

# Regional Governance and Council of Governments(COG) in the United States : Implications of ISTEA/CAAA

미국의 광역 거버넌스와 지방정부 협의회: 참여와 비전수립

Hyunsun Choi Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science and  
Public Administration, Univ. of North Florida(Primary Author)  
Seong-Youn Choi Chief Demographer, Southern California Association of Governments

※ Keywords: Council of Governments, Metropolitan Planning Organizations,  
Growth Visioning, Public Participation, Regional Governance

## Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Regional Governance: History and Institution
  - 1. Organizations for Regional Planning
  - 2. Federal Acts and Policies
  - 3. Governance Theory
- III. Implications of ISTEA/CAAA for Regional Governance
  - 1. Council of Governments(COG)
  - 2. ISTEA of 1991: Significant Changes
  - 3. ISTEA/CAAA for Regional Governance
- IV. Public Participation and Visioning Process
  - 1. SCAG and Governance Structure
  - 2. Public Participation and Governance
  - 3. Growth Visioning
- V. Delegation of Regional Planning/Programming  
Functions to Subregions
- VI. Conclusion

## I. Introduction

Due to emerging urgent regional issues and fragmentation of powers, there have been apparently big needs of regional governance in urban administration and planning of the United States. The American administration and planning system has evolved within a decentralized and fragmented political framework, so, not like centralized system, regional governance is not easy issue at all. After World War II, suburbanization continued harshly, and it didn't observe any political jurisdictional boundaries. Metropolitan areas formed and developed based on this fast growth with fragmentation. In 1960s, transportation congestion and environmental pollution became main issues of regional level. Federal and local governments started to work together for regional issues.

This paper addresses historical and institutional development of regional governance structure and importance of public participation in the United States with metropolitan administration and planning experience of Southern California. While many regions and countries are looking for appropriate and efficient governance structure, the case of Southern can

give good benchmarking one. How have federal and local governments developed regional governance structure to deal with issues of metropolitan area in the United States? After historical development of different kinds of organizations for regional administration and planning, Council of Governments(COG)<sup>1)</sup> and Metropolitan Planning Organization(MPO)<sup>2)</sup> became the more important arms of cooperating among local jurisdictions, regional agencies, state and federal agencies in the metropolitan region. As the concept of governance in public sector and democracy was introduced, the regional administration and planning has adopted governance concept nurtured by continued researches on administration and management(Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill. 2001; Ingraham and Lynn. 2004).

With the case of Southern California, this paper explores how COG deals with growth, land-use, and transportation. In regional governance, public participation and growth visioning are promising assets. To enlarge participation, the federal government has provided important acts to bring collaborative partnership in region. This paper gives some implications for the current efforts and

---

1) A Council of Governments(COG) is a multi-service entity with state and locally-defined boundaries that delivers a variety of federal, state and local programs(<http://narc.org/regional-councils-mpos/what-is-a-regional-council.html>).

2) MPO is an agency created by federal law to provide local input for urban transportation planning and allocating federal transportation funds to cities with populations of greater than 50,000. Nearly half of MPOs(178) operate as part of the Council of Governments serving the same general geography(<http://narc.org/regional-councils-mpos/what-is-a-metropolitan-planning-organization.html>).

discussions of regional and metropolitan planning in South Korea. The experiences of COGs in Southern California brings issues of intergovernmental relations and public participation in decision making process, which are same concern as Korea urban administration and planning. Also, this paper elaborate the tension between counties and state in terms of COGs' regional planning. This case shows difficulties of delegating functions to subregions.

## II. Regional Governance: History and Institution

One local government is too small to deal with big issues to cover region or metropolitan. Since most regional issues are political, governments in metropolitan need to build some kind of governance structure to take care of regional issues with political legitimacy. Regional issues include transportation, water supply, sewers, sewage treatment, solid waste disposal, air pollution, parks and outdoor recreation, open space, economic development, and housing. There have been important organization developments for metropolitan administration and planning in United States. These organizations became the most important arms for governance deal with comprehensive growth issue as well as specific functional one. The need of this regional governance is far back as the early 20th century. The first effort was the Plan

for the City of Chicago of 1909 as City Beatification movement which contained regional elements for both transportation and open space. The first nation-wide need came in the 1920s due to the increase in automobile ownership and expanding suburbs(Levy. 2006).

### 1. Organizations for Regional Planning

Two forms of organization have been created upon regional issues, such as transportation and management before emergence of Council of Governments(COG) in 1960s. First one is Regional Planning Agency which emerged in 1922. The famous example was the Regional Plan Association in the New York Metropolitan area as the first metropolitan planning case. This organization still works upon special needs of region, and has provided their works till 1996. These agencies were entirely private organizations with no official authority at all. Later, some agencies were created by legislative act with minimum authority. However, this regional planning agency could not achieve much, since it had no power to implement except for advising to city government.

In the similar period as Regional Planning Agency, public authority was created by a state government or sometimes by the joint of two or more state governments. This organization is regarded as the first public organization to deal with metropolitan transportation and management

issues with some power and authority. Public authority is a quasi-government with some of the usual powers of government, but not like real government. This organization is not limited to planning and transportation issues, but applied to fields of education, management, water supply, and environments.

The first authority formed in the United States was the Port of New York Authority, which was created in 1921 by the Legislatures of New York and New Jersey and was subsequently renamed the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. This authority often has the power to raise money through the issuance of tax-exempt bonds. It may also have the power to take property through condemnation or to override local land-use controls(Levy. 2006). Public authority still works in many places, for example, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Delaware River and Bay, and Jacksonville Port Authority.

Currently, the American metropolitan urban administration is practicing based COG format. Most regional governance discussions and theoretical development are based on this institutional frame in the post-World War II period. The growth of COGs has been promoted in large measure by the federal government's regional planning requirements for funding bills in transportation, urban redevelopment, environmental improvement, and social services.

## 2. Federal Acts and Policies

The federal government of the United States started to provide some institutional arrangements for regional administration and planning in the 1960s. The federal government passed a series of acts including Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968.

### 1) Transportation Infrastructure

The first set of acts focused on metropolitan transportation and infrastructure issue, since the urban sprawl brought serious traffic congestions. Federal-Aid Highway Act(1962) and Urban Mass Transportation Act(1964) changed the infrastructure provision of national transportation system. Federal funds were distributed, and cities or regions participated in major transportation projects. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 required, as a condition attached to federal transportation financial assistance, that transportation projects in urbanized areas of 50,000 or more in population be based on a continuing, comprehensive, urban transportation planning process undertaken cooperatively by the states and local governments(US DOT. 1988). The 3C(continuing, comprehensive and cooperative) planning process is the result of this

law. Urban Mass Transportation Act was the first major legislation to provide federal aid for the development of mass transit systems. It provided incentives for the preparation of a metropolitan transportation plan(Solof. 1996; 3).

## 2) Urban Development and Intergovernmental Relations

The second emphasis is about urban renewal and community development. As the United States Federalism moved from dual system to cooperative one in 1960s, the federal policy came to focus on urban revitalization and community development with the following acts. Housing and Urban Development Act(1965)<sup>3)</sup> became foundation most urban redevelopment projects till the early 1980s in the United States. With this act, Urban Renewal spread over the America. However, this act was replaced by Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 due to lack of concern of humans in urban space.

Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act(1966) required all applications for federal aid for the planning and the construction of housing, roads and other facilities to be submitted to an area wide planning agency for review and comment. The goal was to insure

that the applications were consistent with regional plans and were coordinated with other federal aid projects(Solof. 1996). Intergovernmental Cooperation Act(1968) consolidated the review of regional review of grant applications. Implemented by the Bureau of the Budget's<sup>4)</sup> Circular A-95 in 1969, this law applied the regional review requirements to numerous other programs receiving federal funds. By 1973, after several revisions to the A-95 directive, about 150 federal programs were covered. The goals were both to better coordinate federal expenditures and to increase regional planning efforts(Wikstrom. 1977; 42, Lewis. 1977; 30).

## 3. Governance Theory

The concept of governance has been spontaneously applied to regional issues in the United States. American regional governance can be expressed as "voluntary" due to their rational choice to avoid transaction cost(Feiock. 2007). Voluntary agreements can emerge from dynamics of political parties in regions. The regional governance in the United States is 'cooperation' and 'partnership' based on, for example, COGs. The governance concept is widely used in the

---

3) This act amended the Section 701 urban planning assistance program established under the housing Act of 1954 by authorizing grants to be made to "...organizations composed of public officials whom the Secretary of HUD finds to be representative of the political jurisdictions within a metropolitan or urban region..." for the purpose comprehensive planning. This provision encouraged the formation of regional planning organizations controlled by elected officials rather than appointed officials(US DOT. 1988).

4) Now, the Office of Management and Budget.

public and private sectors. Also, it works in different scales, for example global and local arrangements, and consists of formal structures and informal norms and practices. The complexity of society gives more legitimacy of this concept in diverse fields. The theoretical concept of governance is 'partnership' in society among government, market, and civil society. Since the governance has assumption that social and economic interactions are governed by rules and regulations in our society. Government should follow these rules. Regional or metropolitan governance can be defined as rule making and partnership for regional issues(World Bank. 1989).

For governance structure, first, multiple stakeholders exist in diverse scenarios. This element is the most important part to support public participation and visioning process. The multiple stakeholders cannot reach consensus or decision making easily without proper institutional arrangement which can hold diverse stakeholders. Second, formal and inform rules are important. Governance should work based on these rules. Third, there are hierarchies and cooperative networks. Certainly, the structure should be vertical as well as horizontal. Fourth, there are key processes of social interactions among governments, private companies, non-profit organizations, and stakeholders (Governance International. 1999).

### III. Implications of ISTEA / CAAA for Regional Governance

In the 1960s the flow of federal money for highways, urban redevelopment, and environmental projects increased greatly. The federal funding was a major factor in activating Council of Governments(COG) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations(MPOs), which is the main instrument for inter governmental cooperation and planning in the United States.

#### 1. Council of Governments(COG)

The number of COGs has increased consistently since the series of acts started. Today, there are about 450 COGs and 384 MPOs in the United States. Most municipalities in the United States belong to one, and some belong to more than one. The growth of COGs/MPOs was promoted by federal interventions through regional planning requirements for funding bills in transportation, urban redevelopment, environmental improvement, and social services. There were increasing concerns about environments and suburbanization in the 1960s, and consequently the bills and funds were followed upon these needs.

There are also numerous other names for the same type of organization are in use, such as regional councils, associations of governments, planning districts, metropolitan planning organizations, regional planning agency and area

development district associations. These organizations have two major associations; NARC(National Association of Regional Councils) and AMPO(Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations). One difference between COGs and MPOs is function of planning and funding authority. While some forms of GOGs would not have these functions and funding, MPOs have these ones. However, MPOs themselves are COGs. Thus, the paper will use terms COGs or MPOs in same time, but those are almost same meaning. And, only COGs / MPOs with planning function and funding are dealt with in this paper.

One of the recent acts was the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991(ISTEA). The main contribution of this act is increasing regional governance capacity through empowering planning role of COGs by designating the COG or COGs in each region as the Metropolitan Planning Organization(MPO) that would coordinate transportation planning and prepare the applications for funding. This organization is strengthened with its role and funding flexibility. Since the act involved the appropriation of \$150 billion or so in federal highway funds over the subsequent five years, it was a very powerful inducement to metropolitan area planning in the realm of highway and related investments. The 1998 highway bill, which authorized \$203 billion in federal expenditures over the next six years, continued the Councils

of Governments as the lead agency in metropolitan area planning.

## **2. ISTEA of 1991: Significant Changes**

To deal with regional issues, especially transportation and environment, there are two major forces. First, ISTEA overseen by U.S. Department of Transportation(US DOT) is mandating transportation funding and planning, mainly. Second, the Clean Air Act of 1990 and by the Environmental Planning Agency(EPA) is guiding regional environmental issue with federal funds. The two efforts, once separate, are now coordinated on a variety of levels. With the introduction of the ISTEA in 1991 and the Clean Air Act Amendment(CAAA) in 1990, the regional planning process has significantly changed. ISTEA made funding flexible. Flexible funding meant that highway monies could be spent on more than just highways ISTEA also allocated more funding for alternative transportation modes, which allowed for more local decision-making on the allocation of funds, and allowed for more public participation In the transportation planning process than previous transportation packages.

ISTEA of 1991 brought significant changes for regional governance upon growth and visioning. First, MPOs can have stronger roles and responsibilities than before. ISTEA requires strong working relationships between MPOs and other

agencies. Second, long-range plans must evaluate a variety of scenarios. In this scenario building, public participation and their opinions are very important. ISTEA requires the long-range plan to define and evaluate several distinct alternatives in terms of broad costs and benefits and the ability to accomplish clearly stated area wide goals.

Third, Regional Transportation Plan(RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Programs(RTIP) should be related. And these two RTP and RTIP must be financially constrained. ISTEA requires plans to contain a list of projects that can be funded with existing and expected revenues over a 20-year time horizon, comparing existing and proposed revenues to cost of constructing and operating the planned system. Requiring the project list to match existing and

expected revenues is called “financially constrained”, and all metropolitan regions must have a financially constrained regional transportation plan and transportation project list.

Fourth, ISTEA requires TIP to conform to air quality goals and places restrictions on the kind of programs they can fund if regions are in non-attainment of Clean Air Act standards.

Fifth, as an important political and governing change, significant public participation is required. ISTEA requires a proactive public involvement process, including access to compete technical and policy information, timely notices, full access to key decisions, and support for early and continuing involvement in plan and TIP development.

<Table> Comparison of Planning Aspects between Before and After ISTEA

Aspect	Status Quo	ISTEA Goals
1. COGs role	Removed from major decisions	Broker, leader, consensus builder
2. Long range plan	Single scenario Focus on 1 or 2 modes	Alternative scenarios Multi-modal and inter-modal. Focus on system performance. Incorporates 15 factors.
3. Links between RTP and TIP	Not clearly established	Clearly established. TIP - strategic management tool.
4. Financially constrained Plan/TIP	No.	Yes.
5. Public role, Participation Representation	Limited-e. g., hearings on draft Plan/TIP. Limited	Actively encouraged. Early and substantive. Broad-public/private sector, citizens

Note: Reorganized from Lyons. 1994. p25

### 3. ISTEA / CAAA for Regional Governance

There are three major implications of this change for regional governance. These changes are related with public participation increase and collaborating process. First of all, the federal law tends to move toward 'regionalism' by providing the regional COGs more control over regional projects. COGs were provided with increased funding, with increased roles and responsibilities to select projects and mandates for new planning initiatives and to use federal funds flexibly among different modes in their regions. The upgraded status of COGs was reflected during the plan preparation process. State transportation officials, for the first time, were required to seriously consult with local representatives on COGs governing boards(Solof. 1996; 1). The empowerment of COGs in several key decision making points was understood as a revolutionary process(Howe. 1994; 11). The project selection and fiscal constraint requirements have led to a planning process that is "more rational than political", according to 1996 Government Accounting Office survey of MPO officials(GAO. 1996; 1).

Second, ISTEA tried to achieve 'responsive' planning meeting local needs by placing significant emphasis on broadening public participation in transportation planning to include key stakeholders including the business community, members of the public, community

groups, and other governmental agencies. This change challenges professional planners and elected officials because meaningful engagement of diverse interests can be difficult(US DOT. 1995; 5). Public participation is also emphasized for minority or low-income groups, relatively underrepresented during the planning process. Federal planning regulations and policies require that a wide spectrum of stakeholders have the opportunity to participate meaningfully in the planning process. Toward this end, MPO places an emphasis on reaching out to the minority and low-income communities and the leadership that represents these communities.

Third, ISTEA strengthened the 'integrated' aspect of regional planning by developing alternative scenarios of visionary perspectives, establishing a clear linkage between the long-range plan and TIP, by coordinating land use and transportation, by linking transportation and air quality. By emphasizing the integration of major planning aspects, ISTEA intended to produce a more coherent set of regional planning and programming. For example, a newly introduced concept is the relationship between transportation and air quality. According to CAAA, in areas failing to meet Federal air quality standards, transportation planning should be geared to improving air quality as well as mobility(US DOT. 1995; 5).

#### **IV. Public Participation and Visioning Process**

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) was established in 1965 by the cities and counties of Southern California after almost three years of effort. The formation of SCAG was presumably a response to the 1963 California law, which enabled the state to establish regional governments with decision - making authority in areas, which did not form them on their own. By creating SCAG, Southern California localities were able to resist greater state control(Wilkstrom. 1977; 43-44).

##### **1. SCAG and Governance Structure**

SCAG has evolved as the largest of nearly 850 COGs and MPOs in the United States, functioning as the MPO for six counties: Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Venturaand Imperial. The region encompasses a population exceeding 18million persons in an area of more than 38,000 square miles. SCAG is mandated by the federal government to research and draw up plans for transportation, growth management, hazardous waste management, and air quality.

SCAG's governing board, the Regional Council, conducts the affairs of SCAG; implements the General Assembly's policy decisions; acts upon policy recommendations

from SCAG policy committees and external agencies; appoints committees to study specific problems and programs; and amends, decreases or increases the proposed budget to be reported to the General Assembly. To adequately represent local concerns in the regional decision-making process, a COG must have an input from all parts of the region. COGs serve as a venue for communication and negotiation between municipal governments. For example, imagine that the Council of Governments is putting together a grant application for highway funds. There must be bargaining and compromise among the municipalities making up the COG. The COG serves as a venue for such activity and in that way helps to bring about some meeting of minds among the governments of the metropolitan area or region.

##### **2. Public Participation and Governance**

Public participation is vital to the regional planning process. Participation by the general public, local and state transportation planners, transit agencies, business interests, and special interest groups is encouraged during the planning process. Public participation requires a proactive public involvement process, including access to complete technical and policy information, timely notices, full access to key decisions, and support for early and continuing involvement in plan development.

### 1) Governing Board

To increase its responsiveness and representativeness, SCAG expanded its governing board from 35 to 71(now 74) local officials. SCAG comes close to a truly population-based method for allocating seats(Lewis and Sprague. 1997). SCAG covers a vast region and population, where granting each jurisdiction a vote on its regional council would be too cumbersome. Thus, SCAG's council includes one county supervisor from each county(two from Los Angeles County and an additional 64 members who, for the most part, each represent districts comprising about 200,000 in population(Lewis and Sprague. 1997; 40). A District shall be comprised of a group of cities that have a geographic community of interest and have a total population of approximately 200,000 people. A city with a minimum population of 200,000 shall be determined to have a District representative on the Regional Council for each 200,000 population increment.

### 2) Public Participation

SCAG created the Regional Advisory Council of 50 members drawn from business, church groups, and universities to make recommendations to the Executive Committee on proposed plans. A deliberate attempt was made to get the private sector, minority groups, women, and disadvantaged involved on this committee. Also, opinion surveys and public hearings were used to

sample citizen opinion. All area studies had a policy advisory committee groups composed of private citizens(Lyons. 1994; 29). A second change was to make meaningful public participation possible by allowing the public to participate in the growth visioning process. The regional growth visioning process was recently introduced to prepare a 2004 RTP as a way of forming the vision of the region. This visioning is focused on the future urban form, for example, centralized or decentralized. Through a series of public workshops, a group of participants is requested to discuss future growth alternatives and their implications and to come up with a single consensus urban growth form.

The third change is related to environmental justice. Title VI of the Civil rights Act of 1964 and associated regulations and policies, including President Clinton's 1994 executive Order 1298 on Environmental Justice, seek to ensure that minority and low income populations are involved in the regional planning process. As reference above, federal planning regulations and policies require that a wide spectrum of stakeholders have the opportunity to participate meaningfully in the planning process. Toward this end, SCAG has placed a priority on reaching out to the minority and low-income communities and the leadership that represents those communities. For example, in the 2001 RTP formulation, a series of Community Dialogue meetings were held throughout the region<sup>5</sup>). For these dialogues, an

overview of SCAG and its purpose were presented prior to discussing the content and importance of the RTP. Appropriate language interpretation services were provided for these meetings as needed. Furthermore, a series of four meetings were held with a set of leadership groups, representing minority and low-income communities, including those focusing upon environmental issues. SCAG elected officials led those meetings. SCAG reviewed its environmental justice policy language with this audience as it was being developed. It also reviewed its RTP environmental justice impact analysis at a set of meetings with these groups. All input was documented and considered in the development of the 2001 RTP.

The fourth change was the enhancement of the traditional public outreach program. At the beginning of the 2001 RTP process, SCAG embarked on an extensive public outreach process to ensure input and community feedback as the update progressed. This effort complemented the bottom-up planning process and relied heavily on the 14 subregions within the SCAG region. The subregions are ideally suited for public outreach as they maintain direct lines of communication with community groups,

businesses, transit operators, environmental organizations, and the public within their cities and local communities.

With the above changes, SCAG recently announced new institutionalized public participation plan in March 1, 2007. Since the federal government wants COGs to have institutionalized participation channel, SCAG finally produced more comprehensive plan to cover bottom-up and interagency participation. Thus, the future path of COGs will focus on public participation, and that will be connected to big improvement of their role in regions(SCAG. 2007).

### 3. Growth Visioning

For the 2004 RTP, the system planning work focusing on updating the RTP is integrated with other planning activities within SCAG, such as the Program EIR and the Growth Visioning work through an integrated planning process called Planning for Integrated Land Use and Transportation(PILUT). The primary objective of the PILUT process is to develop strategies or options for consideration by decision-makers that integrate growth decisions with transportation

---

5) ① 78 public workshops and/or organizational presentations; ② 41 environmental justice community dialogues; ③ 2 Electronic Town Halls focusing on transportation finance and goods movement, respectively; ④ 3 business roundtable forums; ⑤ 1 Transportation Summit at the University of Southern California. ⑥ 1 E-Commerce Summit; ⑦ Numerous Power Point Presentations on the RTP tailored specifically to subregions and updated with the RTP as well. ⑧ 8 fact sheets on individual topics of the RTP and updated as the RTP progressed. ⑨ More than 1,500 public comments on the RTP. ⑩ More than 585,000 "hits" on the public website, including 30,308 unique users.

investment decisions. The PILUT process is designed to improve efficiency and effectiveness in the planning processes within SCAG so as to minimize duplicative efforts, ensure coordination and continuity between the inter-connected programs such as the RTP, EIR and the Growth Visioning or the Compass program, and the Comprehensive Planning Guide.

In order to reduce uncertainties on future urban form goals, the growth visioning process is introduced. Visioning ultimately aims to develop “a clear and succinct description of what the community should look like after it ... achieves its full potential”(Bryson. 1995; 155). This growth visioning process became a popular tool for forming a growth vision of metropolitan areas (Helling. 1998; 335). This vision is being collectively developed by residents of the region. The regional vision will help the land use and transportation coordination process. Growth visioning has achieved successful results for communities such as Portland, Salt Lake City, Denver, Central Texas and Chicago(SCAG. 2002). These areas face the same growth challenges as the SCAG region but through the visioning process have gotten in front of the growth rather than being suffocated by the pressures of their future growth. Growth visioning was introduced as a method of stimulating rethinking about how the future might be shaped in neighborhoods, communities and regions. Growth visioning is a tool to

identify desirable – as opposed to merely projected – future conditions and stimulating change to realize that future image, typically drawing upon “smart growth” strategies and techniques to the extent that they can be applied

The SCAG growth visioning process is implemented as follows: First, workshop participants form small groups with a detailed map of the region Second, groups receive a series of scaled “game pieces” representing different types of land use densities. Third, group members work together to form a strategy and distribute jobs and housing across the region. Fourth, maps are gathered up and taken to a computer facility where the position of each game piece is recorded and double-checked. Fifth, from these maps, several alternative visions for the future of our region are determined.

Numerous workshops were held in various subregions in the SCAG region. Approximately 1,000 citizens participated in the workshop as a player or forecaster. This growth visioning will lead to the development of a normative forecast incorporating the possible land use policy options. A few examples of land use policy options include transit oriented development, smart growth, mixed-used development, and jobs-housing balance.

Southern California tried to overcome the issues experienced in other metropolitan areas. The SCAG growth visioning efforts was translated into the real numbers incorporating

several policy options following the growth principles. The growth visioning effort and the development of a plan forecast is still in progress. The evaluation will be made after a plan forecasts is adopted by the Regional Council, SCAG's decision-making body.

Growth visioning is a promising field in planning. The major concern is its expense. For example, the Atlanta Metropolitan area also tried to develop a growth visioning program. It cost 4.3 million dollars over 2~3 year period. Residents felt happy about the results. However, implementation was another issue. Growth visioning was not developed into a concrete forecast. The question of whether the growth visioning was effective or not was an issue.

## V. Delegation of Regional Planning / Programming Functions to Subregions

ISTEA expected that MPOs would play a leading role in dealing with regional growth and transportation issues. The existing tradition is that The State of California tends to treat counties as regions. California legislation defines counties as regions and this makes a regional approach difficult. There are several examples of the county level approach used by state legislation(Lewis. 2001). The Transportation Development Act quarter-cent sales tax, passed in 1971 to support mass transit, is allocated on

a county-to-county basis. The self-help transportation sales taxes implemented in the 1980s are another example. Proposition 111 and the Blueprint for Transportation in the 21st Century(passed in 1990) established county-level Congestion Management Agencies(CMAs) as major funding players and gave them the proceeds of a 9 cent gasoline tax increase.

Local funding for transportation has become more important. This translates to increased local county's control(Giuliano. 2001). Most local funding comes from sales tax measures that were approved by voters. These measures usually specify the use of funds. The local projects also require matching fund from state and federal sources. Local projects based on local funding(and state and federal funding) tend to get priority over the region wide projects.

The county level approach is generally beneficial to the county, because the county can effectively deal with county specific issues. However, regional issues are also important. One example is the daily trips of suburban commuters. According to the 2000 Census, approximately 30 percent of workers living in the Riverside or San Bernard in counties commute to other counties every day. Without an appropriate region wide approach, the region wide transportation system will get worse.

SB 1435, passed to implement ISTEA in California, is a good example of how California responded to the federal law of delegating more

authorities to MPOs on regional transportation issues. SB 1435 established that all of the “flexible” federal Surface Transportation Program(STP) funds would be sub-allocated to CMAs in the SCAG region on the basis of relative population. The CMAQ<sup>6)</sup> funds were to be allocated according to relative population and the area’s degree of seriousness of ozone non-attainment. SB 45, enacted in 1997, established a new framework for transportation policy. Numerous funding categories were combined into more flexible block grants. The first effect of this law is to strengthen the role of regionally prepared plans relative to the state plan in terms of project selection for metropolitan areas. This does not mean that the role of regional planning agencies was necessarily strengthened. Now all RTIP funds – those to be administered by Regional Transportation Planning Agencies(RTPAs including SCAG) – are now all allocated using a county-based formula, instead of just 70 percent of the funds programmed by RTPAs being allocated to county minimum shares(Innes and Gruber 2001; Barbour 2002). SB 45 strengthened county agencies more than multi-county ones.

The major issue with determination of these funds by county is a lack of consideration of a regional perspective, because counties use different methods for prioritizing proposed

projects. The emphasis among the counties in the use of STP and CMAQ funds is not standardized. For example, an analysis of the allocation of programmed Federal STP funds for fiscal year 1996~1997 indicates that LA County allocates 31% of STP funds to mass transit, while other counties(excluding Ventura county) allocate most of STP funds to roads/highways. Without an independent programming role for SCAG, it is unclear whether an integrating regional framework of priorities really exists(Lewis and Sprague. 1997; 117).

Along with state level legislation(SB. 1435), SCAG which is composed of local elected officials, has chosen to delegate much of the transportation planning process to its constituent counties, subregions, and major operating agencies, for example, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority for transit and Caltrans for highways. SCAG has made a major change in planning and decision making processes. SCAG emphasizes that the plan is a product of a joint, multi agency effort. 13(now 14) subregional organizations, which are cities and counties grouped together by geography and similar interests, now assist SCAG in the development of policies and strategies for the regional transportation plan(Jeff. 1995; 43). SCAG expected that the subregions would coordinate and convey local concerns into the

---

6) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality(CMAQ)

regional plan through the ‘bottom up’ planning process with the recognition that most implementation of the regional plans is strictly a local responsibility. SCAG allocated to subregional organizations the full increase in planning funds(4 million dollars) provided by ISTEA(US DOT. 1994; 14). The process tends to emphasize the subregional rather than regional perspectives.

ISTEA provided SCAG with limited additional authority over the TIP’s content. Although the CTCs are to continue composing their projects lists(county TIPs), SCAG now has the power to refuse to include in the regional TIP proposed county projects that are not in conformance with the SCAG produced long-range transportation plan or the state clean-air implementation plan(US DOT. 1993; 28). SCAG rarely rejects projects, however, so the absence of power between SCAG and the CTCs appears relatively unchanged(Lewis and Sprague. 1997; 99). At times, though, SCAG has negotiated changes in county project lists.

The current approach, in which the MPOs receive inputs for the TIP that are prioritized and financially constrained outside the overall planning process, is inconsistent with ISTEA, which requires the development of prioritized and financially constrained area-wide long-range plans and programs. Some MPO processes are reduced to combining rather than integrating program documents to reflect system-wide

objectives(Lyons. 1994; Innes & Gruber. 2001).

In summary, in response to ISTEA, California passed SB 1435, which was established to allocate the STP & CMAQ to CMAs in the SCAG region. The fund allocation by the transportation implementation agencies, other than a regional MPO, would reduce the likelihood that transportation resources will be allocated on the basis of area wide priorities, including improved air quality and system-wide efficiency(Lyons. 1994; 26). SCAG delegated its short term and long term programming and planning functions to subregions, counties, and transportation implementation agencies. SCAG still performs a function as a consensus builder during the long-term plan preparation process, and serves as a middleman to broker disagreements and insure consistency when the short term plans and programs of the six counties are put together(Guiliano. 2001).

## VI. Conclusion

Current regional planning in the United States is the by-product of the intergovernmental planning coordination efforts of the U.S. Congress and other governments on regional issues. Especially, after pass of ISTEA, state government, regional planning agencies, other regional agencies, and local governments are asked to cooperate more. This new institution encourages more collaboration and participatory planning process.

The regional planning process has become more collaborative and participatory due to enhanced cooperation between SCAG, state governments, other regional agencies, and local governments, and through an emphasis on region-wide public participation. The most successful achievement of SCAG is that it becomes more representative and accountable by increasing the number of regional council members actively participating in major decisions. The plan becomes more realistic by being financially constrained.

Public participation has become proactive and meaningful since the introduction of ISTEA. The creation of the Regional Advisory Council composed of a wide range of public members, helped to sort out regional issues. Public participation also could be effectively used to form the regional vision, which will determine the future urban form. One thousand people participated in this process. The emphasis on environmental justice resulted in more efforts to involve minority and low-income groups in the planning process. General public participation has also been extensively encouraged and enhanced. The newly available technical tools, such as the public website, helped to encourage public input. The growth visioning process is a promising element in the regional planning process. It helps to form a regional vision using a proactive and meaningful public participation process. Growth forecast alternatives are

prepared using specifically recommended land use strategies, such as jobs / housing balance, transit oriented development, mixed land use, following the regional vision of the future urban form.

However, as we can see the practice of California, the state government didn't change their tradition which defines counties as their regional unit. This tradition is weakening regional governance and planning through ISTEA and CAAA. Thus, state governments, especially California, need to reform their funding structure based on from counties to 'real' regions, maybe, in accordance to GOGs. Those redefinitions and funding will bring more effective governance structure in many regions in the United States.

There are two important implications for urban administration and planning of Korea. First one is importance of citizen participation frames. The experience of five decades of the United States concludes that federal government needs to provide proper institutions and funding for citizen participation in decision making process. Thus, while South Korea is developing frame of metropolitan planning and public administration, this lesson should be reflected. Second, the tension and conflicts among governments are sometimes inevitable. Currently, America is suffering this conflict during the delegation of regional planning functions. Korea is also experiencing some similar conflicts as the United States. What

should we do? We may not have yet any clear solution. However, what we can learn from the United States is that federal(central) government should not stop to support for city or county level government rather than state level. Since the small or local level government have no enough resources, states(or provinces) can have dominant power over regional region, which is not recommended.

## Reference

- A Citizen's Guide to Transportation Policy and Planning. 2002. *A Publication of 1000 Friends of Oregon and the Oregon Transportation Reform Advocates Network.*
- Barbour, Elisa. 2002. *Metropolitan Growth Planning in California, 1900-2000.* Public Policy Institute of California. [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/R\\_1202EBR.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/R_1202EBR.pdf)
- Bryson, John M. 1995. *Strategic Planning for Public and Non Profit Organization: A Guide to Strengthening and Sustaining Organizational Achievement.* 2nd. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass.
- Choi, Seong-Youn. 2003.10.11. "New Trends in Regional Planning in the USA: the Southern California Experience". *The 3rd International Conference of Seoul Association for Public Administration(SAPA).* Daejeon, Korea.
- Downs, Anthony. 1996. "The Devolution Revolution: Why Congress Is Shifting a Lot of Power to the Wrong Levels". *Brookings Policy Brief* no.3. The Bookings Institution.
- Feiock, Richard C. 2007. "Rational Choice and Regional Governance". *Journal of Urban Affairs* vol.29, no.1 : pp47-63.
- GAO. 1996. "Urban Transportation: Metropolitan Planning Organization's Efforts to Meet Federal Planning Requirements". *Reports to Congressional Requesters.* Washington D.C.
- Giuliano, Jenevieve, 2001. *Dilemmas of Regional Transportation Planning.* University of Southern California(<http://www.usc.edu/dept/geography/SC2/sg/pdf/Giuliano-Transportation.pdf>).
- Helling, Any. 1998. "Collaborative Visioning: Proceed with Caution! Results from Evaluating Atlanta's Vision 2020 Project" *Journal of the American Planning Association.* vol.64, no.3 : pp335-349.
- Howe, Linda, January 1994. *Winning It With ISTEA.* Planning : pp 11-14.
- Ingraham, Patricia W. and Laurence E. Lynn Jr. (eds.). 2004. *The Art of Governance: Analyzing Management and Administration.* Washington D.C : Georgetown University Press
- Innes, Judith, and Judith Gruber. 2001. *Bay Area Transportation Decision Making in the Wake of ISTEA: Planning Styles in Conflict in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.* University of California Center, Berkeley ; California. ([www.uctc.net/papers/papersalpha.html](http://www.uctc.net/papers/papersalpha.html)).
- Jeff, Jerry. 1995. "Can a Voluntary Association Bring a Regional Focus to an Area Concerned with Parochial Issues?". *California Journal.* pp41-43.
- Levy, John M. 2006. *Contemporary Urban Planning.* 7th ed. Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Lewis, Paul G. 2001. Considerations Regarding the Possible Merger of the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission Reform. ([http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/OP\\_1001PLOP.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/OP_1001PLOP.pdf))
- Lewis, Paul and Sprague, M. 1997. *Federal Transportation Policy and the Role of Metropolitan Planning Organizations in California.* Public Policy Institute of California ([http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/R\\_497PLR.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/R_497PLR.pdf))
- Lynn, Laurence E. Jr., Carolyn J. Heinrich, and Carolyn J. Hill. 2001. *Improving Governance: A New Logic for Empirical Research.* Washington D.C : Georgetown University Press.
- Lyons, William M. 1994. FTA-FHWA Metropolitan Organization Reviews: Planning Practice Under Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act and Clean Air Act Amendments. *Transportation Research Record* 1466.
- Perry, David C(ed). 1995. "Building the Public City: The Politics, Governance and Finance of Public Infrastructure". *Urban*

- Affairs Annual Review*. no.43. CA : Sage Publications.
- Porter, Douglas. 1991. "Regional Governance of Metropolitan Form: The Missing Link in Relating Land Use and Transportation". *Transportation, Urban Form, and the Environment*, Transportation Research Board. Special Report 231 : pp 63-80.
- Saltzstein, Alan L. 1996. "Los Angeles: Politics without Governance." Chapter 3 ed. H. V. Savitch and Ronald K. Vogel. *Regional Politics: America in a Post-City Age*. California : Sage.
- Southern California Association of Governments. 1995. *Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide*. Los Angeles, California.
- Southern California Association of Governments. 1998. *Regional Transportation Plan*. Los Angeles, California.
- Southern California Association of Governments. 2007. *Public Participation Plan*. Los Angeles, California.
- Solof, Mark. 1996. *History of MPOs-Part II, Part III, Part IV*. The North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Quarterly.
- U.S. Department of Transportation(US DOT.). 1988. *Urban Transportation Planning in the United States: An Historic Overview*.
- U.S. Department of Transportation(US DOT.). 1994. "Review of the Transportation Planning Process in the Southern California Metropolitan Area". ed. John A. *Research and Special Program Administration*. Massachusetts : Volpe National Transportation Systems Center.
- Wilkstrom, Nelson. 1977. *Council of Governments: A Study of Political Incrementalism*. Nelson-Hall Chicago, Illinois.
- World Bank. 1989. *Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth: A Long-Term Perspective Study*.

- 
- 논문 접수일 : 2007. 5. 23
  - 심사 시작일 : 2007. 8. 13
  - 심사 완료일 : 2007. 8. 23

**ABSTRACT**

**미국의 광역 거버넌스와 지방정부 협의회: 참여와 비전수립**

**최현선** 북플로리다대학 행정학과 교수(제1저자)  
**최성연** 남가주정부협의회 박사

※ 주요단어: 지방정부 협의회, 성장예측과 장기미래설정과정, 시민참여, 광역 거버넌스

미국의 도시 및 지역계획체계는 교외화와 함께 분권화되고 다기화된 정치의 틀 속에서 발전하여 왔다. 광역도시권의 형성과 발전은 교통혼잡과 대기오염의 상호 연계성으로 인해 더욱 도전을 받고 있다. 미국의 현행 광역도시계획은 정부 간의 협력을 증진시키고자 하는 노력의 결과로 볼 수 있다. 1990년과 1991년에는 미국에 새로운 교통과 대기정화에 관련한 법들이 수 정되면서 새로운 광역계획 수립과정이 도입되었다.

본 연구의 목적은 1990년대 초 교통과 대기정화 관련법의 도입에 따른 제반 계획여건의 변화를 미국 남가주의 실제 광역도시계획의 수립과정에 어떠한 영향을 미쳤는지 검토하는 데 있다. 또한 이 연구를 통해 현재 논의되고 있는 한국의 광역행정에 대한 사례를 제공하고자 한다. 미국 남가주지역의 광역도시계획에서는 여러 가지 영향이 감지되고 있다. 특히, 남가주지역 내의 제반 정부기관 간의 협력증대로 인하여 광역도시계획이 더욱 협력적이고 참여적인 형태로 변화하고 있다는 점이다. 아마도 가장 성공적인 측면으로는 광역도시계획의 결정기구인 지역 의회(Regional Council)의 대의원정원을 증대하고, 대의원을 인구비례에 따라서 선출하는 것 일 것이다. 따라서 광역계획기구가 보다 대표성이 있고 책임성이 제고되었다고 할 수 있다. 아울러 광역계획의 주요 제약요인인 재정소요를 분명하게 함으로써, 계획의 실현가능성에 더욱 중점을 두고 있다는 점은 특기할 만하다. 광역도시계획의 효과성은 장기 미래의 전망 및 제반 대안을 개진함으로써, 아울러 토지이용과 교통을 유기적으로 연결함으로써 제고될 수 있다. 특히 도시의 성장예측과 장기 미래설정과정의 유기적인 연계는 광역교통, 환경, 주택 등 제반 관련 도시문제에 대한 해결방안을 제시할 수 있다는 점에서 그 중요성이 강조되고 있다. 그러나 향후 더욱 요청되는 바는 아마도 광역도시계획기구의 계획뿐만 아니라 예산배분과정에서의 역할증대일 것이다.