REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION GOVERNANCE CONSIDERATIONS: *A Discussion Paper*

Prepared by Regional Planning Services
April 2004

1.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The purpose of this report is to

1. summarize the funding and governance recommendations of the Travel Choices Strategy,
2. identify the range of questions and issues that should be considered in any future transportation governance study
3. identify some case examples of transportation governance arrangements

2.0 REGIONAL POLICY DIRECTION

Increasing transportation choice is one of the five key principles of the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS). In support of this principle, the CRD approved the preparation of a regional transportation strategy. The resulting consultant report is entitled *The TravelChoices Strategy.*

The strategy addresses the two overall transportation priorities identified by the RGS which are to:

1. Develop a region-wide strategy which reduces the demand for single-occupant vehicle travel (SOV) and shifts demand from automobiles to walking, cycling and public transit. The target for the Travel Choices Strategy is to reduce forecast car trips over the next 25 years from 60% of daily travel to below 50%.

2. Examine mechanisms to further plan, implement, fund and manage short-term as well as medium to long term transportation priorities.

The regional transportation strategy is designed to address the implications of projected population and employment growth. Travel projections show that in the absence of significant improvements to the road network, travel alternatives, and land use patterns, the traffic congestion will continue to grow at a faster rate than the projected population growth. For example, peak period traffic on Highway 1 is projected to increase by over 60%. The amount of congested roadway in the region is expected to increase by 200% over the next 25 years.

Background work on the RGS indicated that the amount of congested roadway in the region over the next 25 years would grow by almost 200%. Not only do these delays affect transit travel times and the amount of commercial vehicles in the region, but as congestion increases, transit becomes less attractive, the costs for moving goods and services rise (meaning an increase in costs to business and the consumer) and quality of life decreases.

3.0 REGIONAL POLICY DIRECTION

Initial direction for considering the transportation governance issue is established through the Regional Growth Strategy. Action #2 under the strategic direction: increase transportation choice states:

The CRD, in partnership with the Province and member municipalities, agrees to establish, through an implementation agreement, a permanent and durable framework and mechanisms for short, medium, and long tern transportation planning, governance and funding in the Capital Region within three years of the adoption of the Regional Growth Strategy.

Both the Regional Growth Strategy and Travel Choices (the proposed regional transportation plan) provide policies which contain population and employment growth to defined areas within the Region and focus improved transit and other transportation facilities to serve these areas.

The difficulty in implementing a regional transportation strategy is that no mechanism or authority is in place to plan and implement transportation policy in a way that is consistent with the RGS transportation and land use strategies. There is no one body or mechanism which brings together the various transportation elements (transit, cycling, roads and funding mechanisms). Instead, the region relies on the province, primarily through BC Transit and the Ministry of Transportation, and individual municipalities to provide the necessary planning and resources.

The Travel Choices Strategy includes two basic components, a short-term plan and a longer range strategy. Implementation of the short-term plan can be undertaken within current governance arrangements, using existing revenue sources (although increases would be required). Implementation of the longer range initiatives would require changes to the current governance arrangements for the following reasons:

1. The financial resources required to achieve the Travel Choices Strategy are beyond the means of any one of the jurisdictions or agencies currently responsible for most improvements.

2. Current funding sources and allocations are changing. The provincial contribution to transit service and funding is uncertain. In the short-term these funding allocations are frozen. It is not known what amount, if any, will be available in the long term. The process for obtaining funding from senior levels of government is becoming much more competitive, and more often requires a commitment of matching funds.

3. The current organizational responsibilities for the road network are divided among the province (who manages highways) and 13 municipalities who own, operate and maintain separate local, collector and arterial roads throughout the region. No agency manages the inter-municipal road network or plans at a system-wide level.

4. Current transportation investment levels (for all modes) are low relative to needs and investment is generally not co-ordinated among agencies. The ability to access provincial and federal funds will increasingly depend on the provision of matching funds, partnership agreements, and co-ordinated strategies. Federal programs are emphasizing green infrastructure. Provincial programs are emphasizing smart growth. Funding requests will need to be re-enforced by regional strategies that align with senior government priorities and adequate matching funds.

5. There is no one agency with a clear responsibility for a regional approach to planning, designing, operating, maintaining and monitoring multi-modal and multi-purpose transportation systems.

6. The proposed initiatives, particularly the light-rail transit (LRT) line, would require a high level of co-ordination and formal agreements among parties. The successful utilization of this type of investment requires a high degree of integration and co-ordination between transit planning and land use planning. This requires an inter-jurisdictional authority that can engage federal, provincial and local interests.

7. The proposed initiatives would require a significant commitment of funding. New revenue sources would be required which would require a new deal with provincial and federal governments. Investment levels proposed for transportation improvements are large:

   - The annual operating cost for transit would grow from approximately $58 million per year today to almost $155 million in 25 years – a funding growth rate of 4% a year. This cost does not include operating or debt servicing for LRT which in the long-term could add approximately $30 million a year for debt servicing and $10 million per year for operating costs for public transit in the region.

   - The long-term capital road works required to support vehicular and transit service along the primary roadway network could cost as much as $500 million over the next 25 years, or approximately $20 million per year. Managing this level of investment would require a governance arrangement that can deliver on service and accountability.

   - Estimates for road maintenance are approximately $10,000 to $12,000 per lane kilometre each year (although they could be higher if regular road maintenance has been lacking). With over 350 lane kilometres of ‘primary’ inter-municipal roads (not including highways or local roads) the costs could be $3.5 million a year for basic maintenance alone.

	Funding Scenarios – Annual ($ in millions)		
	Basic Service Level	Higher levels of Surface Transit	Higher levels of Surface transit & LRT
Road Maintenance (1)	$3.5	$3.5	$3.5
Road/surface transit route construction & upgrades	$20.0	$20.0	$20.0
Cycling facilities (2)	$0.7	$0.7	$0.7
Surface transit (operating)	$60.0	$120.0	$155.0
LRT	N/A	N/A	$40.0
Total annual cost	**$83.5 million**	**$178.5**	**$218.5**

(1) Road maintenance costs are estimated for a portion of the inter-municipal road network. This figure does not include local/residential roads. Total costs for road maintenance when all roads are considered would be much higher (close to $7 million/year) due to reduced road conditions resulting from delayed maintenance and infrequent road resurfacing schedules.

(2) Cycling costs are based on a $1.00 per capita allocation. This generates approximately $350,000.00 in this region. With matching funds, this figure becomes $700,000/year.

The Travel Choices Strategy also includes the following recommendation:

It is recommended that the CRD Board establish a Committee to investigate long-term opportunities for funding and managing regional transportation facilities, services and programs as presented in the TravelChoices Strategy. The Committee should develop in more detail optional organisational models that could be implemented in the Capital Region. The committee should also be responsible for consulting with municipal, regional and provincial agencies during the process of developing a Capital Region solution.

The purpose of this report is to identify some of the issues that the Board and the Committee referenced above, may want to address in any future consideration of a regional transportation governance model.

5.0 ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED THROUGH A TRANSPORTATION GOVERNANCE AND FUNDING STUDY

A number of issues need to be addressed before an appropriate model of transportation governance can be determined. Determining what constitutes "appropriate" will require consideration of technical & administrative feasibility, fiscal responsibility, political acceptance, jurisdictional & financial equity. The primary consideration is; *"What will provide better service for residents and businesses within the CRD: the existing system or a new system for managing transportation services?"*

Some of the fundamental inter-jurisdictional governance considerations to be addressed include:

(1). Responsiveness to public policy

The transportation system must be managed within the context of an approved strategic policy framework. The investment priorities need to align with public policy objectives as well as sound financial objectives.

In a recent report prepared for the Regional District of Central Okanagan, consultant Peter Adams emphasizes: "No matter what the structure of the service, regional governance will not work well if participants do not have a shared vision of the future of transit services (e.g. scale of investment required) and a shared understanding about the way transit priorities should be established (e.g. potential ridership; relationship to regional growth strategy, etc.). Therefore, the decision to proceed with a new governance structure must be accompanied by a high-level service plan that demonstrates broad agreement on the future direction for transit. The plan may wish to distinguish between region-wide service issues and local issues." (Review of Governance and Servicing Issues; Final Report, Prepared for the Board of the Regional District of Central Okanagan, prepared by Peter Adams, Victoria Consulting Network ltd., January 2003, p.28)

While Peter Adams was specifically addressing transit, any future transportation authority should be guided by an approved strategic-level plan which outlines guiding principles, region-wide policies, realistic projections of growth and travel demand. The strategic plan should be supported by more detailed planning documents, such as 5 and 10 year capital plans and transportation improvement plans which indicate priority projects. Development of these plans permits the public and elected officials to address priorities, fiscal and social impacts, and the environmental costs and benefits.

(2). Range of Responsibilities

The governance model or authority should have responsibility for a range of transportation modes, including vehicular travel and goods movement, transportation demand management (TDM), congestion management, transit service, cycling, and traffic operations and signal coordination along major routes.

An agreement to establish a new model/ authority should indicate the range of powers available to mange this range of responsibilities. Potential powers to be considered include:

- The ability to raise revenues to pay for infrastructure and services through the setting of user fees, taxes, tolls, vehicle charges, profits from sales and rental of land and other assets.
- The authority to collect and distribute federal infrastructure funds
- The ability to borrow and hold debt
- The ability to identify major new or replacement transportation infrastructure projects required in the region.
- The ability to negotiate cost-sharing and revenue transfer agreements with the Province
- The ability to develop and maintain a transportation improvement program (TIP) which identifies priority projects and funding requirements

- The ability to address and resolve disputes in a fair and efficient manner.

(3). Accountability

The decisions of the authority must be sufficiently transparent, using generally accepted accounting practices and periodic reporting, so as to permit easy assessment by members of the Regional Board and/or Councils and the public of service and financial performance, as well as expenditures against agreed upon targets, policies and investment priorities.

(4). Leadership & Management

Strong leaders and competent managers can usually achieve success regardless of the governance structure they are working within. The reverse is also true: no amount of restructuring will create competence.

(5). Clear Lines of Authority

Any agreement to create an authority must define roles and responsibilities, lines of authority, reporting relationships, representation (appointed or elected?). The agreement must also include a clear understanding of the distinction between the latitude for independent decision-making under general guidelines and the planning framework provided by the Board/Council, and those policies and procedures requiring specific Board/Council endorsement. At a minimum the latter should include all tax and fee increases. Approval may also extend to capital planning criteria, road standards, investment and construction priorities. Mechanisms need to be established to address policy changes, appeals and disputes.

(6). Sound Base of Professional and Technical Skills

The authority requires a capacity to provide specialized skills in the areas of transit systems, signalisation and traffic control, integrated systems management, best practices, systems design, and intelligent transportation systems technology.

(7). Responsive Financial Planning

The authority needs to ability to plan for changes in budget allocations and revenues in response to unanticipated changes in government policy, special maintenance problems, and other than marginal changes in ridership. The authority needs clear definition on financial roles and responsibilities related to the ability to assume debt.

(8). Responsive Service Planning

The authority needs the ability to respond to changing markets, consumer preferences and new technologies. It needs to build in processes to receive information and feedback from system users on an on-going basis.

(9). Responsible Risk Management

The agreement to create an authority needs to consider the balance between risk and responsibility. Is the transfer of political and financial risk to local government adequately off-set by the accompanying benefits to local government, mainly the anticipated control over transportation services and enhanced predictability of revenue sources.

The public benefits associated with a transportation authority may include:

- Granting greater authority over transportation decision-making afforded to local government
- Better co-ordination of roads, transit and cycling infrastructure
- Brings together land use and transportation decision-makers
- Shifts more tax-generating powers from province to the region
- Improved service and greater transportation choice for residents
- Greater ability to implement region-wide policies on growth management, reduction of auto use, reduction of green house gases, improved air quality, economic and environmental sustainability.

(10). Equity

In addition to the organisational concerns mentioned above, the development of an authority needs to adequately address the "jurisdictional equity" issues. For example:

- What is the possibility of a jurisdiction benefiting from a service but not participating in it (free rider issue)?

- How do you address the difference in urban and rural community expectations and the difficulty of achieving a service level and cost of service that will satisfy all participants?

- How do you ensure an appropriate degree of influence and control over service levels or service quality when decisions must be made at a regional level?

- How do you ensure adequate controls over service costs, particularly for the smaller municipalities without a strong tax base?

The report on governance prepared by Peter Adams for the Central Okanagan Regional District had this to say about the free rider issue:

For many regional services, if a small jurisdiction chooses to opt out of the service, it is of limited financial consequence for the other jurisdictions of the region. The service is not delivered to the small municipalities and it does not contribute to the cost. The remainder of the members can still deliver the service in a cost-effective manner.

The difficulty for other members arises when a jurisdiction chooses not to participate in a regional service but its residents can still benefit from the service. For example, if a *jurisdiction did not contribute to the cost of the regional parks system, it would be difficult to exclude its residents from visiting the parks. In any situation where a jurisdiction can be a "free rider" on the service, its failure to participate in a service can lead to friction between a member that chooses not to participate and the other jurisdictions in the region.*

The free-rider issue has significant implications for regional transportation, where the continuity of the network is critical for meeting travel needs of the public. The movement of people and goods is dependent on an inter-municipal road network. The cycling and transit network must also be continuous through the various municipalities – in order to provide convenient access.

6.0 GOVERNANCE CRITERIA

Any proposed transportation governance arrangement may want to reflect the following criteria:

1. Aligns authority and responsibilities for planning, funding and implementing transportation services.

2. Balances the desire for local accountability with the need for a system-based perspective.

3. Facilitates the ability to innovate and change transportation systems.

4. Sustains public support, confidence and input.

5. Enables comparisons among all modes of transportation, ensuring that the most beneficial projects get funded, constructed and maintained.

6. Has the ability to get projects implemented

7. Aligns with good planning principles such as:
    - Safe
    - Affordable
    - Integrated
    - Responsive
    - Sustainable
    - Policy-driven

8. Monitors and evaluates projects and expenditures

7.0 EXISTING SERVICE PROVISIONS: USE OF THE ESTABLISHED SERVICES BYLAWS

The *Local Government Act* provides regional districts with considerable flexibility in designing service arrangements. Some of these authorities may be appropriate for consideration for either establishing a transportation service or for establishing a new governance arrangement.

Some of the provisions available through the established service bylaw legislation include:

Taxation Limits: In some circumstances servicing bylaws must include a limit in the tax requisition that can be charged for the service. In other circumstances this is optional. A taxation limit can provide protection against participation in an unaffordable service.

Exit Provisions: The Act establishes a prescribed process for a participant to exit from a service. By design, the process is multi-phased because the process to exit is not one to be taken lightly. In some circumstances exit is not allowed (e.g. exit is not allowed from a transit or regional park service).

Sunset Provisions: The establishment by-law can be time-limited. After the sunset date, a new bylaw would have to be passed (or other prescribed conditions met) in order for the service to continue. In effect, the sunset date provides a date of automatic exit should a jurisdiction not wish to continue to participate.

Service Increments: The establishment bylaw could allow jurisdictions to participate in service increments. For example, jurisdictions could agree to a base level of service across the region, yet allow some jurisdictions to pay for an enhanced level of service where that is desired by the community.

Voting on Administrative Issues: The Regional Board can delegate administration of a service to a Committee or commission and can customize voting arrangements for that body. This can be used to give small jurisdictions greater influence over day-to-day administration of the service.

Voting Threshold: Board decisions could have a higher voting threshold for change e.g. 10 out of 13 Directors. Requires a high level of agreement, but prevents a single jurisdiction from vetoing a desired change.

A service establishment bylaw can be amended with the consent of two-thirds of the participants

Municipalities may also enter into service contracts with the regional district or other municipalities, rather than participate through a servicing bylaw.

8. TRANSPORTATION GOVERNANCE EXAMPLES

8.1 TRANSLINK

The GVRD began looking at transportation governance options following the release of their regional transportation plan, "Transport 2021" in 1994 and their regional land use strategy (Livable Region Strategic Plan) in 1995. The GVRD and member municipalities began to consider governance changes because progress on plan implementation was slow. The GVRD had very limited authority to plan and implement transportation policy in a manner consistent with its long range strategies. There was no one body to bring together the various transportation elements (transit, roads and pricing mechanisms). Instead, the Region had to rely on the Province, through BC Transit, the Ministry of Transportation, and the Transportation Financing Authority, as well as the individual municipalities to provide the necessary planning and resources.

Mandate

The Greater Vancouver Transportation Authority was created by the Greater Vancouver Transportation Authority Act (Bill 36) in 1998. Its mandate is to plan and finance a regional transportation system that supports the regional growth strategy, air quality objectives and the economic development of the GVRD. The Authority is responsible for transit service, transportation demand management programs, coordinating and funding the major road network, and the Air Care program.

Governance

The Authority is governed by a 15 member board (12 appointed by the GVRD and 3 appointed by the Province). The mayors and councillors are appointed by the GVRD Board. City of Vancouver has 3 representatives, Surrey has two, all other municipalities have one representative on the Board. They meet on a monthly basis.

Accountability

The strategic, capital and major service plans of the Authority have to conform with the regional growth strategy.

The Greater Vancouver Transportation Authority Act requires Translink to carry out a comprehensive consultation process with the public, municipalities, and other affected organisations prior to implementing certain actions, including:

- Increasing property taxes
- Assessing any parking taxes
- Assessing new or increased toll charges, user fees or motor vehicle charges
- Finalising the preparation of a strategic transportation plan and any amendments to the plan.

Translink refers any increases in vehicle charges, property and other tax rates to the municipalities for their consideration and for ratification by the GVRD Board.

Translink consults with local government through municipal meetings, the GVRD Board, and the GVRD's Council of Councils meetings.

Translink conducts stakeholder meetings intended to develop consensus around discussion papers dealing with transportation programs, investments and funding measures. Their decisions are reported to the GVRD Board. Public input is also obtained through Internet-based technology. The site attracted 12,000 submissions pertaining to their recent 10 year Outlook and 3 year Plan.

Roles & Responsibilities

Translink coordinates transit services previously provided through BC Transit and/or its contractors including regular bus service, SkyTrain, Westcoast Express and Handydart.
The Board reviews and authorizes:

- 5 year capital plans
- annual plans and budget
- annual capital plans (with specific project approval)
- detailed transportation studies
- area & sector transit plans
- fees and standards for the Air Care program
- purchases and fleet replacements
- contracts
- project evaluation criteria for transportation initiatives

The Board passes:

- funding bylaws
- property tax bylaws

The Board decides on:

- municipal requests to change truck route designations on major routes
- transit security services

The Board authorizes staff/administration:

- to negotiate loan agreements

Translink Programs
Transit Services:

- On Board: employer services, awareness raising of alternative travel modes, employer pass programs
- Ridesharing: through the JackBell Ride Share program, vehicles are supplied for a fee. Users are able to take advantage of HOV lanes. The program includes vanpooling, carpooling and ride matching.
- Commuter Car Share: an 18 month pilot program by Translink and the Cooperative Auto Network. For a fee, users can obtain the use of a vehicle, a discount transit pass, insurance, BCAA membership, repairs, gas – for $225 a month. The program is intended to encourage people to use the LRT by them to drive to the station.

- Cycling: provision of bike lockers at LRT stations and Park & Ride stations. Bikes are permitted on LRT and bus bike racks
- Parking management strategies
- Special passes and programs

Roads & Bridges:
- Responsible for funding the maintenance, rehabilitation and development of the major roadway network
- Municipalities have jurisdiction over the major roads and their day-to-day operations. The role of Translink is to help co-ordinate, plan and fund the network.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
- This includes advanced technologies and techniques such as communication systems, computers, electronics and information processing.

The Translink Agreement: Financial Responsibilities

Provincial responsibilities:
- Assumed the debt associated with SkyTrain and Westcoast Express (associated debt charges of approximately $118 million at 2000). The Province also assumed the debt for any provincial roads that became part of the Major Road Network.
- Pays 60% of the Broadway LRT, with the Authority paying the other 40% (provincial share of capital estimated to be approximately $920 million of the $1.53 billion total).
- Assumed responsibility for the Greater Vancouver Regional Hospital District's share of hospital costs ($51 m in 1998). The Authority used this created room in the property tax to collect an equivalent amount, replacing the existing hospital levy with a regional transportation levy.
- Transferred a share of the existing fuel tax it receives, the Authority, according to a fixed schedule (6 cents/litre by 2005). This is added to the existing 4 cents/litre the Authority inherits from the Vancouver Regional Transit Commission.
- Transferred to the Authority the West Coast Express revenues and the parking sales taxes collected with the Authority's boundaries.

Translink Responsibilities:
- Received all revenues currently collected by the Vancouver Regional Transit Commission including all transit fares, 4 cents/litre gas tax, $1.90 charge per residential Hydro account, taxes collected through the existing non-residential property tax, and the Commission's existing $50 million (approximate) surplus.
- Has the ability to raise funds from vehicle charges, tolls on Authority facilities (but not on provincial facilities such as the Lions Gate, Second Narrows, Oak Street Bridges, etc.), property taxes on a benefiting area basis, a regional transit property levy, and parking taxes.

Funding shortfalls are to be made up by the Authority through application of its available revenue sources. For example, transit fares could be increased, a surcharge could be applied to the $16 Air Care charge, the non-residential or residential property tax could be increased, tolls or other road pricing measures could be implemented, or any combination of the above.

Translink Funding:
Transit services account for approximately 97% of the project Translink expenditures:

- Existing transit revenues remain in place, becoming Translink revenues (fares, non-residential property tax, existing transfer of fuel tax and residential BC Hydro levy)
- Current provincial contributions to transit, made via a set of cost-sharing formulae are eliminated
- Provincial contributions comprised three elements:
- The province assumes agreed-upon share of existing debt charges (associated with SkyTrain guideway and bridge, West Coast Express infrastructure and locomotive capital, 60% of Broadway LRT capital costs), which is a fixed amount, decreasing over time as the debt is retired.
- The province transfers a set of provincial taxes collected locally (an additional share of the fuel tax collected in the region. The sales tax collected on parking in the region, and the West Coast Express revenues)
- The province would provide property tax room by removing the Greater Vancouver Regional Hospital District levy from the local tax bill, which is replaced by a Translink levy.

8.2 TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION (TTC)

The Toronto Transit Commission was established in 1953 under the Metropolitan Toronto Act. It functions as an independent agency of Metro Toronto (now the new City of Toronto) and reports to Council through a 7 person Commission comprised of Council members.

The TTC operates an extensive and integrated transit system that includes subways, streetcars, LRT and buses.

Changing Provincial Roles & Interests

The provincial role in the TTC and transit development played a large role in the development of the system. Beginning in 1972, the province provided large subsidies to the TTC for capital expansion programs and to cover a significant share of the operating losses. The province wanted to promote transit as an alternative to the ill-fated Spadina Expressway project. The province also wanted to use the transit system as part of its own industrial strategy to stimulate employment opportunities, to transfer transit technology and to influence the procurement process to favour Ontario suppliers.

In 1972 the provincial capital subsidy for transit was 75%. By 1996 the capital subsidy was reduced to 50% and they eliminated certain overhead charges for capital projects. By 2000 the provincial subsidy was eliminated.

Accountability

The TTC conducts public meetings. Deputations from the public are routinely received by two standing committees of Council: Planning and Transportation, and Financial Priorities Committee. These deputations are received when TTC budget and project requests are being debated, prior to them being referred to Council.

The TTC now utilizes a very detailed reporting system used to monitor system performance on a monthly basis to the Commission and Council. Performance indicators are measured against pre-determined targets and goals specified in the operating and capital budgets. Both achievements and variances from targeted achievements are contained in monthly reports from the Chief General Manager.

Funding Sources

The TTC revenue sources include:
- Fare revenue
- Revenues from charter services and contract services provided to other agencies and municipalities
- Revenue from concessions, property rent and advertising
- Operating and capital subsidies from local government
- Borrowing or the addition to existing debt

The TTC is not empowered to incur debt (e.g. by issuing bonds) so when expenditures exceed revenues, the shortfall represents additional debt to be incurred by the municipality.

8.3 CITY OF CALGARY TRANSPORTATION PROJECT OFFICE

The Transportation Project Office (TPO) is a public-private partnership that manages some of the city's major transportation infrastructure projects, including LRT extensions, road interchanges, and transit-friendly development of City-owned lands especially at LRT stations. The TPO was formed in 1999 as a partnership between the City and a private sector consortium. It was given an eight year mandate to manage a number of major projects to 2007.

Members of the private-sector consortium (known as yyC.T) include:
- CANA
- Stantec
- Earth Tec
- SCI
- SNC-Lavalin

The TPO initiatives are responding to the policy direction established in The Calgary Transportation Plan (1995) to create a network of major roads throughout the city. This network of roads, known as the Skeletal Road Network is intended to provide non-stop traffic routes across the city. This requires major road upgrades and grade separating many intersections. The projected cost to implement all the Transportation Plan initiatives is estimated at $4 to $5 billion dollars over 20 years. The TPO is responsible for projects valued at $610 million over eight years.

Mandate

The mandate of the Transportation Project Office is to:
- Maximize the mobility of Calgarians
- Maximize the scope of infrastructure improvements
- Provide the most cost-effective product
- Ensure the least amount of disruption to communities during construction
- Increase possible revenue sources
- Complete projects within their budget.

Governance

The TPO is run through a Management Committee chaired by a senior-level manager from the City of Calgary (the Executive Officer responsible for Land Use and Mobility). The Committee is made up of two representatives from the yyC.T partners, a citizen-at-large chosen by the City Council and the Executive Officer responsible for Utilities and Environmental Protection for the City.

The TPO prepares quarterly reports for review and approval by City Council.

Public Participation

Public input on projects are obtained through open houses, community consultation committees and information provided through community newsletter.

8.4 CHICAGO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (RTA)

The Chicago Regional Transportation Authority was created in 1974 through a referendum with affected counties. It is a special purpose unit of local government and a municipal corporation of the State of Illinois.

Mandate

The RTA responsibilities include the acquisition and operation of public transit as well as contracting with private carriers to provide service. Its core functions are financial oversight and regional planning.

Operating responsibilities are decentralized to three distinct service boards: the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA), Metra commuter rail, and Pace suburban bus.

Governance

A 13-member Board of Directors governs the RTA. The membership includes five directors appointed by the Mayor of the City of Chicago, including one director who is also the chairman of the CTA; four directors appointed by the suburban members of the Cook County Board; two directors appointed by the Chairmen of the County Boards of Kent, Lake, McHenry, and Will counties; and one director appointed by the Chairman of the DuPage County Board. The 13th member is the Chairman of the Board whose election requires the agreement of at least nine directors. Term for the Chairman and Directors are five years on a rotating basis.

The RTA Board has six standing committees:

- Administration
- Audit
- Chairman's Coordinating Committee
- Finance
- Mobility Limited (which considers compliance with the *Americans with Disabilities Act*)
- Planning Committee

The RTA Board employs a staff of 80 people, led by an Executive Director. The staff is organized in several departments, including finance, planning, regional and governmental affairs, communications and human resources.

The Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) provides bus and rapid transit service within the City of Chicago and to 38 suburban municipalities. CTA buses carry approximately 982,000 passengers each weekday while CTA rapid transit carries approximately 505,000 weekday riders.

The Commuter Rail Division (Metra) provides commuter rail service connecting downtown Chicago with 68 other Chicago locations and 100 suburban communities. Metra carries approximately 304,600 weekday riders.

The Suburban Bus Division (Pace) provides fixed-route bus, para-transit and vanpool services to 200 communities throughout the suburbs and from suburban locations to the City of Chicago. Pace carries approximately 117,000 weekday riders.

The CTA, Metra and Pace are each led by a Board of Directors, which determines levels of service, fares and operational policies.

Financing

The *RTA Act* requires that half of the operating expenses of the RTA system be covered by system-generated revenues (fares, advertising, concessions, etc.). The Board is required to annually review and approve a five-year capital plan, which is a blueprint of the capital projects to be funded by the RTA and executed by the CTA, Metra and Pace.

In its role as a financial oversight agency, the RTA is responsible for the various revenue sources used to finance all operations costs beyond those recovered through systems-generated revenues and some of the system's capital projects. Additionally the RTA is responsible for coordinating all capital projects in the system. The RTA applies for applicable grants, requests funds form funding sources and monitors the receipts of dedicated income sources such as the RTA Sales Tax. The RTA transfers funds monthly to the CTA, Metra and Pace based upon funding guidelines approved by the RTA Board of Directors.

The RTA Sales Tax is the system's primary sources of non-system generated revenue. The system's other funding sources include the State of Illinois, the US department of transportation Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), and RTA resources such as investment income.

The RTA Sales Tax is authorized by the Illinois General Assembly, imposed by the RTA, and collected by the State of Illinois for the RTA. It is the equivalent of 1 percent on sales in Cook County and ¼ percent (0.25%) in DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry and Will counties. The 1% sales tax in Cook County is composed of 1% on food and drugs and ¾ ().75%) on all other sales, with the State of Illinois providing a replacement amount to the RTA equivalent to1/4 percent (0.25%) of all other sales. The RTA retains 15% of the RTA Sales tax proceeds and passes on the remaining 85% to the CTA, Metra, and Pace according to the statutory formula.

State Financial Assistance is used to help offset debt service expenses for the RTA's Strategic Capital Improvement Program bonds. The funds are distributed by the state to the RTA, which then disburses them to the service boards.

Programs and Services

Some of the services operated through the RTA include:

Intelligent Transportation Systems

- Active Transit Station Signs: variable, electronic message signs designed to provide real-time arrival, departure and service information
- Parking management guidance systems: used to provide real-time information about the availability and location of parking at transit and ride-sharing facilities
- Regional transit asset management system: an Internet-based application that allows users to query databases and retrieve information about the region's transit assets
- Regional intelligent transportation systems plan

- Transit signal priority system

Regional Technical Assistance Program

- Provides technical and financial assistance to various levels of local government to support planning projects that complement transit service. This program also helps communities to apply for and qualify for federal and state funding for transit-supportive planning.

Regional Transit Coordination Plan

- Improves transfer opportunities between various transit services and reduces barriers to access.

RTA/CTA Transit Benefit Program

- Market a program which allows employers and employees to take advantage of tax laws permitting the purchase of up to $100 in transit fare media using pre-tax dollars. By exempting transit costs from federal, state and local taxes, the benefit program lowers the cost of commuting.

RTA Reduced Fare Card

- Applies to seniors and veterans

8.4 GREATER BUFFALO-NIAGARA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL (GBNRTC)

The GBNRTC is an inter-agency transportation planning group which establishes policies and programs for the Niagara Frontier. It provides a regional decision-making forum for the development of multi-modal, integrated transportation system. The GBNRTC is based on the principle of collaborative planning.

Governance Structure

Policy Committee

- Provides a forum for co-operative decision-making in regard to transportation planning and programming for the region
- Membership: primarily mayors & chairs (of transportation authorities and federal departments)

Planning and Co-ordinating Committee (PCC)

- Purpose is to coordinate and guide the regional transportation planning process in accordance with guidance set by the Policy Committee
- Provides a forum for broad-based discussions of transportation issues and planning, including the programming of federal transportation funding for the region, and is the main avenue for public participation in the planning process.

- Membership: senior-level engineers and executive directors of transportation authorities.

Sub-Committees of the PCC
- Purpose is to provide technical advice and recommend appropriate courses of action to PCC on current and emerging transportation planning issues, goals, plans, priorities and programs.
- The PCC subcommittees are comprised of one or more PCC members, possibly supplemented by appointees from other parts of member organisations and/or non-member organisations. The PCC Chair appoints members and designates each Subcommittee Chair annually with PCC approval.
- The PCC may establish any ad-hoc subcommittee, subject to a majority vote
- Subcommittees meet regularly or as required by responsibilities assigned to the subcommittees by the PCC. Subcommittees are required to present an annual report to the PCC at the first PCC meeting of each calendar year.

Administration Sub-Committee
- Reviews and recommends work plans
- Reviews budget & expenditures, proposed staffing changes and administration procedures.

Cross Border Planning Sub-Committee
- Addresses all bi-national issues, prioritizes related projects, coordinates projects and programs with cross border impacts
- Includes the Regional Municipality of Niagara, Ontario Ministry of Transportation, Niagara Falls Bridge Commission, Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority, New York State Dept. of Transportation and New York State Thruway Authority.

Long Range Planning Sub-Committee
- Reviews the development of the LRP and updates, reviews plan status, risk assessments, performance measures, demographic and other factors; makes recommendations regarding project implementation consistent with plan progress.
- Includes all PCC members

Systems Management & Operations Sub-Committee
- Reviews congestion management strategies, reviews transportation system performance, evolves operational and management projects

Transportation Projects Sub-Committee
- Prioritizes projects for funding
- Reviews project status and funds availability
- Recommends Transportation Implementation Priorities (TIP) and recommends TIP amendments
- Includes all PCC member organisations.

9.0 CONCLUSION

This report is not a governance report. It is intended a discussion paper on governance issues, and to provide members of the Regional Board and Councils with some background information on various governance models.

Options for addressing the governance requirements for future transportation planning may range from modest changes to existing decision-making bodies to the establishment of a separate transportation authority with responsibility for all transportation modes, and every variation between these two. The starting point for any discussion on transportation governance should be a region-wide consensus on transportation planning goals, objectives, targets and priority initiatives. The governance model should then be structured to achieve the objectives. Choosing the governance model before obtaining agreement on the overall plan can have the effect of simply shifting inter-municipal disagreements from the Board table to the Authority table.