

Institutional and Governance Issues for Large Cities in Transportation

Henry Peyrebrune, *Center for Transportation Policy and Management, New York University*

The Steering Committee for the Conference on Transportation Issues in Large U.S. Cities identified issues concerning the institutional and governance structure for transportation in central cities as one of the six major issues for the conference. Five questions were raised for discussion and research:

- What is the institutional and governance framework for transportation in these central cities, both internally within city government and within the region and state?
- What is the decision-making process for transportation?
- How do central cities fare in this structure, both for short-term and long-term decision making?
- What is the role of the central city in regional organizations, regulated transportation, and other modes?
- Is fragmentation of responsibilities and authority a concern?

A questionnaire was prepared that included all the points of interest from the Steering Committee as well as additional questions designed to obtain a complete picture of the institutional and governance framework. The responses to the questionnaire serve two purposes: to illuminate the preparation of this paper and, at the request of the Steering Committee, to provide a description to the conference participants of the institutional and governance structure in each of the subject cities for the conference. To date, eight cities have responded, and their responses are the basis for this paper.

A literature search was performed to obtain input for the paper. No similar effort to examine the institutional and governance structures for transportation in large cities was recorded; however, there are several sources (1–5) dealing with the broader questions of institutional and governance issues. These sources are incorporated in this paper.

CONTEXT: CURRENT AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

Each city has an internal structure for dealing with transportation decisions, often spread out among a number of different agencies within the city. In this paper, the various internal struc-

tures, coordination mechanisms, and issues related to these internal structures will be documented.

Each city also functions in a larger environment within the region and state (or several states) in the provision of transportation facilities and services. These external structures, coordination mechanisms, and issues will also be presented. Included in the internal and external environments is the concept of the "authorizing environment," which has been effectively articulated by former Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Tom Larson.

The authorizing environment is the total of all the institutions and programs that allow agencies, in this case the central city transportation agencies, to provide transportation facilities and services. The environment includes the authorizing legislative and financing activities as well as the internal and external institutions.

The review of the role of the central city in the transportation authorizing environment comes at a time of transition in the institutional and governance arrangements in transportation. The passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) established new guidelines and requirements for transportation planning, programming, and project development.

The role of the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) is evolving. The literature (1-5) concludes that the transition is, in fact, working to the benefit of all parties. The proposals for the reauthorization of ISTEA continue the planning and programmatic innovations of ISTEA, although with some refinements.

ISTEA has been considered an experiment in democracy, and the reauthorization continues that experiment. An issue for this conference is to assess the degree of involvement and success of the central city in this new environment. The results of previous conferences suggest that the picture is mixed.

One of the conclusions of the Conference on Institutional Aspects of Metropolitan Transportation Planning is the need to "assess the MPO role in central cities, including strengthening the involvement of central city residents and decision-makers in the MPO process." Four strategies were recommended to deal with this issue:

- "Ensure that central cities are adequately represented in the MPO and are treated equitably in the planning and project selection process."
- "Ensure that the potential impacts of transportation projects in central cities are fully explored and assessed."
- "Identification of transportation improvements required in the central cities to enhance their quality of life and economic development."
- "Advancement of local partnerships to address critical issues, including the mix of suburban and urban employment opportunities, jobs/housing balance, social service requirements and other issues beyond the scope of traditional transportation elements."

As important as the federal transportation programs are to the central cities and the regions, federal funds and programs are still a small part of the total transportation program in central cities. The decision processes for state transportation programs and locally derived funds are as important to the day-to-day operation of transportation services in central cities. The federal planning and programming requirements can establish a framework for cooperative technical and transportation processes, but if these processes are restricted only to federal programs, the participants are missing the majority of the programs. Therefore, another issue for this conference is integrating the various programs at the different levels of government into a cohesive whole.

In a presentation at the Workshop on Institutional Aspects of Metropolitan Transportation Planning, Stephen Del Giudice of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments states, "I also think that it is a myth that central cities are not adequately represented on MPO boards. In most cases, the central cities do have representatives on MPO boards and do participate in the transportation planning process. To the extent that this is an issue, however, it may reflect a larger concern about central city representation in the political process

in general.” Therefore, this paper will look at not only the internal institutional issues but also the larger “authorizing environment” that reflects the political structure and role of the central city in that structure.

The responses to the questionnaires provide a snapshot of the current institutional and governance structures and to some degree recount past restructuring efforts. However, of equal concern to this conference is the future. The Transportation Research Board (TRB) Executive Committee has selected the topic “Institutional Arrangements in Transportation: Impacts of Changing Roles” as a special subject for discussion of future directions in transportation. The first discussion is contained in *TR News* (Sept.–Oct. 1997) (3).

Steve Lockwood frames the issues in “Transportation Infrastructure Services in the 21st Century.” He points out that the current programs, organizations, and financial arrangements have been stable and well defined for the past 50 years to support a mission of constructing and preserving a basic network of major public facilities.

In the 21st century, a number of forces will require reexamination of this structure. Lockwood lists nine vectors of change:

- Customer service mission focus,
- Performance measurement and accountability,
- Systems operations and management priority,
- Streamlined project delivery,
- Enterprise-style management,
- Innovative financing and progressive commercialization,
- Devolution and reconfiguration,
- Public-private partnerships, and
- Strong leadership and cross-institutional negotiation.

In the response to the questionnaire from the eight cities, these vectors appear in different places but basically as ad hoc attempts to solve specific problems. The reinvention of transportation government structures is occurring on an incremental, ad hoc basis, if at all. This is especially evident in the attempt to implement Intelligent Transportation Systems programs. Research has shown that the primary impediment to implementation is not the technology but the institutional and governance structures (5). Therefore, the results of the survey and the subsequent discussion at the conference should look to the future.

Lockwood concludes, “What is currently missing is a broad, vigorous, and organized national dialogue focused on the institutional challenges faced at the national, state, regional and local levels, drawing on collective wisdom and varied experience. The existing institutional conventions, having been explicitly developed through policy and professional support for the mid-20th century mission, can be just as explicitly evolved in new directions more supportive of 21st century missions.”

INSTITUTIONS AND GOVERNANCE OF TRANSPORTATION IN CENTRAL CITIES: SURVEY RESULTS

Agencies Involved in Highways and Their Responsibilities

Jurisdictional Responsibilities

The general model for highway jurisdictional responsibilities in the United States has the state department of transportation (DOT) responsible for expressways and some major routes, a county responsible for the next level of roads, and the city responsible for some arterials, collectors, and local streets. The model includes some special-purpose agencies, typically toll agencies, also responsible for key roads and bridges.

In a review of the role of state DOTs nationwide, there is a great variation in the level of responsibility for highways from state to state. In rural areas, the range of state respon-

sibility for rural roads is from a low of 7.7 percent of the highway length accommodating 50 percent of daily travel to a high of 96 percent of highway length covering 99.5 percent of travel. Four states have more than 90 percent of the length under state jurisdiction, whereas 10 states have less than 10 percent.

Similar statistics occur in urban areas. Nineteen states have less than 10 percent of urban length, with a low of 4 percent handling 28.8 percent of travel. Six states have over 40 percent of the urban length, with a high of 78 percent handling 93 percent of travel. Statistics are not readily available for central cities within the urban area, but the statistics quoted set the context for the wide variability among states and indirectly describe the urban versus rural orientation of each state DOT and the degree of state involvement in and control of highways in general.

Of the eight cities in the survey, Los Angeles, Boston, Philadelphia, Miami, and Chicago follow this general model. Table 1 gives the variation in the jurisdictional responsibility of the state, the central city, and other organizations. The range is from a low of 2.4 percent of mileage under state jurisdiction to a high of 15 percent. Each of these cities was compared with the overall state responsibility for highways in all urban areas within the state.

There is a direct relationship between the percentage of state responsibility in all urban areas and the state responsibility in central cities. However, in all cases the percentage of state responsibility in central cities is lower than state responsibility in all urban areas. Perhaps this finding is a reflection of the larger political question raised previously.

Internal Responsibility for Highway Activities Within Central Cities

Table 2 gives the number of agencies with jurisdictional responsibilities for highways in each city. Two cities are unique. Washington, D.C., being a federal district, is responsible for all roads except for 45 km (28 mi) of National Park Service Roads. In Baltimore, there is a one-of-a-kind arrangement making the city responsible for all highways. The state provides most of the nonfederal funds and has assumed responsibility for some Interstate highways, I-95 and I-395, but this represents less than 1 percent of total mileage. I-95 was built by the city and turned over to the state for maintenance.

Two cities, Los Angeles and Boston, have a Public Works Department responsible for construction and maintenance of highways and a Department of Transportation with responsibilities for traffic, parking, and other programs. Chicago and Philadelphia have centralized organizations responsible for all highway activities within their jurisdiction, although in Philadelphia, a Parking Authority is responsible for the parking programs.

TABLE 1 Jurisdictional Responsibility for Highways

City	Miles Under Jurisdiction			Total	Statewide — Jurisdiction (Percentage)		
	City	State	Other		State	Urban	Rural
Los Angeles	6400	160	—	6560	2.4	4.7	16.4
Boston	820	35	53	908	3.8	11.2	15.1
Philadelphia	2000	350	—	2350	24.3	24.3	42.3
Chicago	2990	399	79	3468	11.5	13.4	13.9
Miami	663	88	65	816	10.7	10.2	12.2
Baltimore	1880	20	—	1990	1.0	14.1	23.4
District of Columbia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dallas	N/A	N/A	N/A	3383	N/A	12.7	31.2
Nationwide						13.6	22.3

Note: 1 mi = 1.6 km.

TABLE 2 Internal Highway Agencies by City

City	Agency	Responsibility
Los Angeles	Dept. of Public Works Dept. of Transportation	Construction and Maintenance Planning, Traffic Control, Parking, Intersection Control
Boston	Dept. of Public Works Dept. of Transportation Public Improvement Commission Air Pollution Control Commission Police	Construction and Maintenance — Joint Control on Street Permits Traffic and Parking Operations, Planning Utilities Layout Fee Parking Regulation Traffic Enforcement / Taxi Regulation
Philadelphia	Dept. of Streets Parking Authority Deputy Mayor's Office	Design, Construction, Maintenance, Traffic Control Parking Coordination, Other Programs
Baltimore	Dept. of Public Works	Design, Construction, Maintenance, Operations
Miami	City	Parking Regulation and Traffic Enforcement
Chicago	Dept. of Transportation	Design, Construction, Maint., Operations— Skyway
District of Columbia	Dept. of Public Works Division of Motor Vehicles	Design, Construction, Maintenance and Operation Motor Vehicle Regulation and Parking
Dallas	Dept. of Public Works and Transportation Dept. of Streets and Sanitation	Design, Construction, Operations, Signals Maintenance

Dallas has two agencies involved in highways. The Department of Streets and Sanitation has maintenance responsibilities, whereas the Department of Public Works and Transportation has the other highway functions. In addition, the North Texas Tollway Authority is responsible for tollway construction and maintenance.

Miami is a special case. The Miami-Dade County government structure was created in the late 1950s as a two-tier regional government structure. The county has the primary responsibility for highways, including all street regulatory signs and signals and all highways in unincorporated areas. In municipalities such as the city of Miami, the municipality has the responsibility for parking regulation, traffic enforcement, and construction and maintenance of basically local roads.

Agencies Responsible for Public Transportation Services and the Role of Central Cities

Agencies Responsible for Public Transportation

In two cities, the responsibility for the provision of public transportation rests with a county or state governmental agency. In Miami, the county government is the provider of public

transportation with a state agency providing commuter rail service. In Baltimore, the Maryland Department of Transportation provides all public transportation services in the state. The role of the city is limited to the role in the MPO and city representation in the county and state political structure.

Chicago has a two-tier transit governance structure. The Regional Transit Authority is an oversight organization responsible for planning, coordination, and fund allocation. Services are provided by three separate authorities. The city has five representatives on the 13-person RTA board.

The Transit Authority (CTA) is responsible for bus, elevated subway, and paratransit services in the city, with some connections to the suburbs. The CTA board is composed of seven members; four are city appointees. METRA provides commuter rail services in the region, and the city has one representative on the seven-person board. PACE provides bus service in the suburbs; the city is not represented on the board.

In Boston, public transportation is provided by MBTA. The seven-person MBTA board is appointed by the governor. A 78-person MBTA Advisory Board reviews and approves the MBTA budget; representation is weighted by the municipal government share of the costs of service.

The primary transit agency in Philadelphia is SEPTA, a regional operator of all public transit modes. Of the 15-member SEPTA board, two are appointed by the city. The city owns most of the infrastructure and provides 85 percent of the operating deficit and capital match. Additional service is provided by PATCO (a commuter rail link) under an arrangement whereby the city owns the subway right-of-way and receives funds from the operator (Delaware River Port Authority). Other service is provided by the New Jersey Transit Authority, which runs commuter buses from New Jersey communities to the central city.

Los Angeles is served by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. The board of the authority has 13 members, four appointed by the mayor, with the approval of the city council. Commuter rail service is provided by a state agency, the Southern California Regional Rail Authority. In addition, the city DOT sponsors 40 bus routes provided by private operators on a competitively bid basis.

Transit service to the District of Columbia is provided by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, a regional authority with a 12-person board. The District of Columbia has two members of the board and provides 40 percent of the operating budget and 38 to 40 percent of the local capital requirements.

Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) is responsible for public transportation within the Dallas metroplex. The city has eight individual members and shares one representative with three smaller cities on a 15-member board. The City of Dallas representatives are nominated by city council members and approved by the full city council. There is a localized trolley service operated by a local transit authority.

Role of the Central City

The provision of public transit services varies greatly in each of the areas served. The role of the central city includes membership of the governing boards in five cities. In all cases, except for CTA in Chicago and DART in Dallas, the central city is a minority member of the board and in some cases provides a larger portion of costs than the proportion of representation. CTA operates only within the city and is one of four organizations with boards involved in public transportation in the city. This minority representation may reflect the role of the central city in the state and regional political structure. The Federal Transit Administration is sponsoring research on the governance of transit organizations and, under the New Paradigms project, future governance structures to meet the needs of the 21st century. Central cities should monitor these activities with a focus on efficiency and performance of the different structures and the equity issues of funding and representation.

Agencies Responsible for Other Transportation Facilities and Services and the Role of the Central City

Airports

Three cities—Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Chicago—have responsibility for the airports serving their regions. In all three, a separate division or department of aviation is responsible for the airport. In Boston, there is a state authority for the airport, whereas in Baltimore the airport is run by the state DOT. The Miami–Dade County Airport is under the jurisdiction of the county government. Airports in the Washington, D.C., area are under the jurisdiction of the federal government. The city of Dallas has responsibility for one local airport and shares responsibility with the city of Fort Worth for the regional airport.

Water and Port Facilities

In Boston and Baltimore, waterborne facilities are under state control, with the same agencies responsible for airports. A new agency has been created in Philadelphia, the Port of Philadelphia and Camden, to consolidate functions of three previous organizations. The county is responsible for the Port of Miami. Los Angeles has a Harbor Department governed by the Board of Harbor Commissioners within the city government. The Port of Chicago is governed by the Illinois International Port District, with the city appointing five of the nine board members.

Rail Facilities

The Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation constructs and maintains rail facilities in that city's parks. Chicago has a program for dealing with some 1,600 rail viaducts. The city owns or maintains 113 viaducts and has maintenance responsibility for many of the 103 viaducts over state expressways. In addition, the city has a viaduct clearance improvement program designed to increase vertical clearance beneath railroad viaducts to between 4.3 and 4.4 m (14 and 14½ ft). The Illinois Commerce Commission may reimburse up to 60 percent of the cost of improvements. Otherwise, cities reported that rail facilities were basically private-sector responsibilities. Los Angeles is involved in the \$1.9 billion rail corridor improvement that links the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to the major intercontinental rail network.

Regulation

The regulation of taxi services is currently under review in Los Angeles and Philadelphia. Dallas monitors and licenses taxicabs within the city and for shuttle service to the regional airport.

Role of Central Cities in Regional Planning

Under federal legislation, MPOs are a prerequisite for federal highway and transit funding. Literature references document the history and evolution of MPOs [Francois (1)]. MPOs in different states and regions have very different organization and decision structures. The current MPO structure is a reflection of past planning efforts and the current political structure of the region.

All cities responding to the survey are voting members of their MPO. The size of the MPO board and city representation are given in Table 3. Again, the city representation is in the minority on all boards. In two areas, Boston and Los Angeles, these are separate organiza-

TABLE 3 MPO Board Size and City Representation

City	MPO	Board Size	Number of City Representatives
Los Angeles	SCAG	71	16
	LACO MTA	13	4
Boston	MPO	14	1
	MAPC	N/A	N/A
Philadelphia	DVRPC	18	1
Baltimore	Baltimore Metro Council	6	1
Miami	Board of Commissioners	17	1
Chicago	CATS	20	1
District of Columbia	Wash. Council of Governments	33	5
Dallas	NCTCOG	223	1

tions dealing with funding allocations. In Boston, the Metro Area Planning Council (MAPC) deals with the TIP distribution and project selection and, in Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Metro Transportation Authority handles the state-created funding programs amounting to more than \$2.3 billion per year.

Issues for the workshop include

- The effectiveness of the existing MPO processes to meet federal requirements,
- The evolving role of MPOs under ISTEA and new opportunities under reauthorization,
- The representation and voting power of central cities, and
- The use of the MPO structure for all transportation programs rather than just federal programs.

Hierarchy of Transportation Decision Making and Coordination of Transportation Activities in the City

Mechanisms for coordination vary among the cities responding to the survey. The District of Columbia is unique in that the government is under congressional authority and oversight. Internal coordination occurs within the Department of Public Works. In Miami, where the county plays a strong role, coordination is done within the county and the MPO governing board.

Several cities use the budgetary process for coordination. In Baltimore, the Department of Public Works develops the initial budget with input from housing, planning, and the Baltimore Development Corporation. Projects are prioritized by the planning department and the program is approved by the City Planning Commission (which includes representatives of city departments and mayoral appointees), then the Board of Finance, Board of Estimates, city council, and, finally, the mayor. In Boston, the Capital Budget Office coordinates infrastructure investment and interagency partnerships. The Chicago Department of Transportation submits its program to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Programs are then reviewed by a 15-member Capital Improvement Advisory Committee before approval by OMB, the mayor, and then the city council.

The Los Angeles Department of Transportation takes the lead for coordination through its planning responsibilities. Additional coordination is achieved through checks and balances between the mayor and the city council. Philadelphia has established a deputy mayor for transportation to coordinate programs as well as assume responsibility for several programs without a departmental home. Boston also has a mayoral cabinet position responsible for integrating services.

Dallas is managed by a city manager and five assistant city managers, one of whom is responsible for the Department of Public Works and Transportation, another for the Department of Streets and Sanitation, and a third for legislative duties.

In some ways, the different arrangements reflect the individual charter or structure of each city government. Where there is a strong mayoral charter, the mayor's office clearly has the lead. In other instances, the balance of power shifts between the executive and legislative branches. In three areas—Miami, Baltimore, and the District of Columbia—the major coordination is at another level of government given jurisdictional responsibilities for the various modes and programs. In Dallas, the direction is under the city manager.

Role and Organization of Any City Legislative Body Concerning Transportation

Each city except Miami reported involvement of the legislative body in transportation decision making. In Los Angeles and Philadelphia, two committees of the city council affect transportation. In Los Angeles, there is a Committee on Transportation and a Committee on Planning and Land Use. A Committee on Streets and Services and a Committee on Transportation and Public Utilities both have transportation responsibilities in Philadelphia. The City of Dallas Council has a Transportation and Telecommunications Committee. Chicago has three council subcommittees—the Committee on Budget and Government Operations, which has jurisdiction over government expenditures; the Committee on Finance, which oversees intergovernmental grant agreements; and the Committee on Transportation and the Public Way, which has jurisdiction over transportation issues. Whereas the primary responsibilities of these committees and the respective city councils is in approving budgets and passing legislation, they are also involved in constituent issues and appointments to boards.

Transportation Financing

A separate paper on transportation financing has been prepared for this conference. The financing paper provides an overview of the financing issues, whereas this paper and the accompanying responses to the questionnaire provide some specifics for the eight cities.

In general, the financing of highway projects follows the outline of jurisdictional responsibilities presented earlier in this paper. Federal funds are administered by the state and programmed for projects in a number of ways. The discussion on programming issues of federal funds was the subject of a separate conference and is reported in *Transportation Research Circular 465 (2)*.

A discussion of the national trends in financing, comparing local financing with state and federal financing, helps provide some context for the effect of financing on institutional and governance issues. Again, the term "local" means all local governments because the data source does not break the data out by level of local jurisdiction.

Nationally, in 1995, total highway disbursements were \$92 billion—\$57 billion for state-administered highways and \$35 billion for local highways. The source of highway receipts for state and local governments is given in Table 4, which reveals that state funding for highways comes mainly from motor fuel taxes, vehicle taxes and fees, and federal aid. About 22 percent of state-collected motor fuel and vehicle taxes is shared with local governments. Of this, 82 percent is grants-in-aid, and 18 percent represents direct expenditures by the states on local highways. (The term "local highways" means all nonstate highways. The source of the data does not distinguish between city, town, and county.)

The direct level of sharing and the proportions vary from state to state. The proportions are somewhat related to the level of jurisdictional responsibility for highways between the state and local governments. Whereas population is the most frequently used parameter for distributing taxes to local governments, a variety of other factors are used, including equal shares, origin and amount of fuel sales, geographic area, and minimum shares coupled with

TABLE 4 Financing of Highways—Sources of Funds—State and Local Governments

Source	Percentage of State Receipts	Percentage of Local Receipts
Motor fuel and vehicle taxes	45	4
Tolls	6	2
General funds	3	27
Property taxes and special assessments	0	14
Other	3	6
Miscellaneous	3	12
Bonding	8	9
Subtotal, jurisdiction-generated funding	68	74
Outside funding	2 (local)	24 (state)
Federal aid	30	2

other factors. Several states have different distributions associated with increments of fuel and motor vehicle taxes imposed at different times. Some increments are for specific program purposes, and the allocation is a function of the specific purpose.

Federal aid is a small portion of highway receipts for local governments (2 percent), compared with 30 percent for states. Local governments raise a larger share of highway receipts internally (74 percent) than do states (68 percent). State and local governments use the same proportion of bonding, although that proportion may change with the introduction of state infrastructure banks.

For public transportation, federal funding is about 45 percent of total capital expenditures (\$5.6 billion) and 5 percent of total operating expenditures (\$17.3 billion). State governments fund 18 percent of capital and 21 percent of operating costs. Locally generated funds support 26 percent of capital and 31 percent of operating costs. The remainder of the operating costs (44 percent) comes from fares and other operator revenues.

For the eight cities in the survey, the funding sources vary greatly.

Baltimore reports that most of the funding is federal or comes from state-collected fuel and vehicle taxes allocated to the city, with only a small amount from the city’s general fund.

Chicago lists nine funding sources: federal, state gas tax/motor fuel taxes allocated to counties and cities on a population share, city gas tax collected by the state, general obligation bonds backed by property tax revenues, public-private partnerships such as a 50 percent/50 percent partnership on sidewalks, tax assessment special service areas, tax increment financing, special use fees such as vehicle stickers and parking taxes, and transit asset sales/leasebacks.

Los Angeles submitted a 29-page matrix prepared by the local MPO describing all the various federal, state, and local funding sources. Miami enclosed a one-page summary of conventional transportation funding sources.

Restructuring or Consolidation of Responsibilities: Implemented or Under Consideration

Nationally, much has been written about reengineering government agencies. Concepts such as consolidation of services with other governments have been proposed. Privatization of services is also reported as a major trend. Examples of these trends are seen in responses to the questionnaire on which this paper is based.

In other parts of this paper, there is discussion of the organizational structures in the eight cities, many of them resulting from reorganizations or consolidations. Examples include

- Creation of the Chicago Department of Transportation, which consolidated all highway and planning responsibility in one agency;
- Consolidation of highway programs in Baltimore under one city agency with state responsibility for all financing;
- The region (county) approach in Miami-Dade County, where the traffic engineering and control responsibility as well as transit, aviation, and ports are under the county government;
- Creation of the position of deputy mayor for transportation in Philadelphia to coordinate transportation activities and undertake unique programs that do not fit into existing organizations;
- The restructuring of the MPO in Boston to give local officials a voice in the MPO;
- Creation of LADOT in 1979 to coordinate key transportation responsibilities within one department; and
- Creation of special-purpose organizations, such as the Dade County Expressway Authority and the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority for the construction and financing of a \$1.9 billion rail corridor project in Los Angeles.

Several consolidations or reorganizations are under discussion, including shifting responsibility for taxi regulation from a larger commission to a local taxi regulatory authority and creation of a special transportation zone in the San Fernando portion of Los Angeles to assume control from the existing regional transit authority.

Additional Information Provided

In the survey there was room for respondents to list activities that did not fit into the preceding questions. The additional information generally presents ongoing activities in the city that help shape the transportation future. Items reported include the following:

- The Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control System in Los Angeles;
- The Logan Airport 2000 project in Boston;
- Boston Department of Transportation involvement in managing the competition for scarce access to public ways between residential, retail, and institutional developments;
- Philadelphia's initiation of a "transit first" policy in 1989 (to further the policy, a joint city-SEPTA transit improvement committee meets to review street designs, traffic controls, and other strategies);
- District of Columbia completion of a strategic vision transportation plan and a 6-year capital improvement program; and
- Chicago's reengineering of the processes for design and materials procurement (Chicago is now submitting projects for budget approval on an annual program basis).

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RELATING TO STEERING COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

What Is the Institutional and Governance Framework for Transportation in These Central Cities, Both Internal Within City Government and Within the Region and State?

Internal Organization

The survey has identified a number of different ways in which cities have organized transportation activities. The organizational structures for highways can be grouped into two generic models and several specialized organizations responding to local conditions.

Under one generic model, most responsibilities are consolidated under a city DOT. This model is analogous to state DOTs. The second model has internal activities spread among several agencies, with strong coordination at the mayoral level. Highway construction and maintenance is accomplished in a larger, multifunctional public works department.

A specialized model exists in Miami, where the county has the major responsibility for highway construction and maintenance as part of a larger consolidation of government responsibilities. Another specialized model is found in Baltimore, where the city and state have consolidated responsibilities into one organization currently housed under city government.

Several cities have responsibility for airports and ports. The organizations are separate from other transportation-related functions.

In the cities studied, multimodal or intermodal coordination occurs, if at all, at a level higher than city; there are no city-level multimodal agencies.

External Organization

Cities typically rely on external organizations for the provision of public transportation services. The role of the city government in these organizations varies; however, in all but two cases the city representation is in the minority. The role of the state in highways within the city also varies. The jurisdictional role of the state is related to the amount of revenue shared by the state with cities. There are many special-purpose organizations with their own revenue sources, generally toll authorities, that greatly affect the transportation picture. Again, city involvement varies, but in most cases these organizations are created and controlled by the state.

What Is the Decision-Making Process for Transportation?

City transportation agencies operate in a complex authorizing environment subject to legislation, regulations, and funding programs from federal, state, county, and city executive and legislative bodies. The authorizing environment is different from the generic organization models described under the section titled "Internal Organization."

How Do Central Cities Fare in This Structure, Both for Short- and Long-Term Decisions?

The distribution of the jurisdictional responsibility for highways among states and other levels of government has been studied.

State responsibility for highways in central cities varies with the overall state role for highways in the entire state. In all instances, the level of state involvement in central cities is lower than the level of involvement for urban areas in the state. Countering this is the fact that the state has the responsibility for the highest level of highways, including Interstate highways, expressways, and arterials that carry the heaviest traffic volumes. Similar statistics on financing have been presented.

The conference will discuss these issues at length and present recommendations for both the short and the long term.

In the context of how central cities fare in transportation, conference participants will benefit from discussion of the statement made by Stephen Del Giudice of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, as quoted earlier: "To the extent that this is an issue, however, it may reflect a larger concern about central city representation in the political process in general."

What Is the Role of the Central City in Regional Organizations, Other Modes, and Regulated Services?

In all cases, the central city is a voting member of the MPO, but in a minority position with regard to the region. The effectiveness of the central city in this regional structure should be discussed in greater detail. The evolving role of MPOs to make sense of this multiagency transportation picture increases the need for meaningful city involvement in the MPO.

Is Fragmentation of Responsibilities and Authority a Problem?

The answer to the question, "Is fragmentation of responsibilities and authority a problem?" rests not in this paper but in the total conference setting. The answer goes to the performance of the system and the users' perception of system performance. Is there a significant difference between the condition, operation, and performance of transportation services between the central cities? Is there a correlation between structure and governance and the system's performance? Is performance different for the facilities under the jurisdiction of the city versus those under jurisdiction of the counties, the states, or the special-purpose authorities?

ISSUES FOR THE CONFERENCE

- Is there a significant difference in system performance among central cities?
- Can the differences be correlated with differences in institutional and governance settings and structures?
 - Are central cities being treated equitably in the assumption of jurisdictional responsibilities and financing among state, county, and special-purpose organizations?
 - Given the evolving influence of MPOs, how can the central cities play a more significant role in the process?
 - Since federal funding is a small portion of city transportation budgets, are there processes for coordinating programs between the other funding agencies, states, counties, and special-purpose authorities? Is the MPO the appropriate mechanism?
 - How can multimodal coordination be accomplished within the city? within the region?
 - How can cities better share information on institutional and governance structures and issues, and on some of the special programs?
 - What is the future mission for cities in transportation? Do the "vectors of change" listed earlier point to the need to reexamine existing organizations and reinvent an institutional and governance structure for tomorrow's mission?

REFERENCES

1. *Transportation Research Circular 450: Institutional Aspects of Metropolitan Transportation Planning*. Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., Dec. 1995.
2. *Transportation Research Circular 465: Conference on Transportation Programming Methods and Issues*. Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., Dec. 1996.
3. *TR News 192*. Institutional Arrangements in Transportation: Impacts of Changing Rules (entire issue). Sept.–Oct. 1997.
4. T. F. Humphrey. *NCHRP Synthesis of Highway Practice 217: Consideration of the 15 Factors in the Metropolitan Planning Process*. Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1995.
5. H. L. Peyrebrune. *Technology: A Bridge to the States—Opportunities for Intergovernmental Cooperation on Intelligent Transportation Systems*. Public Technologies, Inc., 1996.