

GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION
IN TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES
(Panel Discussion-Part III)

Procedures for Local-State Cooperation

STERLING BOLYARD
Chief
Urban Planning Department
Indiana State Highway Commission

WHY COOPERATION AND COORDINATION? KNOWING WHY HELPS DETERMINE THE PROCEDURES

Although the stage must be set for this discussion, there seems little justification for professionals in the highway field to question why coordination and cooperation is essential between various levels of public agency jurisdiction. At this time when federal and state motor fuel tax funds are the dominant source of funding highway construction, and when we travel in almost any direction of the compass to our neighboring states we can readily discern the possibilities for the following errant actions in urban areas without the benefit of cooperation and coordination:

1. Freeways being constructed and local areas not having provided access corridor facilities during what seems to be eons of time to the auto owner-driver who seeks to recoup his small contribution via the gas tax investment by having the benefits of maximum convenience and accessibility to the highway system.

2. Rights-of-way acquisition in corridors where federal funds have been only recently used for land acquisition by other than Bureau of Public Roads supported agencies. The original acquisition being designed to stabilize the neighborhood housing and community environment. The results of this action would be the duplication of expenditures of federal funds and even a possible waste of funds.

3. Where major arterial streets cut across land that has been earmarked by local agencies for non-highway uses such as schools, parks, hospitals, fire stations, and utility treatment plants.

4. Where new industry or other essential development of the local

land use plans will be damaged as to the geometric adaptability of the property in relation to its non-highway use.

5. Where location of the facility including a viaduct or bridge or the under-design of such a facility becomes apparent, due to the changing traffic desire lines.

Faux Pas, such as the five listed above can be found in many areas, and disgustingly so, are the product of inadequate understanding of the various problems which can be created by not coordinating all efforts of development.

THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1962 WAS THE ADVANT OF MANDATORY COOPERATION

The same reasons listed above coupled with much study and discussion by prominent city, county, state and federal officials led the Bureau of Public Roads officials to realize that uncoordinated and uncorrelated disbursements from one of the largest sources of self-perpetuating public finance could result in the creation of a "monster" with as great a threat as the demands of auto traffic generation.

The net result was the earthshaking "Holmes memo of 1963" (by E. H. Holmes, Bureau of Public Roads, director of planning 9-13-63) which in effect said, "All Urban areas having over 50,000 in population must get their 'house' in order, and exercise the comprehensive planning provisions of their State planning enabling legislation, in order to be able to carry on a comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing planning program." The program was subsequently defined in the Bureau of Public Roads, Instructional Memorandum 50-2-63 followed by Policy and Procedure Memo 50-9 defining the ten basic elements of the 3c's program.

QUALIFYING FOR INDIANA HIGHWAY DOLLARS FROM THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Immediately following the Holmes memo was the instructional memorandum which outlined the mandatory 3c's program and also carried a penalty clause identifying the work needed to be accomplished by a certain date in order for federally supported project to be approved for participation by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Indiana has, or is considered a part of, 14 urban areas of over 50,000 population which are subject to the Bureau of Public Roads instructional memoranda. By virtue of the long standing thinking of the Indiana Highway Commission all projects must be initiated at the local level (excluding the interstate program). Therefore all

projects are considered as being subject to the above referenced memoranda and the approval of the expenditure of funds.

The 3c's planning program as defined in the memoranda sets forth a programming effort, not just a planning effort whereby the plans are drawn, paid for, and then laid upon a shelf to gather dust. Now, the Indiana State Highway Commission must consider a complete plan and program as one and the same. The planning program being the design or tool by which determination can be made for expending funds on projects planned.

The state has legislation which enables and defines an organization which should be the planning agent in each local area. In most of the urban areas such defined agency was in operation but not to the extent which was defined by the instructional memoranda, and in no instance was the Indiana State Highway Commission or its representative considered a member or even an ex-official member of the local program of planning.

ORGANIZATION FOR COOPERATION

When analyzing the situation created by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 it became very apparent an organization by cooperation was needed to do the planning in the urban areas.

The first step toward such an organization to accomplish an urban transportation planning program is to establish the need and obtain an agreement on that need for the program from all jurisdictions and agencies having a responsibility for transportation and for community development in the area. The initial stage of organization must be guided by the policy level representatives from the governing bodies having the responsibility for implementation.

This organizing committee, after determining the type of study, sets forth the general guidelines, as a basis for an agreement on the conduct of the study and the organization.

At least two committees, boards, or group of representatives of both local and state agencies must be activated to direct and prepare the planning program as defined in the agreement.

A possible third group should be included, the Citizens Advisory Committee, however, in all but one urban area, in Indiana the advisory committee was not desired by the local participants.

The basic purpose of the committees in the transportation study organization is to provide a means of involvement of the various governmental bodies and agencies, utilities, private interest groups, and citizens of the area into the planning process.

At this point I wish to turn to referencing my remarks to the happenings which have taken place in Indiana while attempting to set up a completely coordinated program.

Two committees were developed in each regional and/or metropolitan area namely:

1. *The Administrative Committees*

The administrative committees are made up of elected officials and budget guardians from all three levels of governments; state, city, and county.

The purpose of the administrative committee is to agree upon and coordinate basic non-technical public policy, and to provide the general direction for the conduct of the study. The administrative committee must also familiarize itself and the public and civil leaders within the study area, with the conduct and its progress of the study.

The make-up of this committee was determined early in the procedure. Each member must be that representative of the governmental unit who is the chief administrative officer who can sign documents with authority or one who can commit the fund expenditures needed to implement the improvements defined by the planning study's formal report.

The administration committee members were named by position, and not by name of person, namely: the mayor, or mayors; boards of works president, plan commission chairman (both city and county), chairman board of county commissioners, president of the air board, and chief administrator of any additional city or county board along with a representative appointed by each, the highway commission and the Bureau of Public Roads.

At this level serious questions arose about the inclusion of the president of the city council and the president of the county council. It is our belief these positions should be represented also, but this puts them in the position of being both judge and jury as to the development of the program and to the approval of the expenditure of the funds to initiate the program at any stage.

Autonomy also reared its head and caused much discussion when considering the formation of a composite membership to a body to do planning for all. This was without a doubt the toughest question to get answered satisfactorily.

At the outset only one urban area was organized as an area planning unit, the membership being designated in the same manner as above except for the state and bureau members. It was decided to make

the operative area plan commission board the new board committee and included the state and bureau members on it.

At first, voting was enjoyed by all if this statement "enjoyed" can stand, but soon the Bureau of Public Roads members were given directions by Washington that they could not participate in the voting at the committee level.

2. *The Technical Committee*

A group of technical persons representing the members of the administrative committee at the working level of operation; was appointed to serve on a technical committee and were charged with the responsibility of developing a program which would follow the guidelines set forth by the instructional and policy and procedure memoranda of the Bureau of Public Roads, and as agreed upon by the administrative committee.

A heuristic approach was attempted by the state but apathy on the part of most local authorities allowed considerable length of time to elapse before the actual 3c's planning approach was activated. It must be referred to again to the Indiana State Highway Commission unwritten policy, "that all projects must be originated at the local level." A belief that the deadline date would not be adhered to was the chief cause for apathy. Approximately three years had been set aside for meeting the deadline date.

Each study area experienced a cut off of federal funds to one or more programs before the apathy was set aside to the point of decision to actually actively participate in other than a procedure of meeting monthly to discuss the 3c's planning program.

True the committees were formed, the study was given a title and a prospectus was drawn usually within the confines of the technical committees operation. Most areas proceeded to join with the Indiana State Highway Commission in the hiring of consulting engineering firms to develop the study design, operations plans, the critical path and finally into the study proper.

An equitable split of costs was attempted between local and state expenditures on the planning program in an attempt to achieve organized coordination. Organized cooperation has one prime purpose and that is to eliminate the duplication of efforts and money expended.

There are also several lesser advantages through cooperation, such as: expanded transportation studies for the oriented comprehensive planning program, made possible by the use of HPR funds; expanded

and more detailed land use, economic and population data, and more precisely defined development patterns. The study of these items is the result of funds made available thru HUD or Housing and Urban Development grants.

You may wish to say we have all, each planning agency, been doing these items of planning. True. But has it been meaningful? Has the transportation facility been considered as a land use? Is it the best and highest use? (Is the land used for a street, road, or rail, etc. compatible with the adjoining land use and visa versa?); (what are we doing to our transportation system by changes in the adjoining land use?)

I do not believe there is any attempt to assume the answers to the above questions. However, thru the cooperation of the governmental agencies, an attempt is being made at answering those and many additional questions.

These questions will be answered when full cooperation is achieved in the attempt to fully coordinate all planning activities within the urban areas.

Additional cooperation is being achieved thru the TOPICS program, the 204 review program an element of the Demonstration Cities Act, the current HUD A-95 review program of the HUD Model Cities Act.

The HUD A-95 program demands a review of every project which calls for the expenditure of federal funds. Each governmental agency has been requested to examine a list of all projects eligible for federal funds and indicate their interest in review. Each time a review is studied an increase of knowledge and interest in the other agency is consummated.