

evaluation, TDOT is able to recommend shifting of fund balances among areas to obtain maximum advantage of available funding and satisfy local program needs for major projects. Careful coordination and understanding between TDOT and the local public works or street departments during the administration of the federal-aid urban program have led to agreement by local officials that this manipulation of available funds is in their best

interests. Each area has been assured that its fund balance will become available for program implementation at the time projects are approved for construction; to date, there have been no problems of coordination or scheduling that could not be overcome nor has any urban-area implementation program suffered as the result of fund manipulation.

Abridgment

Transportation Planners and Local Elected Decision Makers

June E. Lykes, Jr., City Manager, Garland, Texas

What is the perspective of a city manager toward transportation planning? Often, the transportation planner is not as cognizant of the needs and concerns of the elected decision maker as he or she should be.

Elected decision makers have varying characteristics. They come from diverse backgrounds in many respects, such as

1. Economic status,
2. Political views,
3. Vocational condition,
4. Level of education,
5. Motivation toward the decision-maker function,
6. Amount of available time, and
7. View of their role.

However, regardless of their background, these persons want to participate in the decision-making process.

In local decision making, the matrix for understanding has many categories, e.g.,

1. Transportation,
2. Housing,
3. Crime and delinquency,
4. Environmental concerns,
5. Cultural and recreational affairs,
6. Economic conditions,
7. Human services,
8. Education,
9. Employment and job-related conditions,
10. Utilities, and
11. Health.

How can the levels of responsibility in such a matrix be organized? A desirable format is described below:

<u>Organization Trichotomy</u>	<u>Primary Decision Makers</u>	<u>Secondary Approval</u>	<u>Data-Information Recommendations</u>
Strategic policy	Council, city manager	Citizens	City staff, other—regional, state, private, federal

<u>Organization Trichotomy</u>	<u>Primary Decision Makers</u>	<u>Secondary Approval</u>	<u>Data-Information Recommendations</u>
Managerial (programmatic)	City manager, department managers	Citizens' council	City staff, other—regional, state, private, federal
Operational (project)	Operational managers—for water, air, bus transit, rail, street, human services, recreation, and education	Citizens' council, city manager, department managers	City staff, other

This format, however, may or may not agree with the present responsibility levels in a given urban area.

The relationships between transportation plans and planners and elected decision makers also vary. There are various responsibility levels in transportation planning, e.g.,

1. Community direction statements,
2. Local ordinances,
3. Community long-range planning,
4. Transportation system management,
5. The metropolitan planning organization,
6. Zoning and land-use regulations,
7. The capital-improvement program,
8. Budgets,
9. Subdivision development, and
10. Other categories.

In the real world for elected decision makers, the most important levels of responsibility usually involve land use and zoning. Thus, it behooves transportation planners to work more effectively with local elected decision makers to improve the transportation planning and programming process.