BUILDING THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION COMMUNITY

GOVERNANCE FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION: 21st CENTURY GOVERNANCE NETWORK: CASE STUDIES

by

R. Scott Fosler and William R. Dodge

CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

This research sponsored by a grant from
2030 Group Project on
Regional Leadership and Governance for the Greater Washington Region

---

July 2010

The Center for Public Policy and Private Enterprise provides the strategic linkage between the public and private sector to develop and improve solutions to increasingly complex problems associated with the delivery of public services—a responsibility increasingly shared by both sectors. Operating at the nexus of public and private interests, the Center researches, develops, and promotes best practices; develops policy recommendations; and strives to influence senior decision-makers toward improved government and industry results.

Table of Contents

PREFACE

In 2009 the Center for Public Policy and Private Enterprise (CPPPE) at the University of Maryland, School of Public Policy was asked by the 2030 Group to do a series of papers on regional governance and leadership in the National Capital Region (NCR), a project labeled “Building the National Capital Region Community.” Paper I, “Assessment of Regional Governance in the National Capital Region,” summarized the history of regional governance in the National Capital Region (NCR) from its roots in 17th century English colonies and an 18th century federal district under the U. S. Constitution, to a globally-recognized multi-state region in the 21st century. Based principally on the interviews conducted for this project, Paper I also presented the challenges facing the NCR and its public, private, nonprofit, and civic assets and liabilities for addressing them. Overall, Paper I concluded that the NCR lacks the governance and leadership capacities it needs to be able to effectively think and act as a region, especially a world-class one.

Paper II, "Governance Models and Case Studies," provided background information on regional governance. It shared information on the models of regional governance that have been proffered and, to some degree, practiced, nationally and globally. It offered thoughts on the key components that need to be found in the practice of regional cooperation in the NCR. It reported on the thoughts of individuals interviewed for this project on actions that might be taken to build the capacity of the NCR to address cross-cutting challenges, effectively and confidently. Finally, it suggested case studies for further exploration from regions that have pursued these actions.

This paper, Paper III, “Case Studies,” presents the ten case studies that were selected, and also illustrate the range of interviewee suggestions for strengthening regional governance, as they have been applied in other regions. The ten case studies are:

1. Citizens League of Minneapolis/St. Paul
2. METRO (Portland)
3. Envision Utah (Salt Lake City)
4. Southern California Association of Governments State of the Region Report (Los Angeles
5. Chicago Metropolis 2020
6. St. Louis Cross-sector Collaboration
7. Negotiated Investment Strategy (Dayton, Ohio)
8. Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
9. San Diego Association of Governments
10. Institute for Portland Metropolitan Studies

1. CITIZENS LEAGUE OF MINNEAPOLIS/ST. PAUL (Regional Citizens League)

Background

Civically-sponsored regional civic organizations have been around longer than many of their publicly- or privately-sponsored counterparts. They generally define themselves as non-partisan, independent, and open membership organizations that conduct studies of emerging regional challenges and educate and encourage regional citizens and community leaders to address them.

Often called regional citizens leagues, forums or councils, they have been created in various regions over the past century. Some of the earliest, such as the Citizens League of Greater Cleveland (citizensleague.org), were created to reform municipal governments over a century ago. Many have sprung up over the last decade to help guide implementation of regional planning processes, such as Valley Vision in the Sacramento region (valleyvision.org) and the Regional Atlanta Civic League, a merger of Research Atlanta, the Atlanta Metro Group, and the Regional Leadership Institute of the Atlanta Regional Commission (racl.info). They range in size from a few hundred to a few thousand members and exist in a few dozen regions, nationally.

Regional civic leagues especially focus on regional governance questions and have supported the launching of regional visioning processes, creating new regional planning and service organizations, and enacting regional revenue sharing agreements to share the cost of critical infrastructure or overcome inequities across jurisdictions.

Lacking adequate sources of predictable funding, however, regional civic organizations often have short half-lives and, consequently, do not currently exist in many regions. Such was the fate of “A Greater Washington” in the National Capital Region. A couple of the regional civic organizations, such as the long-established citizens league in the Minneapolis/St. Paul (citizesnleague.net) region and the newer Jacksonville Community Council, Inc. (jcci.org) and Focus St. Louis (focus-stl.org) have provided multiple regional governance venues. Regional civic organizations especially provide regional problem-solving arenas through their citizen study committees and conduct regional cooperation performance audits through preparing “state of the region” reports.

The future of regional civic organizations is problematic. The growth of special interest organizations, with their focus on short-term advocacy, has siphoned off citizen participants, and funding, for the traditional in-depth analyses conducted by regional civic organizations. Even some long-established citizen’s leagues are wrestling with declining memberships and resources. For example, the Citizens League of Greater Cleveland closed its doors after supporting “good government” initiatives for over a century. And the newer citizens leagues are struggling to stay solvent. The possible good news: this dilemma illustrates that citizens still want to be involved in addressing regional challenges and have a direct impact on their resolution. Technology is on their side. Electronic forums, modeled after MoveOn.org, might be key to the future of regional civic organizations.

Description

The Citizens League of Minneapolis/St. Paul (Citizens League) describes its mission as:

The Citizens League builds civic imagination and capacity in Minnesota by:

- *Identifying, framing and proposing solutions to public policy problems;*
- *Developing civic leaders in all generations who can govern for the common good; and*
- *Organizing the individual and institutional relationships necessary to achieve these goals.*

The Citizens League vision is 'to create the common ground where "We the People" can achieve the common good'.

Founded in 1952, the Citizens League sees itself as “one of the nation's premier citizen-based ‘good government’ organizations", "distinguished by its pioneering process that involves citizens in studying public issues and developing policy solutions." Study committees, composed of Citizens League members and assisted by staff and consultants, engage the public in dialoging on issues selected by the Citizens League board, prepare reports, and pursue the implementation of recommended actions.

The Citizens League focuses on public policy issues at the local, metropolitan and state levels. Over the years, the Citizens League has been one of the most effective agents of change in Minnesota public policy, in areas such as public finance, regional government, education, transportation and health care. It was instrumental in establishing the Metropolitan Council, the regional planning and service delivery agency, and the Minnesota Fiscal Disparities Program, which equalizes tax burdens across the region's local governments.

According to the Citizens League, its "members don't all think alike, but they do share some common beliefs, such as:

- Effective government depends on uninhibited discussion and ensuring that special interest groups are challenged;
- Issues must be probed beyond the narrow confines of partisanship;
- Results need to be more than just talk - League members want to see things happen."

The Citizens has 2200 members, both individuals and institutional.

The Citizens League is governed by a 29-member Board of Directors, which is elected by the membership. A professional staff supports the activities of the members with an annual budget of nearly $1,000,000. Member dues cover about half of operations costs, dues categories ranging from $25 to over $10,000 annually. The balance of revenues comes from foundations and other sources.

Citizens League activities include:

- study committees on the public policy issues important to Minnesota. These include regional policy, including a Regional Public Policy Workshop to define a focus for future regional initiatives. "The most promising idea identified was to create a model for resource use by examining the connections between the "groups of entitlement" we form and our civic claims on one another." Recent Citizens League studies addressed water governance, charter schools, aging services, judicial selection, immigrant students, and transportation studies. The Citizens League also prepares an annual Fiscal Disparities Report.

- civic leadership building through casual gatherings, action groups, workshops and action groups, such as launching the Quantum Civics program to train future civic leaders.

- events like Policy and a Pint (pub gatherings) and Mind Opener Breakfasts that foster dialogues on timely topics,

- publishing the *Minnesota Journal*, a bimonthly publication sharing background on Citizens League policy issues, and

- partnering with other organizations, including the Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs.

Accomplishments

The Citizens League has recently expanded to serve citizens and the issues they are addressing in Rochester, Minnesota. Its volunteers contributed over 12,000 hours of their time in 2009, more than equaling staff time. In 2009, it also eliminated an operating deficit, in part by "releasing net assets for distribution."

Shortcomings

The major shortcoming is predictable funding. The loss of a major contributing member can result in the loss of key activities and staff.

Future Plans

The Citizens League has set a target of 3200 members by its 60th anniversary in 2012. In addition, the Citizens League is creating a new CitiZing software platform to combine social networking with the Citizens League solution-building process.

Contact Information

Sean Kershaw
President
Citizens League of Minneapolis/St. Paul
555 N. Wabasha
St. Paul, MN 55102
651-293-0575, ext. 14
skershaw@citizensleague.org

Additional Information Sources

Website -- www.citizensleague.org

2. METRO (PORTLAND, OR) – (Regional Service District)

Background

The historic regional planning and service districts -- the Metropolitan Council (Metro Council) in the Minneapolis/St. Paul region and the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) in the Portland (Oregon) region -- have attracted lots of praise, but little replication in the last century. These districts not only provide regional planning services, like regional councils of governments, but also deliver major regional services, such as solid waste and transit, and even zoos and convention centers.

The Metro Council is the oldest, created in 1967. It has regional transit and sewage treatment as well as regional planning/growth management responsibilities, and is governed by a board appointed by the Governor. Metro was created in 1977, has regional solid waste transfer, zoo, convention center, and preservation of natural areas, as well as regional planning/growth management responsibilities, and is governed by a directly-elected board.

Many regions have examined the Metro Council and Metro and tried to bring planning and service delivery, such as for transit or sewage treatment, into single regional organizations, but have been relatively unsuccessful. There has already been one notable success in this century. State-mandated examinations of regional governance in the San Diego region eventually resulted in creating a similar district, a new San Diego Association of Governments, which grew out of a regional council of governments and is described in another case study.

Description

The Metropolitan Service District (Metro) was created by the Oregon state legislature in 1977 and approved by the voters in the three central counties (Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington) of the Portland region the following year. Originally, METRO was a consolidation of the regional planning council and the Metro Service District, which was responsible for solid waste disposal, and the Washington Park Zoo, which had been administered by the Portland Zoological Society. Both of these latter operations were facing fiscal and service issues for which regional solutions looked appealing.

Although legislation enabled Metro to add additional responsibilities, with voter approval of a revenue base, none were added until it built and began operating the Oregon Convention Center in 1986. In 1990, Metro took over responsibility for the facilities managed by the Portland Exposition-Recreation Commission (performing arts, civic stadium and exposition center) and in 1994 several regional parks, cemeteries, and marine facilities from Multnomah County.

In 1992, voters approved a new Metro charter with the following ambitious preamble:

> *We, the people of the Portland area metropolitan service district, in order to establish an elected, visible and accountable regional government that is responsive to the citizens of the region and works cooperatively with our local governments; that undertakes, as its most important service, planning and policy making to preserve and enhance to quality of life and the environment for ourselves and future generations; and that provides regional services needed and desired by the citizens in an efficient and effective manner, do ordain this charter for the Portland area metropolitan service district, to be known as Metro.*

Metro was required by its charter to produce a regional vision (Region 2040) and regional framework, including establishing the urban growth boundary required by the state growth management program. Every five years, Metro prepares a regional growth update to assure adequate urban and rural reserves of land to accommodate growth for the next twenty years, including making adjustments in the urban growth boundary, the “line in the mud” as some pundits call it, if necessary. The home rule charter also requires Metro to adopt ordinances to assure consistency of local government plans with the regional framework plan, including adjudicating differences and requiring changes in local land use standards and procedures, as necessary.

Metro's unique contribution to regional planning and service districts is its elected Metro Council. Starting with a seven-member board composed of local elected officials, it shifted to an elected board of a dozen councilors in 1977 as a result of state enabling legislation. The 1992 charter reduced the size of the council back to seven, all elected by district. The 2000 charter revisions created the position of President of the council, elected at large, and reduced the number of remaining councilors to six, all elected by district. The 1992 charter also called for the election of a Metro Auditor to monitor Metro fiscal activities.

To assure strong ties to local governments, the charter created the Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee, composed primarily of local elected officials (21), which guides the Region 2040 regional planning process and recommends growth management policy.

The charter revisions also authorize Metro to levy property, excise, and income taxes, with voter approval, as well as continue to use the taxes and fees already collected in its various operations. It primarily uses property taxes to cover general operations costs and debt service on infrastructure improvements. The charter requires voter approval before issuing general obligation bonds.

Accomplishments

Metro has successfully implemented the responsibilities assigned to it. It has not only prepared regional plans, but gained the support of local governments and citizens for shaping future growth. It has pursued cooperative, cost effective, approaches to handle solid waste transfers and implement a regional natural areas program, as well handle regional assets such as the zoo and performing arts center.

A major strength of Metro is its capacity to design, guide, and even help implement strategies for addressing regional challenges. Moreover, it can focus regional decision-making and make it prominent enough to capture and sustain community leader and citizen interest in addressing regional challenges. At times, regional cooperation is as popular at the breakfast table as the weather or sports.

Shortcomings

A shortcoming of Metro is that it covers only part of the whole region. When it was created, the Oregon side of the Portland region contained most of region's population. Now Clark County and the Washington side of the Columbia River represents about 15% of the population and is growing rapidly. Metro has added non-voting representatives from the Washington jurisdictions to the Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee and informally involves them in other regional initiatives. Thus far, few compelling challenges have resulted in collaboration across the whole region, though the current discussions on a new Columbia River Crossing might offer such a topic.

Another shortcoming is the lack of public/private cooperation in the Portland region. The major businesses focus their attention on state government. Private leaders consolidated the Portland Chamber of Commerce and Alliance for Portland Progress, but the resulting Portland Business Alliance is still evolving. A recent effort to combine public and private economic development efforts failed, but efforts are underway to make a second attempt. Metro is rarely called upon to assist in regional economic development efforts

A major continuing challenge for Metro is striking a balance between state and local government interests, to secure the state powers and authorities and local government cooperation needed to succeed at regional decision making. It has taken enormous patience by Metro to build community leaders and citizen support. Metro has gone through a decades-long evolutionary process and has been the frequent subject of legal challenges. Throughout it all, Metro has not only survived, but emerged stronger with each transformation.

Future Plans

Metro tends to respond to requests from local governments and citizens to shape its future. It has found that it takes time for issues to emerge regionally, usually only after local governments have struggled to address them, individually and ineffectively. When issues emerge regionally, Metro has been willing to address them and then focuses its attention on performing well. Metro carefully monitors its performance, such as through quarterly performance reports.

Contact Information

David Bragdon
President
Metro Council
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 92232

503-797-1889
david.bragdon@oregonmetro.gov

Additional Information Sources

Website -- www.oregonmetro.org

Martin, Sheila, Horizontal Intergovernmental Relations in the Portland Metropolitan Region: Challenges and Successes, unpublished paper

3. ENVISION UTAH – (Regional Growth Compact)

Background

Regional visioning efforts have taken many different forms, often at the initiative either of existing regional organizations, which were otherwise preoccupied with other matters, or through the creation of *ad hoc* organizations, which then fade away after the regional vision (or plan) is complete. Most regions also struggle with fluctuations of growth and recession, highly fragmented local government, and strains among the government, business, and civic sectors; as well as the fundamental question of how to define their region. The Greater Wasatch Region of Utah -- grounded by the state's capital and largest city, Salt Lake City – organized a permanent, public-private partnership called Envision Utah, tailored to its unique circumstances.

Utah is both a large state, geographically, and also the sixth most urban state in the country. The amount of available land for development is severely constrained by geographical factors, including the Wasatch and Oquirrh Mountains, the Great Salt Lake and Utah Lake, and the desert. The limits on development are further restricted by the large expanses of federally-owned land. Most of the state's population and business activity is concentrated in the Greater Wasatch Region located along the Wasatch Front, a long and comparatively narrow stretch -- never exceeding a width of approximately 18 miles -- along the Wasatch Range from approximately Santaquin in the south to Brigham City in the north. The built-out extent of the Wasatch Front is about 120 miles long, but most of the residents in this broadly defined region – who constitute about 80 per cent of Utah's population -- live in the 80-100 mile corridor between Ogden and Provo, which includes Salt Lake City. The population of this region was 1.6 million residents in 1995, and is expected to grow to 2.7 million by 2020, and to five million by 2050.

The Greater Wasatch region encompasses 10 counties, 88 cities and towns, and 157 special service districts. Historically, most of these jurisdictions have managed their own land use on an independent basis, without any single entity attempting to integrate regional policies, or facilitate interaction among the business, government, and civic sectors.

Today, the Wasatch region is principally concerned with the question of how to accommodate the expected growth without jeopardizing the region's environment and quality of life, or dampening its competitiveness and desire for prosperous businesses and high paying jobs.

Description

Coalition for Utah's Future

In 1988 a group of regional leaders formed the Coalition for Utah's Future, principally in response to a serious recession that had caused many Utah residents to leave the state and seek employment elsewhere. The Coalition's mission statement declared:

> "The Coalition for Utah's Future seeks to create a Utah rich in opportunity, diversity and quality of life for all our citizens. We encourage widespread participation, information sharing, planning, consensus building and leadership. As a network of involved citizens representing broad interests, we seek to address critical long-term issues to enhance economic opportunity, educational excellence, and a superior cultural and physical environment.
>
> Through a wide variety of communications media partnerships, educational forums and collaborative endeavors, we seek to examine and publicize important choices facing Utahans, and to promote courageous community leadership to achieve specific objectives in pursuit of these goals."

In pursuit of this mission, the Coalition worked to increase cooperation and consensus across a range of issues, including transportation, education, information technology, rural economic development, affordable housing, and neighborhood concerns.

Quality Growth Steering Committee (QGSC)

By the mid-nineties the state was experiencing an unprecedented period of growth, and new worries emerged about the impact of growth on Utah's quality of life. In response, the Coalition formed a Quality Growth Steering Committee (QGSC) – comprised of prominent business leaders, representatives from the Governor's Office of Planning & Budget, state legislators, urban planning advocates, and local government officials -- to research that topic and make recommendations to the Coalition Board.

Through a formal public opinion survey, the Quality Growth Steering Committee confirmed that growth was the top public concern in the region, examined how other states, including California, Oregon and Colorado, had dealt with such growth concerns, and recommended the following:

- Develop an on-going process, not a project;
- Create a process that could be updated over the years to address growth challenges;
- Identify representatives from the public/private sectors willing to work toward the common good;

- Design a group that is manageable in size and represents as many segments of the community as possible;
- Develop several alternative scenarios as choices for future growth;
- Complete a baseline report projecting how the area would grow without a change in current trends;
- Design a technical model to create and analyze a baseline and alternative scenarios;
- Provide area residents with an opportunity to be involved in the process as much as possible and to make decisions about how the Greater Wasatch Area should grow.

In order to build public support for such an effort, the QGSC interviewed 200 community leaders -- business leaders, developers, state and local government leaders, media representatives, religious leaders, educators, environmentalists, utility companies, and minority and civic leaders – to address the following three questions: Do you believe a process to coordinate future growth would be helpful? Will you support this process? Who should be involved in this process to ensure its worth and success?

Envision Utah

In 1996, the Coalition worked with the Governor's Office for Planning and Budget and some 140 public and private entities to create a model called "Baseline," which projected future growth in the Greater Wasatch Area through 2020 according to current municipal plans. Based on the consensus and concerns raised by this projection, the Coalition created a public-private partnership called "Envision Utah," with some 200 individual members from the business, government, civic and nonprofit sectors**.** Each "Partner" was asked to sign a pledge form, promising to place the region's overall interest above their own personal and professional self-interest, while also bringing their expertise to the table. Envision Utah defined its mission as helping all the residents of the Greater Wasatch Area deal effectively with growth-related challenges, while preserving the quality of life for future generations. A key focus of their activity was to promote necessary change through a public process that engaged the entire community as proactive players in determining their region's future.

Envision Utah received funding from a variety of sources, including grants from federal, state, and local government, foundations, and businesses, and enjoyed strong leadership and support from key points across the political, business, and civic spectrum.

Envision Utah commissioned a survey by Wirthlin Worldwide that showed a core set of common underlying values drove most individuals' opinions in the region, and also indicated how to communicate effectively with citizens. The organization established four committees to coordinate its efforts:

- A Steering Committee to oversee the day-to-day activities and make political and strategic decisions regarding the accomplishment of long-term objectives;

- A Scenarios Committee, comprised of technical experts, to assist with the creation of four scenarios for residents to review and vote on;

- A Public Awareness Committee, consisting of representatives from all major media outlets in the region, to develop an effective outreach program for residents; and

- A Technical Committee to provide technical work, modeling and analysis of alternative growth scenarios, and the final Quality Growth Strategy.

In 1999 Envision Utah widely circulated four growth scenarios in the media and at public meetings, asking residents to voice their preferences on-line. Some 18,000 residents responded, with an overwhelming majority choosing Scenario C, which became known as the Quality Growth Strategy (QGS), which combined protecting the region's environment while maintaining its economic vitality and quality of life.

Envision Utah continued working with stakeholders and the public to develop specific strategies for achieving the Scenario C goals. The emphasis was placed on using market-based approaches, local incentives, education and promotion, rather than regulatory means. One of Envision Utah's roles was to analyze and disseminate the costs associated with the various strategies, to provide the information and resources to community leaders, and to facilitate informed decision making.

Accomplishments

Putting in place the ambitious institutional arrangements described above was a significant accomplishment in and of itself. Envision Utah claims that its collaborative approach has produced such results as the following:

- The reopening of the state's largest metropolitan planning organization's 30 year transportation plan, resulting in more than doubling the amount of public transportation (with its accompanying economic impact);

- Working behind the scenes to facilitate the purchase of 175 miles of existing rights-of-way for nine different potential transit corridors, considered one of the largest geographical land acquisitions in the nation by a transit agency;

- The development of iMPACS, a user-friendly software program (to be made available to Utah communities at no charge) that analyzes the costs of future growth;

- The Regional Transportation and Land-Use Opportunities Strategy brought together 27 communities to design the location of a significant transportation corridor and encouraged development to maximize this infrastructure investment;

- *Envision Your Future*, an educational package for students (grades 5 to 12), correlates with core curricula and is expected to be used by more than 12,000 students;

- The Toolbox of Quality Growth Urban Tools serves as a resource to local planning staff and elected officials, as well as developers, realtors and others, and has been used to train more than 3,000 individuals;

- A public awareness campaign that proved instrumental in the passage of a quarter-cent sales tax increase for the creation of the region's first light rail system;

- Changes to local government codes, ordinances and general plans.

In 2000 Envision Utah supported a ballot measure which called for the development of a region-wide public transportation system, supported by an increase of the sales-tax by a quarter-cent-per-dollar. Rather than lobby specifically for the measure, Envision Utah provided residents with information about the impact of building out the public transportation system. Whereas the same measure had failed eight years earlier, Envision Utah was generally credited with its passage in 2000.

Shortcomings

Envision Utah is one of the more ambitious regional civic institutions, especially in terms of its geographical reach, and its inclusion of individuals, organizations, and interests across the full spectrum of sectors. That is one of the reasons for the success it has achieved. The downside of so broad a reach is the danger of losing focus, of permitting process and interaction to obscure a clear and persistent focus on tangible results, and of creating suspicion and reaction that defeats efforts for positive change. Envision Utah has been aware of such problems, and has attempted to address them.

Envision Utah initially faced enormous public suspicion regarding the subject of regional planning and "regionalism." Its "bottom up" strategy to abate that suspicion was based on openness and inclusiveness to build trust, and on education through training sessions and design workshops that exposed citizens to Envision Utah and built a deeper understanding and trust in its capacities and ideas. Envision Utah concluded that in initiating and sustaining regional change, education was the key. Its education initiatives included seminars for hundreds of community leaders, widely distributed materials on best practices, and the annual training of thousands of key stakeholders. Leaders and citizens were encouraged to express their views, make genuine contributions to the region's solutions, and also feel that they truly were a part of the solution.

By working from the beginning of each project with the elected officials and those who will be responsible for future implementation, Envision Utah believes it is more likely to create a sense of ownership that can lesson initial resistance and even build support for implementation. By staying in the background and working as an informed facilitator and educator, Envision Utah attempts to minimize the sense that it is pushing its own agenda, and encourages local leaders and residents to internalize the core values that motivate the regional efforts and adapt them to their local circumstances. Over time, the Envision Utah's position has become the default position in land-use decisions in the state.

Future Plans

Envision Utah has put in place an ambitious agenda, which now requires substantial energy to implement. However, it also continues to emphasize the importance of remaining adaptive to the region's changing needs. Since Envision Utah remains a project of the Coalition for Utah's Future, it has a degree of adaptability that, combined with its strong and representative leadership from influential community leaders across the public-private spectrum, keep it in a favorable position to be a regional leader.

Contact Information

Alan Matheson, Jr.
Executive Director

Envision Utah

254 South 600 East
Suite 201
Salt Lake City, UT 84102
Phone: (801) 303-1452
Fax: (801) 983-0040

amatheson at envisionutah.org

Robert Grow
Founding Chair Emeritus
Envision Utah
299 South Main, Suite 2200
Wells Fargo Center
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Tel: 801-538-5076 (5078 for Jennifer)
Fax: 801-538-5080
Email: rgrow@omm.com (jlscott@omm.com)

Additional Information Sources

Envision Utah Web Site
http://www.envisionutah.org/

Envision Utah. “History of Envision Utah”
http://www.envisionutah.org/historyenvisonutahv5p1.pdf

Envision Utah. 2004. Application for Alliance for Regional Stewardship (ARS) Award**.**

4. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS–(State of the Region Report Card)

Background

A growing number of regions are already preparing state of the region reports. These reports are prepared by a public, private, academic, nonprofit, and civic regional organizations, depending on the region. Some focus on statistical indicators, some pick particular topics to focus on in each iteration, some are becoming incredibly citizen friendly, such as the Flight or Fight report of the Metropolitan Philadelphia Policy Center. (peleast.org) In a few regions, two or more regional organizations are preparing these reports. Whereas many of these organizations have inadequate resources to prepare reports on a regular basis, some are now preparing their third, fourth, or even fifth annual or biennial reports, such as the State of the Region Project of the Institute for Local Governance and Regional Growth at the State University of New York in the Buffalo region (regional-institute.buffalo.edu) and the annual The State of the Region Report and Report Card of the Southern California Association of Governments (scag.org).

To date, these reports have mostly focused on tracking key regional economic, environmental, and social indicators, both year-to-year and in comparison to other regions. Little attention has been given to assessing regional governance performance.

Finally, state of the region reports have rarely been critical, much less prescriptive. Many provide only the data and encourage others to use it to develop action agendas. Those that prepare report cards grading performance become controversial; especially if new reports document that the region is losing ground, especially to other regions. This controversy contributed to the decision to cease issuing annual state of the region reports by the Southern California Association of Governments, the example shared in this case study.

Description

The Southern California Association of Governments -- known affectionately as SCAG -- represents the six counties, 189 cities, and over 19 million residents spread over 38,000 square miles in the Los Angeles region. It carries out a wide range of regional planning responsibilities, especially in transportation, air quality, hazardous waste management, and now under new State of California legislation, growth management and global warming. Its responsibilities are similar to those of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, but only answers to one state government.

Between 1998 and 2007, SCAG published an annual State of the Region Report and Report Card (SOR). The reports had three objectives:

- "Tracking and assessing the performance of Southern California in comparison to other metropolitan areas in the nation.

- Disseminating information on the region's performance to assist public officials, business and community leaders in developing appropriate strategies to improve the communities.

- Informing and educating community residents on how our region is performing."

A Benchmarks Task Force, composed of elected officials and issue experts, provided guidance to SCAG staff in preparing the report.

Each year, SCAG staff analyzed demographic, economic, housing, transportation, environmental, education, and public safety information. In addition, issue experts prepared short essays and policy recommendations on timely issues. Finally, the Benchmarks Task Force developed an annual Report Card on regional performance, with grades ranging from A to almost F, based on the information trends.

Over the last five years, the SOR was released at a press conference. (In the first five years, it was released at an annual regional conference.) Attendance by the press increased over the first few years to include over two dozen newspapers and a half dozen each of television and radio stations, including some coverage by the national press. The SOR was widely distributed and posted on the SCAG website. In 2007 alone, it was downloaded over 75,000 times. Finally, SCAG staff made numerous presentations to organizations following the release of SOR and distributed CDs of the report to participants.

The SOR have been used as a model in planning textbooks and courses. Both the 2006 and 2007 reports received awards for increasing regional awareness.

No SORs have been issued since 2007. In 2009, a topical report on Climate Change and the Future of Southern California was published in lieu of the SOR report.

Accomplishments

According to Ping Chang, the SCAG staff person responsible for preparing the reports, the annual reports primary accomplishment was educating individuals and organizations on their regional connections; in his words, the reports provide "an anchor point for holistic thinking." In an extremely fragmented region, the annual reports helped individuals understand their common interests. The release of each new report heightened regional awareness, focusing attention once a year on whether grades on the Report Card were improving or worsening.

The other major accomplishment was to help community leaders select the issues for priority attention over the coming year. For example, the 2002 SOR indicated that the region was "losing ground" economically, resulting in SCAG launching a major economic development planning initiative. Throughout the years, the reports identified common issues cutting across jurisdictions, making it easier to bring the jurisdictions together to address them.

Shortcomings

The major shortcoming of preparing the reports was their cost, which began to make it prohibitively expensive to prepare comprehensive reports on an annual basis. In addition, annual change was frequently statistically small, resulting in little change in Report Card grades on a year-to-year basis. SCAG is now experimenting with reports that focus on particular issues, such as the 2009 Climate Change and the Future of Southern California report.

The other major shortcoming is that the reports share negative as well as positive news. After 2002, when the Report Card scores started to decline or were already low, the public reaction was often critical toward those public and other organizations that were not able to raise the grades. According to Ping, continuing negative news combined with declining funding, resulted in SCAG's decision to cease preparing SORs.

Future Plans

According the Ping, SCAG remains committed to preparing SORs. In the future, he would like to have the reports monitor progress on actions as well as outcomes; for example, reporting on the jurisdictions that have passed inclusionary housing ordinances (from 10% to 25% of jurisdictions in the last couple years.) He would also like to test a web-based report that could be dynamically updated throughout the year as new information is available

Contact Information

Ping Chang
Southern California Association of Governments
818 W. Seventh Street, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017

213- 236-1800
chang@scag.ca.gov

Additional Information Sources

Website -- www.scag.ca.gov

5. CHICAGO METROPOLIS 2020

Background

One of the principal challenges confronting every modern metropolis is how to get organizations in the government, business and civic sectors throughout the region to work together on regional issues. Many different kinds of approaches have been tried. One model, represented by the St. Louis experience (and discussed in another case study), is to have strong and effective organizations in each sector that both sponsor their own boundary-spanning activities and collaborate actively with one another on specific joint ventures. Another model, represented by Chicago Metropolis 2020, is to join representatives from the various sectors into the same region-wide organization. One of the first challenges tackled by Chicago Metropolis 2020 was the fundamental restructuring of the Chicago region's planning institutions.

Chicago has a long tradition of urban planning in which both the public and private sectors are involved, dating back to the city's earliest decades. By the late nineteenth century, Chicago had become a major city and commercial hub, and was growing more rapidly than New York City. Investment was pouring in, industry was exploding, some people were making vast fortunes, income disparities were growing, health standards were dangerously lax, and labor was increasingly well organized and militant. Civic leaders recognized the need to bring some sense of order to the city, and engaged architect Daniel Burnham to produce a "Plan of Chicago" in 1909, which transformed the city, and went on to become a national model of urban planning. This early civic success established the standard and legitimized the process by which civic leaders in all sectors have continued to work toward the greater good of the city of Chicago and of the broader region.

One of the principal leaders in these efforts for over a century has been the Commercial Club of Chicago, a membership organization of leading business and civic leaders in the Chicago area. It was founded in 1877 with the express intent "to advance the public welfare and the commercial interest of metropolitan Chicago by co-operative effort, social intercourse, and free interchange of views." Election to membership in the Commercial Club is "limited to residents of the Chicago metropolitan area who shall be deemed qualified by reason of their personality, general reputation, position in their business or profession and service in the public welfare." The Club's Civic Committee is charged with considering the needs and plans for the development of the Chicago metropolitan area

In 1950s the Commercial Club established the Chicago Central Area Committee to stop the downturn in retail activity in the central business district. The greater Chicago region today encompasses some 8,000 square miles and nearly 10 million people in three states (Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin) served by 1,500 local governments. The core of the region lies in the Illinois counties of Cook, DuPage, Lake, McHenry, Kane and Will.

The challenges of this huge area are region-wide, and the Commercial Club has been determined to mount an appropriately region-wide assault on them.

Description

Chicago Metropolis 2020

In 1996, the Commercial Club initiated the Metropolis Project, an effort to ensure the preeminence of the Chicago Metropolitan Region in the 21st century. Some 200 Club members studied a range of issues considered to be vital to the social and economic well-being of the region, and which required a regional approach. These issues included "unlimited, low density sprawl; concentration of poor minorities; the spatial mismatch between jobs, affordable housing and transportation; and disparate degrees of access to quality education." The results of the two-year study were published in a 1999 report "Chicago Metropolis 2020: Preparing Metropolitan Chicago for the 21st Century" (authored by Elmer W. Johnson and published as a book in 2001). A central recommendation of the report called for the creation of a new organization: Chicago Metropolis 2020, to continue and expand the process started by the Commercial Club and to implement the ideas contained in the report. Chicago Metropolis 2020 has focused on developing a new kind of "civic entrepreneurship," in the Chicago region, through the creation of collaborations with other organizations.

The Commercial Club viewed this initiative as continuing the same Chicago tradition of renewal and foresight that motivated the Burnham Plan a century earlier, requiring the development of a contemporary plan for the city's future development. Some of the challenges confronting the Chicago region today have a familiar echo from that earlier era: "how to reconcile privatism with public control, growth with restraint, wealth with poverty, and beauty with industry." But while Burnham's plan focused principally on architecture and spatial planning, Chicago Metropolis 2020 is more broadly concerned with all facets of urban life, including public education, suburban sprawl, transportation, social and economic segregation, albeit with the same venerable goal of continuing Chicago's tradition of renewal and foresight.

While a project of the Commercial Club, Chicago Metropolis 2020 is directly governed by an Executive Council, which includes representatives from business, labor, civic, religious, and governmental organizations. Half of the representatives on the Executive Council are members of the Commercial Club. The Executive Committee appoints an Executive Director who manages the organization.

Chicago Metropolis 2020 is an ambitious undertaking that aims at economic vibrancy, quality of life, and equity of opportunity. The organization defines its mission as ensuring that the Chicago region is one of the places in the world where people most want to work and live.

Chicago Metropolis 2020 draws liberally on its “Senior Executives” program, which identifies senior members of the business, civic and educational communities who provide a repository of public policy knowledge in a number of fields, and agree to volunteer a substantial portion of their time and energy in support of the regional agenda. Senior Executives include current and retired top executives of Chicago area businesses, universities, foundations, and other institutions.

Integrated Regional Planning

One of Chicago Metropolis 2020’s principal proposals is that the Illinois state government create a comprehensive regional planning and service district for the Chicago region, overseen by a “regional coordinating council.” The purposes of this mechanism include the following:

- integrate all aspects of regional planning and plan implementation under a common and comprehensive regional framework;
- encourage the availability of housing for all economic segments of the population in all parts of the region;
- moderate disparities in fiscal capacity and service quality among the municipalities in the region;
- encourage redevelopment in older urban areas that merit reinvestment;
- encourage conservation development and the retention and enjoyment of open space and agricultural lands, natural habitat, and parks; and
- encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures that have historical significance.

Other important functions for the proposed regional coordinating council include the following:

- develop a regional plan;
- deny services for developments that have an adverse regional impact;
- regionally register vehicles and tax them for their usage of regional roads to finance regional transit;
- receive and distribute funds to moderate disparities across jurisdictions; and
- encourage counties and municipalities to negotiate regional cooperative growth compacts, called intergovernmental land use agreements.

Chicago Metropolis proposed a variety of funding mechanisms for the regional coordinating council, including a dedicated region-wide sales tax. It also proposed that the council be given the authority to issue bonds -- for building infrastructure or preserving open space -- on behalf of local governments that took actions to meet the council's purposes, such as enacting building codes that provided for a full range of housing opportunities or preparing comprehensive plans consistent with its purposes.

Chicago Metropolis proposed a 15-member governing board for the regional coordinating council, and considered three options for how the members of the board might be selected: direct election, at large, or by wards, of all the region's citizens; appointment by the governor, the Mayor of Chicago, and the elected officials of the county governments; and a confederation approach. Four criteria were used to determine which option would best assure:

- the board is composed of highly competent people of integrity and good judgment;

- the trustees are held accountable for their performance;

- a sense of common good for the region and a sense of the interdependency of its parts;

- local governments play a critical role in selecting the board members.

Based on these criteria the choice was the confederation approach, under which each of the 270 municipalities would be given votes in accordance with its populations and each of the counties in accordance with the populations of their unincorporated areas. A blue-ribbon committee, perhaps appointed by the governor, would select 45 candidates for the 15 offices. Other variations for the selection process were also considered, including cumulative voting by local governments and some guarantee of geographic distribution.

As a first step, Chicago Metropolis 2020 made a recommendation (similar to that of San Diego Regional Government Efficiency Commission, which is discussed in the case study on the San Diego region) to combine into a single regional planning agency all or parts of three existing agencies: the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC), which served as the regional council of governments; the Chicago Area Transportation Study (CATS), which served as the metropolitan planning organization for transportation planning; and the planning functions of the Regional Transportation Authority. It also recommended empowering the combined agency to guide the use of transportation and other infrastructure funds, a part of the proposal that was updated in 2003 to include the regional transportation agencies and the creation of a Regional Growth and Transportation Commission responsible for regional land use and transportation policy and long-term planning.

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)

In 2005, the state legislature enacted part of the Chicago Metropolis 2020 proposal for a regional coordinating council. Illinois Public Act 094-0510 created the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) by combining just two existing agencies: the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC), and the Chicago Area Transportation Study (CATS). In essence, this joined two traditional regional functions, that of a council of governments (COG) and a metropolitan planning organization (MPO), into a single regional agency. The CMAP board is comprised of 15 members representing the City of Chicago, seven Illinois counties (Cook, DuPage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry and Will. Cook County), and -- through various collective voting mechanisms -- the municipalities of the region. Decisions of the (CMAP) board require a concurrence of four-fifths of the board members. CMAP has the responsibility for identifying, supporting, advocating, and integrating regional priorities among public and private organizations throughout the greater Chicago region.

The state law instructs the new regional planning agency "integrate land use and transportation planning in the seven county region," as well as to promote economic development, improve mobility, minimize traffic congestion, and protect natural resources. The law specifically directed CMAP to "plan for the most effective public and private investments," and to develop and adopt "a funding and implementation strategy" for the integrated land use and transportation plan. The law also directs the agency to work in a broadly collaborative fashion with interests in all sectors throughout the region, and specifically directs that "the regional comprehensive plan and any modifications to it shall be developed cooperatively by the Board, the CATS Policy Committee, and NIPC with the involvement of citizens, units of local government, business and labor organizations, environmental organization, transportation and planning agencies, State agencies, private and civic organizations, public and private providers of transportation, and land preservation agencies." Local governments in the region "continue to maintain control over land use and zoning decisions.

Shortcomings

Sweeping as is may be for the governance arrangements of the Chicago region, the new regional planning agency nonetheless essentially merged traditional regional governance functions of councils of governments (COG) and metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). It leaves some 1,500 largely autonomous local government units to decide whether they will comply with regional plans and implement them through their local land use authority. The agency's funding is also a major question mark; the state legislature, facing a difficult fiscal climate, has not been inclined to fund the agency at a level close to what it requires to carry out the basic duties the legislature assigned it. And some critics charge that the new regional agency will simply introduce another layer of bureaucracy to the process of development in the region.

Future Plans

The principal task before the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) is to complete and begin to implement its first comprehensive plan for the Chicago region. NIPC had already completed its 2040 Regional Framework Plan and was in the process of implementing it when (in 2007) it was merged into the new regional planning agency. CMAP has attempted to build on the work of NIPC in developing its new comprehensive plan, called GO TO 2040, scheduled to be completed and to begin implementation by the end of 2010.

As for Chicago Metropolis 2020, it continues to pursue implementation of the ambitious agenda laid out in the report of the same name, and which also called it into being.

Contact Information

Frank Beal
Executive Director
Chicago Metropolis 2020
30 West Monroe Street
Chicago, IL 60603
Phone: 312-332-2020
Fax 312-332-2626
Email: frank.h.beal@cm2020.org

Additional Information Sources

Chicago Metropolis 2020 Website
http://www.chicagometropolis2020.org/5_3.htm

Fosler, R. Scott and Renee Berger (eds.). 1982. *Public-Private Partnership in American Cities: Seven Case Studies.* Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath & Company: Chapter 1. Fosler and Berger. "Introduction," pp. 1-16; and Chapter 4. Pastora San Juan Cafferty and William C. McCready. "The Chicago Public Private Partnership Experience: A Heritage of Involvement," pp. 129-163.

Johnson, Elmer W. 2001. *Chicago Metropolis 2020: The Chicago Plan for the Twenty-First Century.* A Project of the Commercial Club of Chicago in association with the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Chicago.

6. ST. LOUIS CROSS-SECTOR COLLABORATION

Background

One of the principal challenges confronting every modern metropolis is how to get organizations in the government, business and civic sectors throughout the region to work together on regional issues. Many different kinds of approaches have been tried. One model, represented by Chicago Metropolis 2020 (and discussed in another case study), is to join representatives from the various sectors into the same region-wide organization. Another model, represented by the St. Louis experience, is to have strong and effective organizations in each sector that both sponsor their own boundary-spanning activities and collaborate actively with one another on specific joint ventures.

In 2003, regional leaders in the government, business, and civic sectors of the greater St. Louis region recognized that the numerous and complex issues confronting the region could not be addressed by one individual, one organization, one jurisdiction, or even one sector acting alone. Greater St. Louis is a 16-county bi-state region which spans the boundary between Missouri and Illinois. The more concentrated Gateway Region, with 2.48 million residents, is comprised of eight counties, including the City of St. Louis, Jefferson, Franklin, St. Charles and St. Louis in Missouri, and Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair in Illinois. The City of St. Louis is home to slightly less than 14 percent of the region's population, and only 25 percent of the region's jobs are located there. In recent years the region has experienced only modest overall population and employment growth, which masks continuing losses in the core, and significant growth in some suburban areas. Planners project these patterns and trends will continue over the next two decades.

The Gateway Region is home to several premiere colleges, universities, and research institutions. The region regularly ranks near the top in polls of "sense of community" among major metropolitan areas. The cost of living, price of housing, and tax rates are all comparatively low. On the other hand, the region tends to rank low in job growth, in new business starts, and in attracting people from other metropolitan areas. There are large economic and racial disparities among the region's jurisdictions and neighborhoods, and the local governmental structure is one of the most fragmented in the nation.

The leadership of East West Gateway Council of Governments, representing the government sector, the Regional Chamber and Growth Association (RCGA), representing the business sector, and FOCUS St. Louis, representing the civic sector, agreed that the complex issues they faced required "a coordinated effort among government, business and civic leaders …if the St. Louis region is to compete and thrive in the 21st century." With this understanding, each board delegated representatives to work with those from the other two in order to "set the foundation for a sustained collaboration among the three sectors." Their intent was not just to undertake a single visioning process, and not even just to establish a formal tripartite agreement or a new organization, but rather to consider how stronger relationships among the three organizations, and the three sectors they represented, could be developed over time in the interest of supporting a range of cross-sector actions that could benefit the bi-state St. Louis region as-a-whole.

Description

There is no single regional institution in the Greater St. Louis metropolitan area that stands out as unique in American regional governance. Rather, the St. Louis model is characterized by its comprehensive, balanced, and integrated combination of regional institutions in the government, business, and civic sectors. This includes a substantial capacity for cross-sector collaboration in which there is a deep and ongoing mix of interaction within and among government, business, and civic organizations.

The St. Louis model of cross-sector collaboration rests on three main pillars. First, each of the three principal sectors has an active regional organization. Most large metropolitan regions have some type of organization representing the government and business sectors. But relatively few metropolitan regions -- not to mention bi- or multi-state metropolitan regions -- have a region-wide citizen-based organization, such as FOCUS St. Louis. Second, the principal organizations in each of the three sectors each has a variety of regionally oriented programs, organized from the perspective of its respective sector, which actively reach out and engage with the other two sectors. And third, the principal organizations in the three sectors regularly and actively collaborate with one another, jointly fashioning cross-sector institutional mechanisms suited to specific regional issues that require, or could benefit, from a cross-sector perspective.

Each of the three principal organizations in each of the three sectors can point to regionally oriented programs that have made tangible contributions to the region by reaching across sectoral boundaries.

East West Gateway Council of Governments

The East West Gateway Council of Governments, established in 1965, supports a full range of activities typically associated with regional councils of government, such as offering a forum for cooperative planning and problem-solving for the region's local governments. It also serves as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the bi-state region.

East-West Gateway has been especially engaged in issues related to the challenges and consequences of growth, in a region where some sub-regions are low-income and economically stagnant while others struggle to deal with the consequences of rapid growth. The growth issue, coupled with the region's complex, bi-state tax structure, has motivated East-West Gateway to develop a sophisticated capacity for researching and promoting public investment and taxing policies that will lead to responsible growth and redevelopment. The agency works closely with a range of local governments to facilitate and assist coordinated community-driven planning processes that balance economic, environmental, and quality of life issues.

Regional Chamber and Growth Association

The Regional Chamber and Growth Association (RCGA) defines three primary roles for itself: 1) to serve as the regional chamber of commerce for over 4,000 member companies; 2) to act as the bi-state region's lead economic development organization; and 3) to investigate and support public policy initiatives that help the region thrive and grow. These three functions came together in one regional organization in the early **1970s** with the merger of the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis, the St. Louis Regional Industrial Development Corporation, and the St. Louis Research Council. The RCGA prides itself on promoting a broadly defined economic perspective that looks beyond narrowly defined business interests in favor of public policy and civic initiatives that strengthen the region's capacity for business expansion, location and entrepreneurship, as well as provide a good place for employees and their families to live and work. The RCGA traces its roots back to 1836 (one of the earliest Chambers of Commerce in the United States). Over the years it has helped define St. Louis in the public mind through supporting such initiatives as Charles Lindbergh's 927 transatlantic flight on the "The Spirit of St. Louis," and construction of the Gateway Arch.

The RCGA supports a full range of activities typically associated with promoting the local and regional business interest, often in combination with other organizations. For example, Forward Metro St. Louis, a coalition of the RCGA and other regional business groups, promotes a unified public policy agenda before governments in both states. And it works through the Private Sector Infrastructure Council to promote transportation infrastructure, including surface transportation, transit, airports, and river ports.

The RCGA has placed major emphasis on environmental issues, which it views as both critical to business and the region's economic future, as well as to the quality of life in the Greater St. Louis region. The RCGA's Energy and Environmental Council -- whose members come from industry, small business, environmental engineering and consulting – holds bi-monthly environmental policy discussions addressing such issues as regional sustainability, renewable energy, air quality, water quality, energy efficiency, and brownfield redevelopment.

FOCUS St. Louis

FOCUS St. Louis is a locally-based, nonprofit, membership organization that describes itself as "the citizens' league" of the Greater St. Louis region. It claims some 1,000 members and builds on personal connections through its leadership programs, which by 2010 had an estimated 4,000 graduates throughout the region. Membership is open to all residents in the 16-county, bi-state region.

Only a few dozen of America's hundreds of metropolitan areas have a single organization such as FOCUS St. Louis representing the regional civic sector. Without such a regional citizen-based entity, there can be no unified organizational perspective for regional citizens; no continual, region-wide vehicle for credible citizen communication and education; no unified, region-wide channel for regional citizens to invest their resources in initiatives designed to benefit the region-as-a-whole; no orderly means for regional citizens to reach across sectoral boundaries through their own programs; and no structure for collaborating across sectoral boundaries with counterpart organizations in the government and business sectors. FOCUS St. Louis has performed all these functions.

FOCUS St. Louis views its role as being “a unique regional catalyst for positive community change” throughout the entire 16-county, bi-state region. It is “committed to creating regional solutions through community leadership. We bring people together, help find the common ground, and make progress happen. Its stated mission is “to create a cooperative, thriving region by engaging citizens in active leadership roles and to influence positive community change.” Its core values are citizen involvement, diversity, quality leadership, regional perspective, community consensus, and focused outcomes. Its highest priorities are good governance, racial equality and social justice, quality educational opportunities, and sustainable infrastructure.

FOCUS St. Louis organizes its programs and initiatives into three spheres that correspond to its three regional roles. First, in developing leadership, FOCUS St. Louis offers a range of leadership development programs geared toward civic and professional development across a spectrum of regional citizenship. Second, in influencing policy, FOCUS works to engage citizens and influence community policy by offering opportunities for citizens to discuss issues, providing feedback to decision-makers, and taking action for positive change in the organization’s four priority areas (good governance, racial equality and social justice, quality educational opportunities, and sustainable infrastructure). And third, in promoting community connections**,** FOCUS sponsors activities that provide user-friendly access to knowledge and information about the region. It structures learning to facilitate and encourage people to see things from new perspectives, across conventional boundaries, and to build the inter-sectoral networks necessary to achieve real change in the complex society of the modern 21st century metropolis. FOCUS sponsors a variety of events designed to promote a spirit of regional community.

Accomplishments

Most of the St. Louis region’s cross sector collaboration is grounded in the programs of one or another of the three principal organizations in each sector. For example, RCGA has launched an environmental initiative called the St. Louis Climate Prosperity Project which links the bi-state region's economic competitiveness with sustainability. St. Louis is one of seven pilot “Climate Prosperity” regions in a national initiative sponsored by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund which advances the idea that innovation, efficiency, and conservation in the use and reuse of resources can increase jobs, incomes, productivity and competitiveness in a region. (The President and CEO of the St. Louis Regional Chamber and Growth Association is also President of the Board of Directors of the national Climate Prosperity Project, Inc.) The “Climate Prosperity” project promotes three interdependent kinds of actions: "green savings**”** (energy efficiency), **“**green opportunities**”** (clean energy technology) and **“**green talent" (entrepreneurs, scientists, construction workers, and a trained workforce). The aim of the project is to guide the St. Louis region toward becoming a world-class "Green Belt" economy.

Similarly, FOCUS St. Louis engages all people from all the sectors in a wide range of leadership programs:

- Leadership St. Louis is a nine-month program designed for a selected group of recognized leaders in the different sectors, providing a combination of seminars on critical regional issues, site visits, and interactions with key decision makers;

- Youth Leadership St. Louis aims at the rising generation of regional citizens who are high school juniors from public, private and parochial schools throughout the region, developing leadership skills and team-building strategies by involving the students in the issues facing the region;

- Experience St. Louis, an orientation program for top-tier executives new to the region, is jointly sponsored with the RCGA;

- Leadership Plenty, a customized program provided on a contract basis, aims at developing community-based, grassroots leadership.

The organizations in the three sectors also join together in various ways tailored to the needs and features of particular regional issues. Some of these involve organizations in just two of the sectors. For example, Gateway Connections is a civic partnership between FOCUS St. Louis, RCGA, and the St. Louis Business Diversity Initiative which offers a free, one-day orientation welcome to people of color coming to the St. Louis region.

The principal organizations in all three sectors have also joined together through more formal arrangements, such as **Metro Forum**, a joint venture of the East West Gateway Council of Governments, RCGA, and FOCUS. Under the auspices of the Metro Forum, the three organizations have collaborated on a number of joint projects:

- The Metropolitan Forum Web Site provides tools to promote fiscal responsibility among local governments. Its intent was to increase public transparency regarding the St. Louis region's multitude of governmental operating systems, permitting citizens to more easily access information by state, county, city, township, or school district:

- The Catalogue of Cooperation is a survey and web posting of specific activities and opportunities for “Working Together Across Jurisdictional Boundaries” in the St. Louis region. Its purpose was to identify hundreds of examples of ways in which the 795 local governments in the St. Louis metro area have worked across jurisdictional and sectoral boundaries to provide the best possible services for citizens, and to specifically record the “who,” “what,” “where” and “why” behind the most innovative cooperative approaches: and

- The Metropolitan Forum Fiscal Reform Panel, comprised of 16 national and regional public policy and public finance experts which assessed systematically and in depth the fiscal challenges confronting the region (Disclosure: one of the case study authors was a member of that panel). Following a process based on the National Academy of Sciences model, the panel examined the economic and fiscal conditions of the region, its principal assets and liabilities, current and future challenges, and the range of realistic options available for the region. Of the panel's 11 recommendations for regional fiscal reform, three were prioritized by the Metropolitan Forum as most important: to establish standards for public service, create minimum service levels, and reform local development incentives.

Shortcomings

Even when firmly grounded in well-designed formal agreements and strong informal and professional relationships, reliance on collaboration alone across sectors to address mutual regional needs is always vulnerable to the inevitable tides of change in institutional priorities and personnel. The St. Louis model of cross-sector collaboration depends heavily on the continued strength of capable leadership, including the continuity of key leaders themselves. In the long run, the real test of such arrangements will depend on the depth of leadership, the effectiveness and quality of leadership development, and succession planning to assure continued leadership support and initiative over the long run.

Future Plans

The three organizations in each sector intend to continue their own internal programs that reach across sectoral boundaries. For example, the RCGA has joined with the St. Louis Regional Chapter of the U.S. Green Building Council to launch the St. Louis High Performance Building Initiative with the mission to "green every building in St. Louis." And, they also remain committed to the cross-sector institutional arrangements and personal relationships they have forged over the years. All of these entail ambitious agendas of regional activity, and demand a focus on the effective implementation and management of the many initiatives already underway as much as the initiation of innovative new projects.

Contacts

Maggie Hales
Interim Executive Director
East West Gateway Council of Governments Web Site http://www.ewgateway.org

Richard C. D. Fleming
President and Chief Executive Officer
St. Louis Regional Chamber & Growth Association (RCGA)
1 Metropolitan Square, Suite 1300
St. Louis, MO 63102

(314)444-1100 (direct)
(314)444-1177 (fax)
dfleming@stlrcga.org
www.gotostlouis.org

Christine A. Chadwick
Executive Director
FOCUS St. Louis
1910 Pine Street, Suite 200
St. Louis, MO 63103
(314) 622-1250 ext. 120
(314) 622-1279 Fax
chrisc@focus-stl.org

Additional Information

East West Gateway Council of Governments Web Site http://www.ewgateway.org

St. Louis Regional Chamber & Growth Association (RCGA) Web Site
www.gotostlouis.org

St. Louis Climate Prosperity Project
http://www.stlrcga.org/x2886.xml]

FOCUS St. Louis Web Site
http://www.focus-stl.org/

St. Louis Metropolitan Forum Advisory Panel. 2008. *Fiscal Reform in the St. Louis Metropolitan Region*. 2008. Report of the St. Louis Metropolitan Forum Advisory Panel. St. Louis, MO: Metropolitan Forum

7. NEGOTIATED INVESTMENT STRATEGY (Dayton, Ohio, Gary, Indiana, Connecticut) – (Federal/State/Local Regional Initiative)

Background

In the late 1970s, American cities were severely squeezed by a combination of increasing global competition, a weakening fiscal base, a continually rising demand for public services and investment, and growing taxpayer reaction. City leaders in Dayton, Ohio, decided to take stock of their overall assets, and conducted a study to identify all the streams of public funds flowing through the Dayton metropolitan area. They discovered more than 700 program units in 270 separate jurisdictions (federal, state, regional and local).

There was no apparent order or cogent pattern to all of this spending, just a jumble of conflicting policies, duplication, overlap and inefficiency. No single agency, let alone any one level or branch of government, anywhere in the Dayton metropolitan area (or in the state capital of Columbus or in Washington, D. C., for that matter) showed any interest in determining the net benefit of all these various expenditures, or how they might be better allocated and spent to benefit the region-as-a-whole. Even the most jaded Dayton leaders, long accustomed to the more obvious examples of misdirected public spending, were astounded at the magnitude of the problem.

The implications of the Dayton study were obvious: the first fiscal priority was not to find additional revenue but simply to better target and leverage the huge amount of money already in the regional system. Dayton's leaders enlisted the support of the local Charles F. Kettering Foundation to come up with a way to do this. And out of this collaboration emerged the Negotiated Investment Strategy (NIS).

Description

The essence of the Negotiated Investment Strategy was to identify all of the public money being spent in a community (city, region, etc.), to document precisely where it was going, and to use that information as a base-line for more effectively setting priorities and directing the use of those funds. Teams representing each of the three levels of government, as well as other interests in the community, would then engage in a facilitated negotiation to formally agree on how those funds could be better used in the interest of that community.

The requirement that federal, state and local levels of government each form one negotiating team required a series of preliminary negotiations internal to each level, so that it could formulate a common strategy in preparation for negotiation with the other two levels. Thus, the model required addressing several basic questions that had often been taken for granted:

- Who speaks for the Federal government?

- How does the Federal government determine its priorities for cities, and what are those priorities?

- Who speaks for a state government?

- How does a state determine its priorities for cities, and what are those priorities?

- Who can effectively represent a city?

- How does a locality marshal its resources for negotiations with representatives of state and local government?

- When state, local, and federal teams are ready to negotiate, what do they do?

Accomplishments

The NIS was tested at the local level in St. Paul, Minnesota, Columbus, Ohio, Gary Indiana, and Malden, Massachusetts, and at the state level in Minnesota, Ohio, Indiana, and Connecticut. The results of the tests were widely regarded as positive both by participants and observers. The common-sense notions underlying the NIS proved to be workable in practice. Following are examples of what the NIS accomplished at the local level in Gary Indiana, and at the state level in Connecticut.

Gary Indiana

Three "core teams" were appointed in 1980 to negotiate an investment strategy in Gary, Indiana. The mayor appointed the local Gary team, including the city's most influential local industry, U. S. Steel, which agreed to join the discussions as an "observer." The governor appointed the Indiana state team. And the head of the Region V (Chicago) Federal Regional Council appointed the federal team. The three teams approved a mediator, James Laue, founder of the George Mason University Center for Dispute Resolution, and agreed to a set of procedural rules (covering composition the negotiating teams, role of the mediator, access of the press, time constraints, meeting locations, public access to the sessions, etc.). At the outset of the negotiations the Gary team distributed a proposed draft of the city's investment strategy, which became the focus for the negotiations.

After eight-months, the negotiators agreed to a comprehensive strategy for Gary that directed some $250 million to: develop the downtown commercial district and adjacent residential neighborhoods, improve the transportation network, expand adequate and affordable housing, and establish medical treatment and preventive health care facilities. The agreement spelled out the specific objectives agreed to by all parties, the responsibilities of each of the parties, specific steps for implementing the agreement, and the methods for monitoring the performance of the parties. The final agreement was signed at a large community meeting by the mayor of Gary, the governor of Indiana, the chairman of the Region V Federal Regional Council, the captains of the three negotiating teams, and the mediator.

Six years after the Gary agreement was signed, a hometown newspaper noted that "the face of Gary's downtown is significantly different, in large part because of the agreement, known as the Negotiated Investment Strategy." In addition to the tangible agreements reached, the NIS process also turned out to have added benefits. As one Gary city official noted, the negotiated investment strategy "was the beginning of a whole new relationship with the state. Everything the state has committed to has been done. The relationship among the different bureaucracies greatly improved. And the relationship with the private sector has continually developed."

Connecticut

In the early 1980s, the governor of Connecticut, William O'Neill, decided to use the Negotiated Investment Strategy model as a means of better allocating the state's federal block grant for social services. State officials viewed a structured negotiation as preferable to the usual fierce competition in lobbying among government and private social-service agencies. Governor O'Neill announced that he would accept the result of the negotiation and recommend it in its entirety to the state legislature, which he did, and which the Connecticut legislature approved without change.

The Connecticut NIS negotiation was structured with three core negotiating teams, one representing the state, one the municipalities, and one the nonprofit service providers. The state appointed a team representing its eighteen different departments, boards, and offices. The municipalities enlisted two municipal associations to fashion a team. And the nonprofit service providers created a statewide steering group for the express purpose of selecting their core team. The three teams in turn agreed on a mediator.

The Connecticut NIS agreement clarified definitions, specified criteria and guiding principles for selecting service providers and distributing social service money, identified the services to be funded by the block grant, indicated the funds to be allocated to each service.

The governor appointed a Tripartite Committee to monitor execution of the agreement and provide for continuing negotiations.

In summarizing the agreement, Governor O'Neill has said that:

> "It was and is my believe that the NIS is the kind of creative response that Connecticut must make to meet its new responsibilities and burdens … by bringing together state agencies, municipalities, and private, nonprofit humans service providers, the broad picture of human service needs and resources could be viewed… As one who has long believed that those who are critically affected by government decisions should have some say in how those decisions are made, I truly feel that the NIS has opened up the decision-making process in a democratic manner. "

Shortcomings

The early experiments with the Negotiated Investment Strategy had two principal short-comings. First, they were labor intensive. The first attempts, of course, required fashioning new processes and making adjustments along the way. And, while the generic model held up well, the different circumstances and purposes of the various states and localities in which it was tried required some customization of the process in each case.

A second problem was that implementation could be more problematic with a change of personnel, either in professional staffing or in political administrations. The fact that the NIS agreement was written and committed the parties in question to specific obligations militated against this problem. Still, the practical reality was that people who had not been involved in negotiation and did not necessarily feel committed to it were less likely to go out of their way to see to its expeditious implementation.

Over the course of the 1980s both of these shortcomings took their toll. Both the foundation that had initially financed it, as well as the federal government, which at first had been willing to engage in it, turned their attention to other priorities.

Future Prospects

In the meantime, the NIS concept had begun to gain traction among state and local officials for the simple reason that it seemed to work. It proved to be a practical tool to address tough policy, financial, and political problems. Even without outside financial support or federal engagement, state and local governments continued to use the NIS, or variations of it.

One example of an offspring of the NIS is the "climate prosperity" movement, which is based on the proposition that responding to climate change is not only an environmental imperative, but also an economic development opportunity. Climate Prosperity Project, Inc., a national nonprofit, uses a model that is an offspring of the Negotiated Investment Strategy, combining intergovernmental, cross-sectoral, and regional perspectives. It argues that localities and regions control or directly influence many of the policies, laws, personnel, and infrastructure needed for practical progress to be made in such areas as renewable energy, building codes, and transportation. And it believes that people at the local level are experienced in ways to encourage innovation and economic development. (The President of the Board of Directors of Climate Prosperity Project, Inc. is also President & CEO of the St. Louis Regional Chamber & Growth Association, which, as noted in another case study, has its own Climate Prosperity Project).

Key concepts behind the Negotiated Investment Strategy, or various components of the NIS, have also found their way into various disciplines, such as Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). The late James Laue, founder of the George Mason University Center for Dispute Resolution, and mediator in the Gary, Indiana Negotiated Investment Strategy, believed the NIS was primarily responsible for the rise of interest during the 1980s in the use of mediation to address complex public policy issues.

There are several factors that may induce the federal government to take another look at the Negotiated Investment Strategy. One is the ever tightening federal fiscal squeeze. A second is a growing tolerance, and even appetite, for intergovernmental, cross-sector interaction at the regional level. A third is the availability of practical experience and knowledge about the various spinoffs of the Negotiated Investment Strategy, including the professionals, tools and practices that have been developed, tested and proven to work. And, fourth, the federal government itself has recently shown an inclination toward programs that use concepts basic to the NIS, including, for example, the federal "Livable Communities" approach to sustainable development, and the Department of Homeland Security's Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP) and Regional Resiliency Assessment Program.

One possibility is that the time might be ripe for the Greater Washington Region to experiment with some variation of the Negotiated Investment Strategy. It might be well suited to a region where the federal government plays such a uniquely important role, and where the stream of regionally directed federal money is unparalleled. A successful demonstration project for the NIS in the National Capital Region might also suggest useful applications in other regions of the country as a way of better using federal money.

Contact Information

Chris Carlson, Senior Advisor
Policy Consensus Initiative
P.O. Box 1762
Portland, Oregon 97207
Phone 503-725-9096
Fax 503-725-9099
www.policyconsensus.org
chris@policyconsensus.org

Carl M. Moore, Ph.D.
The Community Store
16 Camino Delilah
Santa Fe, NM 87506
505.820-6826, 505.982-5974 (fax)
carl@thecommunitystore.com

Additional Information Sources

Carlson, Chris and Lew Francis. 2009. "Not All Good Ideas Are New: Tough Times Call for Reviving the Negotiated Investment Strategy." (unpublished paper for Policy Consensus Initiative)

Coke, James and Carl M. Moore. 1979-10-26. "Experiments will Test the Procedure, "*Nation's Cities Weekly*. pp. 38-40

Committee for Economic Development. 1980. *The Negotiated investment Strategy: A Review of the Concept and Its Implications for Revitalizing Cities*. A Report of the Subcommittee on Revitalizing America's Cities of the Committee for Economic Development. Washington, D.C.: Committee for Economic Development

Kunde, James E. and Daniel E. Berry. 1981. "Restructuring Local Economies Through Negotiated Investment Strategies." *Policy Studies Journal.* Vol. 10. No. 2. pp. 365 - 379

Moore, Carl M. 1988 (4) NCR. "Negotiated Investment Strategy." *National Civic Review*. Vol. 77. No. 4. pp. 298 – 314.

8. PORT AUTHORITY OF NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY – (Public authority and Regional Service District)

Background

The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey is considered in the literature of governance to be a "public authority;" which, in turn, is a type of "public-benefit corporation." The idea for the Port Authority and for public authorities more generally, was conceived during the Progressive Era at the turn of the 19^{th} to the 20^{th} centuries as a means of insulating important public functions from overt political influences, reducing political corruption, and increasing the efficiency of government.

Description

The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (Port Authority) is a bi-state organization that was established in 1921 (as the Port of New York Authority) through an interstate compact. The Port Authority builds, maintains, and operates major regional transportation infrastructure, including bridges, tunnels, airports, marine terminals, and seaports, within the geographical area designated the Port of New York and New Jersey, which lies within the Greater New York region. The Port Authority's domain covers an irregularly shaped area of some 1,500 square miles within about a 25 mile radius of the Statue of Liberty in New York City. The Port Authority also operates its own 1,600-strong police force, with full police status in New York and New Jersey, providing police services for Port Authority facilities throughout the region.

Large as its domain may be, the Port Authority manages only a portion of the overall transportation infrastructure in the region. There are several other important public agencies that also own and operate various bridges, tunnels, and other transportation facilities. For example, the New York City Department of Transportation is responsible for the Staten Island Ferry and for the majority of bridges in the city; the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority is responsible for other bridges and tunnels in the area; the New York City Transit Authority, which is controlled by the MTA, operates buses, subways, and commuter rail; and New Jersey Transit operates buses, commuter rail, and light rail; all independent of the Port Authority.

The Port Authority is governed by a 12 member Board of Commissioners, half of whom are each appointed by the governors of New York and New Jersey, with the approval of their respective state senates. Commissioners serve overlapping six-year terms without pay. Board meetings are open to the public. The Board of Commissioners appoints an Executive Director, who serves at the pleasure of the Board, to implement Port Authority policies and manage its facilities**.**

The Port Authority has no power to tax and does not receive tax money from any local or state governments. Its revenues are derived from rents, tolls, fees, and other charges related to the facilities it operates. It is also authorized to borrow money by issuing bonds, which are backed by its ability to generate revenue from its various facilities. These have proved to be powerful financial foundations, enabling the Port Authority to build and manage major infrastructure projects.

Accomplishments

The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey proved its capacity and efficiency early on with such major projects as the construction of the George Washington Bridge, which was begun in 1927 and completed in October 1931, ahead of schedule and well below projected costs. The Port Authority's efficiency impressed other public officials, including Franklin D. Roosevelt, who used the public authority as a model in creating the Tennessee Valley Authority and other such entities.

Over time, the Port Authority has constructed and today maintains and operates a widespread system of infrastructure that is critical to the transportation, trade, and commerce of the greater New York region. This infrastructure includes the region's four airports, the New York/New Jersey seaport, the PATH rail transit system, six tunnels and bridges between New York and New Jersey, and the Port Authority Bus Terminal in Manhattan.

In addition to its original function of transportation, the Port Authority over the years has also become a major player in New York real estate and economic development more generally. The Port Authority participates in various kinds of joint development ventures throughout the region, such as the Teleport communications center in Staten Island, the Bathgate Industrial Park in the Bronx, the Essex County Resource Recovery Facility, the Legal Center in Newark, Queens West in Long Island City, NY, and the South Waterfront at Hoboken, New Jersey

The most prominent of the Port Authority's real estate developments was the World Trade Center in lower Manhattan. The original conception for a massive World Trade Center office complex came from David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank. However, the magnitude and nature of his conception was beyond what he, his bank, or any conceivable private consortium was willing to finance. So Rockefeller approached the Port Authority about becoming involved in the project. With much controversy, the Port Authority became the overseer and major financer of the project.

Shortcomings

While the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey has made major contributions to the New York region, it has also been severely criticized on several counts. Most of the criticism relates to problems that are widely seen as inherent in the structure and nature of public authorities more generally. The most regularly cited of these is the lack of accountability. This is the downside of the political insulation that was initially viewed as one of the principal attractions of a public authority. In 2004 New York State Comptroller Alan Havesi and Attorney General Eliot Spitzer characterized the hundreds of public authorities in New York State as constituting "a semi-secret fourth branch of government" with "a culture of arrogance" and "little or no accountability."

The Port Authority is also charged with placing a higher priority on building new projects than in maintaining the ones they have. For example, the generally poor condition of facilities and maintenance at the Port Authority's 42nd street bus station is regularly cited as being the result of the agency' relative lack of concern about maintaining facilities after they have been constructed.

The Port Authority is also accused of unnecessarily running up debt. Public authorities raise capital for construction projects by issuing bonds and taking on debt, and hence the more active and ambitious an authority, the more debt it is likely to accumulate. Of course, other government entities also issue bonds and accumulate debt. However, public authorities are typically off-budget and not directly accountable to the public. Consequently, they have even greater incentives to begin new projects, and issue more bonds to cover them, with the justification that the new projects will generate revenue to pay off the debt. This inclination can be encouraged, or otherwise overlooked, by politicians who can claim credit for providing another public service and for creating short-term construction jobs and on-going service jobs associated with a project. By 2004, the total debt of New York State's hundreds of public authorities had reached $114.6 billion (more than the total value of California's economy).

Powerful public authorities can also be tempted to move beyond their initial missions in search of new activities and means of generating revenue. Ever since it undertook the World Trade Center project, the Port Authority has been criticized regarding both the size and nature of that massive real estate venture, as well as the agency's very entry into the real estate market. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and the subsequent collapse of the World Trade Center twin towers, had a devastating impact on the Port Authority (which, of course, was just part of the far broader impact of 9/11). The Port Authority headquarters had been located in 1 World Trade Center (North Tower). Of an estimated 1,400 Port Authority employees who worked in the World Trade, 84 lost their lives in the attacks. In addition to this loss of life and talent, the organization was also deprived of its principal base of operations both in responding to the immediate aftermath of the attack, as well in the recovery from them.

Another downside with public authorities in general is that there appear to be few means of reforming or otherwise altering them without undermining the strengths that make them appealing. Reform actions, therefore, typically end up being watered down into limits on their debt-issuance power, efforts to create clearer lines of accountability between elected officials and authority leaders, and/or stricter public disclosure of authorities' financial activities.

However, even these relatively few and mild actions to curb the abuses of public authorities can run into still other inherent characteristic that makes reform politically difficult. Public authorities, once established, become formidable political powers in their own right. Many become huge economic entities with direct control over substantial financial resources, as well as indirect influence with friends and allies in powerful places. Such powers cannot be expected to willingly acquiesce in, let alone agree to, legislation that curbs their powers.

Public authorities are also complex legal and political entities that pose a tangle of obstacles in their own right. This is all the truer with respect to bi-state authorities, such as the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. Any reform of the agency passed in one state also requires approval by the legislature and governor of the other state, not to mention contending with pressures likely to come from Washington.

Another obstacle to reform has to do with the significant role played by the bond market, which is likely to fear any change which threatens a public authority's ability to service its bonds, and which could result in higher interest rates for the agency and subsequently higher rates, fees, and tolls for citizens.

Future Plans

The Port Authority continues to plan major transportation infrastructure projects for the New York region, including additions, upgrades, and improvements to the region's existing infrastructure. Future plans include a new passenger terminal at JFK International Airport, the redevelopment of Newark Liberty International Airport's Terminal B, and the rehabilitation of the Goethals Bridge,

As owner of the World Trade Center site, the Port Authority has worked since the attacks in 2001 on plans for reconstruction, in conjunction with Silverstein Properties, and the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation. In 2006, the Port Authority and Larry Silverstein agreed to a deal which ceded control of One World Trade Center to the Port Authority.

Contact Information (name, position, email, phone, address)

Stephen Sigmund
Chief, Public and Government Affairs
Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
225 Park Avenue South - 18th Floor
New York, NY 10003
T: 212 435-7777
F: 212 435-4032

Additional Information Sources

Cudahy, Brian J. 2002. Rails Under the Mighty Hudson: The Story of the Hudson Tubes, the Pennsy Tunnels, and Manhattan Transfer. *New York: Fordham University Press.*

Doig, Jameson W. 2001. *Empire on the Hudson*: *Entrepreneurial Vision and Political Power at the New York Port Authority*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kifner, John and Amy Waldman. *2001-9-12. "A Day of Terror: The Victims; Companies Scrambling to Find Those Who Survived, and Didn't".* The New York Times. *September 12, 2001*

Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ). 2002. *Annual Report 2001*. (PANYNJ 2002 Annual Report 2001 New York: Port Authority of New York and New Jersey)
http://www.panynj.gov/AboutthePortAuthority/InvestorRelations/AnnualReport/pdfs/2001_Annual_Report.pdf.

Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ). 2008 Retrieved "*Governance.*" New York: Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
http://www.panynj.gov/AboutthePortAuthority/Governance/

9. SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SANDAG) – (Empowered Regional Council)

Background

Regional councils of government (COGs) have provided over half a century of experimentation in regional governance. They have been a lightning rod for all of the hopes and fears about making regions work. On one hand, they have been expected to "wave a magic wand" and instantly resolve pressing regional challenges. On the other hand, they have been expected to do this without threatening local government "turfs". They have all too often been asked to play the regional cooperation game without the resources and authorities to win against tough regional challenges.

Regional councils of governments generally provide more regional venues than any other organizations. They are often initiators of regional visioning alliances, many of which are now focusing on negotiating regional cooperative growth compacts. They provide regional problem-solving arenas for ongoing planning processes, such as in transportation and economic development, as well as ad hoc planning processes to explore new regional initiatives, such as tax base sharing. They serve as regional service-delivery agents for regional information and mapping services as well as delivering joint services to especially smaller jurisdictions. They even conduct regional performance audits, such as preparing state of the region reports.

Most regions -- urban and rural -- have regional councils; some have had them for over half a century. Not only have they offered the most significant ongoing experience in regional governance in most regions, they have tested the capacity of the federal system to respond to regional challenges. They have become seasoned experts at tying national, state and local government legislation and largesse together to respond to challenges that are critical to all three government levels. For examples, visit the National Association of Regional Councils website (narc.org).

The national government created the first demand for regional councils in the 1960s by tying the receipt of transportation, economic development, and other funding to the preparation of area-wide (regional) plans. State governments have provided the executive and legislative authority for regional councils and some have used them as administrative agents to deliver state services, especially those services that are too big to be delivered at the state level and too small to be delivered jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction. States increased their use of regional councils when the national government cut back area-wide planning requirements in the 1980s. Local governments have increasingly turned to regional councils to prepare plans and deliver services that they cannot effectively deliver alone as well as to help negotiate agreements on tough regional challenges, such as handling natural disasters and terrorism threats.

Some regional councils are very representative; over 600 serve on the Puget Sound General Assembly. Some have small, often closed boards, of less than a dozen. Some boards offer weighted voting, to help assure that each individual has an equal voice in board decisions. Some have strictly one jurisdiction/one vote practices, to assure that small suburban jurisdictions have an equal voice. Some have both forms of voting. In late 2002, the San Diego Association of Governments assumed regional transit planning and development responsibilities and changed its voting procedures. Now, actions of the SANDAG board have to pass on a simple one jurisdiction/one vote basis as well as a weighted vote based on the percentage of population represented by each of the jurisdictions. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments Board requires affirmative votes in three categories -- by population, by member cities, and by member counties -- for most actions. It requires an even higher standard for approving area wide plans, standards, and programs -- 2/3 of the governing bodies of member cities and 2/3 of the governing bodies of member counties.

In practice, however, regional councils work by consensus, not majority votes. Their most important power is often persuasion and they tend to keep dialoging on a challenge until everyone can agree to a strategy for addressing it. The downside: it can result in picking the least interesting, lowest common denominator, strategy. The upside: everyone is potentially supportive of any adopted strategy.

Regional councils also directly deliver regional services, either to member jurisdictions or the general public. Somewhere in the country, there is a regional council, and often many, delivering any local or state government service on behalf of its members. Some regional councils believe that delivering services enhances their support and clout, especially with local and sometimes state governments. Some regional councils fear that this compromises their planning processes and reduces their clout in addressing regional challenges. Given the governance struggle going on in many regions, the regional councils' ability to balance problem-solving and service-delivery is especially key to their survival and growth.

Now, regional councils are becoming the targets of governance studies, such as to empower them to guide the implementation of regional plans/growth compacts or to deliver regional services, such as this case study for the San Diego Association of Governments.

Regional councils are found worldwide. Canadian provinces have experimented with a wide range of regional organizations, from those that resemble regional councils in the states, such as the Alberta Capital Regional Alliance (capregion.ab.ca), to metropolitan governments, such as the Municipality of Metro Toronto (city.Toronto.on.ca). Similarly, many of the new regional organizations in the European Community resemble regional councils.

Description

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) serves as a forum for regional decision making for the 18 cities in San Diego County along with San Diego County government. SANDAG "builds consensus; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; plans, engineers, and builds public transportation; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.

The responsibilities of SANDAG were changed dramatically by a state-created commission to examine governance in the San Diego region, the San Diego Regional Government Efficiency Commission (RGEC). REGC, composed of representatives of the regional planning and service-delivery organizations and gubernatorial representatives, was charged to make two recommendations for improving regional governance; one plan for consolidating regional organizations and another plan for better coordinating their activities.

In August, 2001, RGEC recommended creating a new regional agency to develop a regional plan that integrated regional transportation, land use and related planning as well as assured compatibility of regional transportation agency and municipal plans with the regional plan. This agency would have a governing board with directly elected and appointed members and a policy committee of county and municipal officials to guide the preparation of the regional plan. RGEC also recommended creating a new airport authority to site, build, and operate a new airport or expand its current facilities.

REGC's recommendations were modified by the state legislature and implemented, resulting in transferring the planning and major project development responsibilities of the two transit agencies to SANDAG as well as creating a new airport authority. It also called for preparing a Regional Comprehensive Plan that was adopted by the SANDAG Board in 2004.

The SANDAG Board of Directors is composed of mayors, councilmember's, and county supervisors (with two representatives from the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego). "Supplementing these voting members are advisory representatives from Imperial County, California Department of Transportation, the two transit systems, the U. S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, the Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association (representing the 18 Native American reservations), and Mexico."

SANDAG Board members are heavily engaged in guiding SANDAG operations. It holds bimonthly Friday meetings, the first to discuss policy and the second to take action. Board members also participate on the five key SANDAG committees, which meet on Fridays during the in-between weeks. Most SANDAG Board members are involved in SANDAG activities each Friday.

SANDAG now conducts planning and delivers a number of services, at the request of its members and state and federal governments, including:

- conducting regional transportation planning, to meet state and federal standards,
- administering the local transportation ½ percent sales tax, *TransNet*, which will generate an estimated $14 billion through 2048 and is monitored and evaluated by an independent taxpayer oversight committee,
- co-leading air quality planning,
- preparing an annual legislative program setting priorities for possible federal and state legislation and local activities for the calendar year,
- conducting environmental planning, including acquiring habitat conservation land for the *TransNet* Environmental Mitigation Program,
- recommending actions to implement the state-mandated Integrated Waste Management Plan,
- reviewing projects for regional impact under California Environmental Quality Act and National Environmental Policy Act,
- managing the North County Multiple Habitat Conservation Program,
- administering the Regional Criminal Justice Clearinghouse and the Automated Regional Justice Information System,
- providing the 511 Advanced Traveler Information System, a free telephone and Web-based service that provided up-to-the-minute information on freeway conditions, travel times, traffic maps, toll rates, and transit and rideshare information,
- operating the Regional Census Data Center,
- engaging the public though a Public Participation Plan, and
- partnering with Baja California, Mexico on a third border crossing, to be paid for, in part, by a toll on State Route 11 (SR 1486).

In addition, SANDAG received authorization in 2008 to use future *TransNet* revenues for other than transportation regional needs in future ballot measures.

SANDAG established a baseline for monitoring performance in implementing the Regional Comprehensive Plan in 2006 and prepares an annual Regional Comprehensive Plan Monitoring Report. The report highlights topics that are "Moving in the Right Direction" as well as "Areas for Improvement".

SANDAG has an annual budget of approximately $1.1 billion, including an annual capital program of approximately $780 million and annual operating budget of approximately $60 million. It rarely requests Federal earmarks, preferring to pursue regular Federal funding, but frequently requests flexibility in using and combining Federal and other funding to pursue priority initiatives.

Accomplishments

SANDAG is successfully making the transition from predominately a regional planning agency to a "full-service" regional planning and service delivery agency. It has built solid working relationships with all levels of government, and across the Mexican border, which prepare SANDAG to address new challenges as they are raised by its members. Examples of these accomplishments are listed in the Description section above.

Shortcomings

SANDAG's work program is becoming increasingly constrained by the fiscal dilemmas of the State of California. It is also encountering "border" challenges, including developing working relationships with the Los Angeles region to the north and securing the support of the federal governments in Mexico and the United States for building a third border crossing.

Future Plans

SANDAG has recently launched a quality of life initiative, including developing a new Regional Comprehensive Plan for future growth that addresses all aspects of quality of life and establishes quality of life measures to be monitored in the future.

Contact Information

Gary Gallegos
Executive Director
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

619-699-1990
gga@sandag.org

Additional Information Sources

SANDAG website -- www.sandag.org

National Association of Regional Councils website (examples of domestic regional councils) -- www.narc.org

European Community's Committee of the Regions website (examples of European regional councils) -- www.cor.eu.int.

10. INSTITUTE FOR PORTLAND METROPOLITAN STUDIES -- (Regional Studies Institute)

Background

Colleges/universities have initiated a variety of approaches to fostering regional cooperation:

- Some conduct selective studies of regional challenges, such as the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (ualr.edu).

- Some historically established urban studies centers that have subsequently evolved into regional studies centers, such as College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University (urban.csuohio.edu), the Center for Urban and Public Affairs at Wright State University (wright.edu/cupa), and the Great Cities Institute at the University of Illinois in Chicago (uic.edu/cuppa/gci).

- Some have established new regional centers, such as the Institute for Portland Metropolitan Studies at Portland State University (upa.pdx.edu/ims), the Center for Greater Philadelphia at the University of Pennsylvania (cgp.upenn.edu), and the Institute for Local Governance and Regional Growth at the University of Buffalo (regional-institute.buffalo.edu).

- Some have defined the whole institution as regional, such as the almost 60 that have signed the Declaration of Metropolitan Universities. (Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities, uc.impui.edu/cumu).

- Some have attempted to create multi-institution centers with regional agendas (Hartford Consortium for Higher Education, hartnet.org/hche).

Many, if not most colleges/universities, have some involvement in addressing the challenges facing their regions. In the National Capital Region, George Mason University, George Washington University, and the University of Maryland have all been involved in addressing regional challenges.

The colleges/universities with regional academic centers have established reputations for conducting neutral, professional research on urban and regional challenges. They provide critical information and skilled staff support for regional visioning/planning processes. They also conduct regional cooperation performance audits, such as on regional organizations, and provide training for regional experts. For example, the Institute for Local Governance and Regional Growth continually updates a state of the region report on an interactive website.

Generally, regional academic centers receive some regular support from their institutions, usually in the form of full- or part-time faculty, staff, and student interns, and office and overhead support. Some receive state government funding for priority activities. For example, the eight centers located at Ohio's public urban universities receive funding from the state-sponsored Urban University Program. All of the centers and institutes also pursue funding from external funding sources, including public and foundation grants and contracts with other regional groups.

The major strength of regional academic centers lies in the neutral, professional resources that they provide for researching regional challenges. They have made significant contributions to addressing the challenges facing their regions. In return, they have enhanced the reputations of their institutions, making them more attractive to students, faculty, staff, alumni, and contributors.

The major shortcoming of regional academic centers is limited resources and the difficulty in interesting faculty in addressing regional challenges in a timely manner, given teaching and other academic demands. Academic interest in regional cooperation has been episodic, contributing all too often to a dearth of practical models of regional governance when practitioners desperately need them.

The future of regional academic centers looks positive. Regional challenges are attracting new academic interest and regional organizations are looking for trained regional experts. Maybe, most importantly, many colleges and universities have discovered that their future students and alumni predominately come from the regions in which they are located. Regional academic centers could support the regional governance network as well as train the regional experts and provide some of the other equipment needed to play the regional cooperation game.

Description

The Institute for Portland Metropolitan Studies at Portland State University (PSU) was established in 1992 "to advance the economic, environmental, and social goals of the Portland metropolitan region by gathering and disseminating credible information, convening regional partners, and stimulating dialogue and action about critical regional issues". It has served as a broker and catalyst in the region, a vehicle for identifying critical regional issues and actively working to create a constituency to give them the attention they deserve.

The Institute was started with $100,000 in seed funding and fund-raising commitments from the City of Portland.

The Institute has addressed pressing regional information needs. The Institute provides regional economic, environmental and social information, including the Portland-Vancouver Indicators project to "track the ups and downs" of the whole region's well-being, the Regional Equity Atlas to map regional equity conditions, the Oregon Regional Economic Analysis Project to examine emerging trends across Oregon's regions.

The Institute also shares stories on the history and culture of the region in the biennial *Metroscape* magazine and the Silicon Forest Family Tree, which collects data on the historical roots of the regional electronics cluster. Finally, it reports on political institutions in the periodic bi-state regional conferences that it co-hosts with the University of Washington.

The Institute also promotes metropolitan collaboration, including *Metroscape* (semi-annual magazine covering current and historic regional challenges), *The Catalyst* (quarterly newsletter sharing new regional events and developments), *Metropolitan Briefing Book* (annual report presenting new and revised regional information), periodic Leadership Symposiums (dialoging on the latest regional challenges),and the Metropolitan Knowledge Network, which shares timely articles written about the Portland region and engages community leaders in discussions about public policy issues.

The Institute also carries out other regional activities, including:

- sponsoring First Stop Portland to organize study tours for delegations from other regions, including providing a virtual study tour on its website,

- supporting a Food Systems Sustainability Project to foster a regional food system, and

- administering the State of Oregon Regional Investment Program, which invests (1) approximately $750,000 of state lottery funds in community and economic development in "distressed communities and lagging populations" as well as regional projects, such as conducting research for the Metropolitan Economic Development Task Force, and (2) another approximately $250,000 biennially in multi-region projects.

The Institute was created by state statute (Oregon Statute 352.074) as a joint initiative of Portland State University and local governments, especially the City of Portland. It operates under a university charter and has a 23-member governing, not advisory, board made up entirely of community representatives. The Institute is located in the College of Urban and Public Affairs serves and its dean serves in an ex-officio capacity. The Board establishes policy for the Institute, validates the list of critical regional issues, identifies and cultivates funding sources, approves the operating plan, assists PSU in evaluating the Director, and takes the lead in designing the leadership symposiums.

PSU provides core support for the Institute, including salaries of the Director, an administrative assistant, and one other staff person, along with office space, utilities, equipment, and supplies. The Institute also oversees the Population Research Center, the state data center, which adds two additional staff (FTEs) to the staff resources. The balance of the Institute's funding comes from the City of Portland seed funding grant for new initiatives, which has been added to by other jurisdictions, and contracts and grants, which are pursued aggressively by Institute staff.

Accomplishments

The Institute is especially known for its publications, its role as a neutral forum, and its ability to develop new and engaging information about the region. It has had an especially dramatic impact on the university itself, making it a practicing urban and regional institution. The School of Government now requires community-based experience for all of its undergraduates, promotion and tenure committees now recognize community service as a form of scholarship, and a center has been established to support creation of curriculum-based university-community partnerships.

Maybe, most interestingly, the Institute ranks high in surveys of what alumni and supporters want PSU to be. The Institute was one of the key activities identified for support in the first PSU capital campaign.

Shortcomings

The Institute has only limited relationships with other departments, and their teaching and research activities, except for occasional articles by their faculty in *Metroscape*. The Institute has better relationships with faculty at other institutions, including joint projects with Oregon State University, Lewis and Clark University and others.

Future Plans

The Institute's future plans include developing a Data Commons to provide professional data to regional advocacy groups. It is continually chasing foundation and government grants to address new opportunities. It has tried to establish an endowment, but does not have board members with the resources, or clout, to attract major contributions. It is especially concerned about maintaining its flexibility to address emerging regional challenges, since it is the only regional organization without a relatively rigid agenda.

Contact Information

Sheila Martin
Executive Director
Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies
Portland State University
P. O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207-0751

503-725-5150
sheilam@pdx.edu

Additional Information Sources

Website -- www.pdx.edu/ims

Seltzer, Ethan, At the Edge: University-based Institutes and Their Communities, *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, Volume 10,Number 1 (Summer 1999))Available on Institute website)