei-Shin expressway	57
Table 2.16	Investment costs and depreciation conditions for Mei-Shin expressway (between Nishinomiya and Ichinomiya interchanges) (unit: million JPY)	59
Table 2.17	Economic effects of Mei-Shin expressway in 1964 (unit: million JPY)	60
Table 2.18	Direct and indirect effects of To-Mei expressway in 1968 (unit: million JPY)	63
Table 2.19	Supposed growth rates of economic effects with Mei-Shin and To-Mei expressways (unit: billion JPY)	63
Table 2.20	Analysis of the public investment criteria based on the benefit–cost ratio: Solutions to Problem: BBC Mei-Shin (Nishinomiya–Ichinomiya) (unit: million JPY)	64
Table 2.21	Analysis of the public investment criteria based on the benefit–less–cost: solutions to problem: BLC Mei-Shin (Nishinomiya–Ichinomiya) (K = 128,019) (unit: million JPY)	67
Table 2.22	O.D. traffic volumes (truck) on the national first-grade national highways along Mei-Shin expressway by interchange section (unit: vehicle per day)	70
Table 2.23	Estimated traffic volume by type of vehicle and by section at the opening year (1964) (unit: vehicle per day)	75
Table 2.24	Estimated end traffic volumes by interchange and type of vehicle at the opening year (1964). Unit: vehicle per day	76
Table 2.25	Traffic distribution in O-D basis: Triangle O-D table	76
Table 2.26	Diverted traffic volumes from railway in the O-D basis to Mei-Shin expressway in the opening year (all types of vehicle) (unit: vehicle per day)	77
Table 2.27	Traffic distribution in the origin-destination basis: Square O.D. table	78
Table 2.28	National highway route no. 1 and interview station of the O-D survey	81
Table 2.29	Traffic distribution in the origin–destination basis: Triangle O.D. table	84
Table 2.30	Estimated parameters of gravity model	86
Table 2.31	Estimated traffic volume on Mei-Shin expressway by vehicle type and by section of interchange at the opening year (1964) (unit: vehicle/per day)	91

Table 2.32	Inflow and outflow of traffic vehicles on Mei-Shin expressway by interchange (Unit: vehicle)	92
Table 3.1	Present value of the net benefits by choice (The caption is added by the author. Some of headings are changed.)	109
Table 3.2	Valuation coefficients	124
Table 3.3	Capital funds (unit: million JPY)	125
Table 3.4	Integer programming format of the optimal capital fund allocation problem	127
Table 3.5	Comparison between combinatorial (β) and LP (α) solutions ...	129
Table 3.6	Comparison between capital funds allocation by model and physical planning	130
Table 4.1	Optimal shipment pattern of goods: agricultural products (unit: 100 million JPY)	205
Table 4.2	Optimal shipment pattern of goods: fiber-chemistry (unit: 100 million JPY)	207
Table 4.3	Optimal shipment pattern of goods: metal-machine (unit: 100 million JPY)	209
Table 4.4	Optimal shipment pattern of goods: others (unit: 100 million JPY)	211
Table 4.5	Intra-regional goods flow (unit: million ton · km (railway and highway); 1000 tons (port))	213
Table 4.6	Interregional goods flow (unit: million ton · km (railway and highway); 1000 ton (port))	215
Table 4.7	Optimal allocation of the capital funds for the private sectors (unit: 100 million JPY)	217
Table 4.8	Optimal allocation of the capital funds for the transport facilities	219
Table 4.9	Optimum Allocation of new graduates	221
Table 4.10	Imputed price associated with final demand constraint (unit: 100 million JPY)	223
Table 4.11	Balance between the demand and supply goods by goods and region by region (unit: 100 million JPY)	224
Table 4.12	Gross regional product (unit: 100 million JPY)	226
Table 4.13	Imputed price associated with production capacity constraint (unit: 100 million JPY)	230
Table 4.14	Allocation of the capital funds (unit: 100 million JPY)	232
Table 4.15	Plane view of Tables 4.16–4.30: three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	236
Table 4.16	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	237
Table 4.17	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	239
Table 4.18	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	240
Table 4.19	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	241

Table 4.20	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	242
Table 4.21	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	243
Table 4.22	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	244
Table 4.23	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	245
Table 4.24	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	246
Table 4.25	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	247
Table 4.26	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	248
Table 4.27	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	249
Table 4.28	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	250
Table 4.29	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	251
Table 4.30	Three regions, three sectors, and three transport modes model (sample)	252
Table 4.31	Rates of fare delivered region by delivered region and mode by mode: example of three regions, three sectors, and three modes	253
Table 4.32	Numerical example of I-O table (unit: million JPY)	288
Table 4.33	Numerical example of I-O table: trade table via commercial sectors (unit: million JPY)	289
Table 4.34	Numerical example of I-O table: Basic trade table (unit: million JPY)	290
Table 4.35	Numerical example of I-O table: Trade table via commercial sectors aggregated (unit: million JPY)	291
Table 4.36	Numerical example of I-O table: purchasers' price (unit: million JPY)	292
Table 4.37	Numerical example of I-O table: producers' price (unit: million JPY)	293
Table 4.38	The basic trade table (T_basic_org) of numerical example 2 (unit: million JPY)	294
Table 4.39	Parameters of distribution costs (rate to the amount traded) . . .	295
Table 4.40	I-O table at purchasers' price (IO_table_pur(T_basic_org)) of numerical example 2 (unit: million JPY)	296
Table 4.41	I-O table at producers' price (IO_table_pro(T_basic_org)) of numerical example 2 (unit: million JPY)	297
Table 4.42	I-O coefficients matrix with purchasers' price (IO_coeff_pur(T_basic_org)) of numerical example 2	298

Table 4.43	I-O coefficients matrix with producers' price (IO_coeff_pro (T_basic_org)) of numerical example 2	299
Table 4.44	The Leontief inverse matrix with purchasers' price of numerical example 2	300
Table 4.45	Numerical example of the Leontief inverse matrix: producers' price	301
Table 4.46	Numerical example of shipment activities: Agricultural sector (region 1)	302
Table 4.47	Numerical example of shipment activities: Manufacturing sector (region 2)	303
Table 4.48	Numerical example of shipment activities: Wholesale sector (region 3)	304
Table 4.49	New distributional cost parameters after the bridge is in placed	305
Table 4.50	Expected reduction rate to the current transportation cost ratio	306
Table 4.51	$\theta(v, k, q)$ when $v = 1$ and 2	306
Table 4.52	$\theta(v, k, q)$ when $v = 3$	306
Table 6.1	Region and prefecture	322
Table 6.2	Classification of industrial sector	324
Table 6.3	Optimal allocation of public funds (transportation facilities)	328
Table 6.4	Optimal allocation of public funds (social overhead capitals) ...	339
Table 6.5	Investment shares among transportation facilities. Unit: million JPY	340
Table 6.6	Investment shares among social overhead capitals. Unit: million JPY	341
Table 6.7	Public investment share of the 7 years new economic plan by EPA. Unit: million JPY	341
Table 6.8	Equalization of imputed prices	341
Table 6.9	Optimal goods flow pattern (agriculture, forestry, and fisheries). Unit: million JPY/year	343
Table 6.10	Optimal goods flow pattern (mining). Unit: million JPY/year . .	344
Table 6.11	Optimal goods flow pattern (chemical). Unit: million JPY/year	345
Table 6.12	Optimal goods flow pattern (metal). Unit: million JPY/year	346
Table 6.13	Optimal goods flow pattern (other manufacturing). Unit: million JPY/year	347
Table 6.14	Optimal leisure trip pattern (private automobile). Unit: million JPY/year	350
Table 6.15	Optimal leisure trip pattern (domestic air for passenger traffic). Unit: million JPY/year	351
Table 6.16	Optimal leisure trip pattern (Railway except for Kokuden). Unit: million JPY/year	352
Table 7.1	Zone division of the target area, zone code, city code, etc	389
Table 7.2	Classification of industries	390

Table 7.3	Planning horizon	391
Table 7.4	Asian Expressway Network link	392
Table 7.5	Number of routes by pair of origin and destination zones (rank 1)	394
Table 7.6	Allowable upper limit on accumulating middle/long period external debt (Unit:100 million US dollar)	419
Table 7.7	Construction patterns of Asian Expressway Network links (Unit: kilometer-four lanes standard)	419
Table 7.8	Case (scenario) for simulation	420
Table 7.9	Total commodity flows between zones (regions): Case 1	427
Table 7.10	Total commodity flows between zones (regions): Case 2	430
Table 7.11	GNP/GNI (results of simulation + statistic data). Unit: trillion US dollar	439
Table 7.12	Statistic data of GDP and GDP deflator. Unit trillion US dollar	440
Table 7.13	NNP. Unit: trillion US dollar	442
Table 7.14	Net investment. Unit: trillion US dollar	443
Table 7.15	Value of objective function (Unit: trillion US dollar)	445

Chapter 1

Public Investment Criteria: A Tentative-Specific Survey on the Benefit–Cost Analysis in the Early Years



1.1 Underlying Fundamental Concepts of Public Investment Criteria: Significance and Necessity

1.1.1 Definition of Investment Criteria

Under the scarce total capital fund that is given in advance by the capital rationing through, for example, policy arguments between the alternative sets of investment targets such as the projects of road construction administered by the ministry of construction, the projects of the railway by the ministry of transportation, the projects of research and developments by the ministry of education, science and technology, and so on, the most concern, for example, the ministry of construction, which is in charge of planning and implementation of the projects of road, is to choose a set of projects of road to which the limited fund may be assigned. The ministry or the department in the ministry has to make a kind of selection between projects and determine a certain set of projects in a consistent manner by considering the accountability because it may usually not include all the projects which the department may implement even if the allocated fund through the capital rationing to the department were huge. The *static* investment criteria work as a sort of *Merkmal* (an indicator) in the choice of the optimal set of projects consistently in the sense that the additional total social surplus (the sum of consumer and producer surpluses = social benefits), which can be created in the whole national economy owing to the implementation of the optimal set of projects, is greater or at least is not less than the social surplus that is to be created by implementing other sets of projects created through the selection subject to the limited fund.

The essence of the public investment criteria is that: (1) the optimal set of projects, (2) the scale of projects in the optimal set to which the fund is to be allocated, and (3) the timing of implementation of projects in the optimal set if, for example, the total capital fund is given as an annual stream of budgets, and so on, are endogenously solved and simultaneously determined. The adoption of the public

investment criteria in this manner will make efficient the allocation of the limited fund to the chosen and implemented projects in terms of the opportunity cost of the capital funds. This is critically different from the basic benefit–cost analysis principle in which typically the amount of allocated fund is predetermined and the project selection is made external to the principle, its scale and timing of implementation and so on are predetermined, and whether the increase in the social benefits, thanks to the project selected in advance, deserves the fund or not is the main concern in the analysis irrespective of how the allocation of the fund, the choice of the project, and so on were predetermined. However, in reality, the case in which the conventional benefit–cost analysis is yet adopted rather usually and even such cases are almost all with the public project management. Significance and necessity of the adoption of the public investment criteria in public investment management and the related topics are first taken in this chapter.

To apply the public investment criteria to the allocation of the limited fund to a limited number of public projects, which shall be implemented after choice among a set of potential investment targets¹ on *a certain criterion*, with respect to *each* potential public investment target (it is a public project) in the choice set, the sum of the increase (or decrease, that has a negative value) in the producers' surplus (profits) and consumer's surplus in the markets (including newly created) of the whole national economy, or, at least, a certain scope of the economy that is to be affected by the public investments in the choice set, are to be estimated focusing on the shifts of demand and supply curves in all the markets directly and indirectly affected by the public investment. The estimation is made over *the time horizon* of the public project, which means the time span in which impacts of the public investment continue. Finally, the time series of the sum of increases/decreases in producers' and consumers' surpluses over the time horizon are capitalized in terms of the value at the beginning of the initial period using a certain discounting ratio. The capitalized value (or, we sometimes call it—discounted value) is called the *benefits* or *economic effects* of the public investment, and it is an indicator of the increase in the welfare of the whole national economy owing to the public investment. In the case where the limited fund is very small compared to the total investment in the macroeconomic sense, as it is a usual case, it may be taken as the marginal benefits of the marginal public investment as far as the chosen public projects are independent of each other, which means that the created benefits by the chosen public project are independent of whether one or some of the other chosen public projects are implemented or not.

The ratio of the benefits to the cost² that is required for the implementation of the public project is calculated with respect to each public investment target, and it works as a marginal benefit indicator of public investment. Using the indicator, the optimal allocation of the limited capital fund to potential public investments targets and, therefore, the optimal set of chosen public projects that shall be implemented

¹The set of public investment targets is called—the choice set.

²In case in which costs are required over the time horizon, the series of costs are capitalized, too.

using the limited capital fund is pursued to maximize the total capitalized benefits that are to be generated by the chosen public projects (Nakamura 1970, pp. 34–37).

The calculation of benefits to obtain the marginal benefit indicator and the solution process of the maximization stated above constitute the theory of *static* investment criteria.³ However, there could be variations related to the maximization process depending on: (1) whether the conventional benefit–cost ratio or benefit-less-cost indicator is applied to the maximization process; (2) whether all the marginal benefit indicators are applied *in a lump sum manner* to the selection of the set of potential (feasible) public projects that shall be implemented with the limited fund; (3) the method applied to the calculation of the benefits that are critical components of the marginal benefit indicator; (4) to what extent *indirect* economic effects shall be included in the benefits; and (5) the scope of the economy with which the benefits created by the public project are to be calculated, and so on (Oishi 1960; Sasaki et al. 1965; Kohno 1974).

1.1.2 Significance of Public Investment Criteria

In the case of the business with the public utilities (whether they explicitly or implicitly exist in the economy does not matter), which utilize large-scale social infrastructures that are usually constructed through the public investment(s), (1) the control of the quantity (e.g., the traffic volumes on the expressway) in the short run through the price (fare) adjustment and (2) the control of the public investment to increase the capacity of the social infrastructures and, thus, control the quantity, are inconsistent with each other in the *laissez-faire* market, and results are *not* socially optimal because the decreasing marginal cost and, therefore, what the marginal cost is less than the average cost while it is decreasing with quantities produced is the pertinent characteristic to the public utilities (Negishi 1964, pp. 29–31). This means that we should not rely on the market mechanism with the quantity and/or investment adjustments through the price mechanism. In this case, (a) the control of the capacity of the social infrastructures shall be made through the application of the public investment criteria presuming the full utilization of the capacity by rather adopting the marginal cost pricing than the self-supporting accounting system that would damage the optimal organization of social infrastructures and (b) a possible deficit by the adoption of the marginal cost pricing (because the marginal cost cannot

³Here, only the public investment criteria will be discussed. Of course, the theory and measurement investigated here can be applied to the *private* (enterprise) investment criteria, also. The main difference between the two is that the benefits with the public project is “social benefits – economic effects created in a certain scope of the economy, typically the whole national economy” and the benefits with the private project is replace by “revenues in the private sense – revenues which only accrue to the firm which makes the investment.” The concept of social discount rate is inherent to the public investment criteria. With the private investment criteria, it is replaced by the interest rate in the market.

cover the average cost) shall be compensated by, for example, using the government general/specific budget. This dichotomy is the kernel of Hotelling Theory that the public investment should be dealt with in a unitary manner focusing on the relation between the maximized total surplus (benefits) that are created by the investment and its necessary costs, namely, the benefit–cost criteria (Hotelling 1938). Here is the significance of the public investment criteria.

1.1.3 Adjustments with Product Quantity and Investment Quantity

Generally speaking, the market plays an important role truly with the short-run adjustment of product quantity through the price mechanism, but with the long-run adjustment of investment quantity, especially the public investment or construction of public facilities (infrastructures), it does not well perform as expected. Here, we would forward our arguments by introducing the following concepts:

1. Allocation objective and revenue objective.

There are two objectives related to public utility activities. One is *allocative objective* and the other is *revenue objective*. The allocative objective is to attain the optimality of resource allocation (e.g., optimal capital fund allocation in the long run, the optimal degree of the rate of utilization to the capacity in the short-run in which the capacity of social infrastructure is fixed, etc.) in the light of the objective function of society, for example, the social welfare function, the sum of the social surpluses, and so on. On the other hand, the revenue objective is the maximization of revenues even if the allocative objective was not attained in the long run or in the short run. In relation to these concepts, we need to mention the pricing theories that are applied to, for example, the toll and fare charged by the public utilities.

2. Marginal cost pricing principle and average cost pricing principle.

The allocation objective is surely attained by charging toll or fare, in conformity with the marginal cost pricing principle, on the users (consumers) of the goods (e.g., tap water) /services (e.g., expressway services) provided by the public utility, although the revenue objective may not be attained. On the other hand, the dependence on the average cost pricing principle assures the attainment of the revenue objective, but the allocative objective becomes imperfect (Table 1.1). The investment by private companies is essentially different from public investment. The decision-making of the former is simple compared to the public investment criteria (and still it is a tough business for the executive officers in the company) in the sense that when they apply a feasibility study, for example, based on internal rate of return or cap rate, they fairly can place reliance on the direction of the market now or in the near future as far as they have the capability of management. The latter has to involve a kind of forecast or prediction of the direction of the market in the long run to obtain the public investment criteria. The

Table 1.1 Summary of discussion in Sect. 1.1

Control mechanism for industries which produce under decreasing marginal cost	Objective	Private company (supply curve (= marginal cost curve) is increasing with the quantity produced)	Public utility (supply curve is decreasing with quantity produced)
Nothing (the laissez faire market)	Optimality of the quantity produced in the short run	Attained	Not attained (e.g., due to natural monopoly)
	Revenue objective in the short-run	Attained and socially optimal	Attained and not socially optimal
	Optimality of the resource allocation in the short-run (optimal utilization of the fixed amount of facilities)	Attained	Not attained (e.g., same reason in the above)
	Optimality of the resource allocation (=investment) in the long-run	Not attained (owe to feasibility study based on internal rate of return/cap rate, etc.)	Not attained (owe to feasibility study based on the public investment criteria)
The marginal cost pricing (MCP) principle in a unitary manner	Optimality of the quantity produced in the short-run	-(n/a)	Attained
	Revenue objective in the short-run	-(n/a)	Attained but deficit
	Optimality of the resource allocation in the short-run (optimal utilization of the fixed amount of facilities)	-(n/a)	Attained but deficit
	Optimality of the resource allocation (=investment) in the long run	-(n/a)	Not attained (owe to feasibility study based on the public investment criteria combined with MCP principle)
Average cost pricing (ACP) principle in a unitary manner	Optimality of the quantity produced in the short run	-(n/a)	Attained but not socially optimal
	Revenue objective in the short-run	-(n/a)	Attained but not socially optimal
	Optimality of the resource allocation in the short run (optimal utilization of the fixed amount of facilities)	-(n/a)	Attained but not socially optimal
	Optimality of the resource allocation (=investment) in the long run	-(n/a)	Not attained as far as ACP principle is adopted even if the public investment criteria is applied