James A. Scott
Highway Research Board

Three papers discuss structures and programs for implementing transportation plans at the state, regional, and federal levels. Mueller describes the creation and subsequent activities of the Florida Department of Transportation. Colcord discusses the institutional opportunities, particularly councils of governments and departments of transportation, available within states to plan and implement transportation programs. Ettinger discusses the assistance the Urban Mass Transportation Administration can offer under various legislative provisions.

Edward A. Mueller
Florida Department of Transportation

Any approach to public transportation in Florida requires some understanding of the transportation organization. By 1972, transportation efforts in Florida had evolved from a highly politically motivated highway department to an urban-oriented, somewhat sophisticated, multimodal professional department of transportation. The changes were not always accomplished smoothly or gracefully, but they did occur. What used to be the strong political right arm of the governor several decades ago is now an action-oriented agency that carries out its program by working together with legislators and all varieties of federal and local officials.

In 1969, Florida legislatively reorganized its transportation functions. At that time a department of transportation was created, largely composed of the former state road department but including other forms of transportation with the exception of waterway development. Four functional divisions were created: planning and programming, administration, road operations, and transit operations. A secretary of transportation was created to oversee these functions. The Administration Division handles personnel, finance, contract lettings, permits, office services, reproduction, and the like. It also houses the right-of-way functions, the numerous toll-collection facilities, and the turnpike. The Road Operations Division designs, constructs, and maintains highways. The Planning and Programming Division undertakes the planning activity for all modes of transportation. In the preconstruction process, this division carries all activities

IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

through the location survey process up through the design hearing; in transit studies, it carries matters up to the transit technical study category. The Transit Operations Division does work similarly to that of the Division of Road Operations and is responsible for aviation and conventional bus and rapid transit. It is also concerned with railroads and will be concerned with waterways.

The lessons and customs of the former highway operation have been carried over to the transit operations. Florida has some unique ways of doing business that need explanation.

Florida has an 8-cent per gallon gasoline tax. Four cents of this goes back to the department itself for "transportation purposes"; 2 cents of this goes to counties; 1 cent is for transportation purposes and is the only money that can be used for maintenance; and 1 cent goes to cities for transportation purposes, but part of it is subject to "diversion." Florida counties also have the authority to impose, by referendum, an additional 1-cent gasoline tax to finance transportation systems.

One will see from the above that only 2 cents of the 8 cents are restricted to highways. Thus, Florida might be said to have a transportation trust fund since three-fourths of the revenue is flexible although dedicated to transportation. We think it is more important at this time for states to have this flexibility now than for the federal government to have it some time in the future.

Florida has been a keen advocate of the partnership concept from the first in developing its 11,000-mile primary highway system, which is largely nonlimited access. This state has insisted that local government, usually counties, purchase the right-of-way. Only for Interstate and highways at a few key locations where unusual circumstances prevailed has the state ever bought any right-of-way. It has not been uncommon for counties to get right-of-way donated for the entire road. Because Florida is so flat, it usually has been easy to indicate a width such as 100, 200, or 250 ft and get landowners to cooperate. When land is not donated, then, of course, local government has to buy it.

In the beginning, the transportation department maintained 7,000 miles of secondary roads for counties and charged them for this. Since October 1, 1971, the counties could do this themselves or have the department do it. The department also designs and builds the secondary road system in cooperation with the counties. Somewhat unusual in nature, the secondary system encompasses many major miles in some places.

We often have had to resort to toll facilities. Some of these are revenue based; others use a combination of revenue and county secondary funds. Almost all major facilities are now operated by the transportation department even though financed with local gas tax funds. The backing usually secures a lower interest rate and, of course, helps to sell bonds under better marketing conditions. The 1969 reorganization process in Florida provided a better cooperative method in selling bonds that requires the joint approval and acceptance by the state and local unit of government.

I cite all of these matters to show that a spirit of partnership and cooperation has prevailed in the construction of our 20,000 miles of principal highway systems. Units of government in Florida just have to get along together; otherwise, the job will not get done.

Lessons learned from highway experiences are being applied to transit operations. In 1970 our legislature made it possible to involve ourselves in nonhighway affairs, and we are taking advantage of it very rapidly. We have set up a basic policy of sharing in cost participation and development. For transit projects, such as bus purchases, for example, we will equally match funds with local agencies and, in turn, use these funds to match federal funds for a project.

We have built our budget, in all instances, on matching available or expected-to-be-available federal funds. Our project funds are committed this way, anticipating the local matching to be done. Some projects do not involve local funding; these are statewide in nature or so small that it is not worth the red tape necessary in getting matching federal dollars.

It is very easy to work with local government units. A single mutually acceptable agreement is drawn up that commits the local funds and sets out what the state should

do. In many instances the state will lend money to get a project into being, do the federal processing, and hold the public hearing. Although the department of transportation has really been in business for modes other than highways for a relatively short period, it already had a good record of project achievement. I would like to share some of the specifics.

We are working with local government and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration to salvage several failing systems, primarily by replacing worn-out buses and by providing capital grants to publicly owned urban systems. We also are establishing exclusive or preferential bus lanes, developing fringe parking facilities, and reviewing special TOPICS projects that will aid bus operations.

We are considering an elevated, rubber-tired system in Miami. Various types of rapid transit are being explored in the urban corridor between the Tampa-St. Petersburg and the Daytona-Cape Kennedy areas and encompassing Disney World and Orlando.

We have plans for a turbotrain link between Miami and Disney World in central Florida. Also, the department sees the future potential of a high-speed tracked air-cushion vehicle carrying tourists and residents between southeast Florida (Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach) and central Florida (Tampa-St. Petersburg, Orlando, and Disney World). A tracked air-cushion demonstration project is certainly a reasonable possibility as a beginning link in tying together southeast and central Florida.

In considering potential rail programs in Florida, we have not been able to avoid the great problems that exist throughout the state in rail-highway at-grade intersections. This interference between the 2 major transportation modes is far more significant than the interfacing of these and other modes for the continuous uninterrupted transport of goods and people over a balanced system. There remains as a final alternative the possible relocation of rail lines to the less urbanized fringe areas of our cities. I have held quarterly conferences with all the railroads operating in Florida to explore ways in which we may jointly improve rail service.

We need to develop additional legislation, especially in the financial field. A channelization bill was introduced that would flow all federal transportation funding through the Department of Transportation, but the legislators balked. They want to take a longer look at it. The department is seeking new sources of state revenue to develop strong programs in urban bus transit, air facilities, and high-speed ground service so that no more Highway Trust Funds will be used than necessary.

I will now address more specifically some of the questions that have been posed. We are naturally interested in the practical problems of implementing public transportation within the political framework of urban areas. A state public transportation policy was developed by the department. This policy pledges state support—technical and financial—to local governmental units within the limits of legislative appropriations. Public transportation received $5 million in 1971 and $7.4 million in 1972 from the state Transportation Trust Fund, primarily gas tax revenue.

We prefer to have local transportation projects originate at the local level. The local people then feel that the project is their own and the state is simply helping them achieve something for the community. We even encourage full community participation in the planning stages so that the various segments of the population feel that they are a part of what is being developed. We have found that they are more apt to support the facilities if they have a hand in developing them. Otherwise, we have found that some segments of the communities view our efforts with suspicion. Often they feel that the transportation system is the brainchild of some far-removed politican and is to be built for political purposes at public expense. Full community participation is about the only way to reduce this attitude and to make the people satisfied that they are really building something for themselves, something that they need, something that they will use, and something that they are willing to pay for.

Usually, the request for a local project originates in the local or regional planning agency. Initially, this is usually a request for a study to solve a particular problem. In the event that the request is for assistance to salvage a faltering transit system, we usually participate on a fifty-fifty basis. If the request is for a long-range study involving a federal grant, we will match the local share and handle all of the paper work

to secure the federal grant and to assist in developing the scope of the studies up to and including contracting with the consultants who will do the job.

We attempt to schedule, or at least anticipate, these local projects as far in advance as possible so that they can be properly considered in the appropriation process. The entire Department of Transportation operates from a 5-year budget and work program.

This works fine with highway projects because funding is more predictable; but, with UMTA funds and projects generating at the local level, the third, fourth, and fifth years of the public transportation get rather "iffy." If we can get the federal funding channelization bill through the legislature, this will do much to improve the validity of the budget and work program. With a 5-year approach to the major projects, development time becomes secondary in importance to the system design concepts.

In most cities public transportation has become a public utility. It is essential to the life of the community, and public subsidization is not only desirable but necessary. Most communities have had to establish fees for certain services such as garbage disposal and sewer systems, and these fees are assessed whether or not the services are used. It is a funny thing that we quite willingly will pay these fees to haul our garbage and to transport our sewage, but not to transport ourselves. It is our great love affair with the private automobile that is the culprit. But more and more we are coming to realize that public transportation is just as essential to our well-being as any of the other public utilities.

Since no city or county can likely operate an adequate public transportation system at a profit, we must get a firm local commitment of ongoing support at the outset. Even though the federal and state governments will provide the bulk of the initial financing for capital equipment and the technical assistance, the local government is ultimately charged with the responsibility of operating the system. Therefore, the local authority will have the greater voice in determining the level of service and the fees to be charged, for depreciation and operational cost must be borne by and large by the local community.

What can the planner or engineer do, if anything, to influence the implementation of public transportation? Planning is very much a part of the process for developing transportation systems. Good planning has very important functions:

1. Translate project objectives into service design that will meet actual needs,
2. Establish the funding commitment necessary, and
3. Justify the expenditure and program to the funding agencies and user groups.

These are 3 major approaches to transportation planning:

1. Broad-scale transportation system planning with statewide benefit,
2. Specialized planning that addresses the regional transportation requirements including not only transit system requirements but also rapid transit systems, and
3. Tailored service intended exclusively for a specific urban area or often for a single group or need within the urban area (e.g., a city transit service and a transit system for the disadvantaged).

The planning process provides a sequential process that will ensure the development of a sound transportation improvement program.

Frank C. Colcord, Jr.
Tufts University

Since the 1950s, the most serious deterrent to the achievement of balanced transportation in urban areas has been inadequate funding for the public transportation mode.