



BUILDING THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION COMMUNITY

Leadership and Governance (Effective Regional Alliance) for the National Capital Region

Summary of the research by the
Center for Public Policy and Private Enterprise
University of Maryland School of Public Policy
College Park, MD

NAIOP
July 20, 2010

This research has been partially sponsored by a grant from the 2030 Group



Successful regions build on their own unique qualities and advantages

*In a global economy, the new race is won by **regions** with the capacity to innovate and with the brainpower – education and skills – needed to create and **sustain a competitive advantage** over the long run.*

Source: *Crossing the New Regional Frontier*, U.S. Econ. Dev. Admin., October 2009

Regional Thinking Pays Off (Study Results)

- Est. of savings (National, based on Portland experience):
 - 11%, or \$110B in 25 yr. road-building costs;
 - 6%, or \$12B in 25 yr. water & sewer costs;
 - 3%, or \$4B in annual operating and service delivery costs
- Incomes of suburbs rise and fall with their central cities
- Central city poverty rates correlate with metropolitan region income growth
- Areas with regional coop. score highest on prosperity, lowest on disparity, and highest on growth indicators
- Faster growing regions have lower cost of doing business, higher education achievement, more young adults, and more central city residents



UMD Research Approach

➤ Phase One: *Governance of the National Capital Region.*

I. “History and Assessment of Regional Governance in the National Capital Region”

II. “Evaluation of Alternative Governance Models”

III. “Case Studies” (Ten)

➤ Phase Two: “Governance for the National Capital Region: Goals and Options for a 21st Century Governance Network”

- Meetings with Senior Advisory Group (SAG); 2030; and COG
- Workshops with key participants (Sept. 20)



Paper III: “Governance of the National Capital Region: Case Studies”

By R. Scott Fosler and William R. Dodge
Center for Public Policy and Private Enterprise
University of Maryland School of Public Policy

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

Conclusion of the Research and Interviews to Date

The dramatically altered nature and scope of the National Capital Region, over the course of the 20th century, simply outpaced the efforts of regional leaders to update the region's existing, limited governance structures and fashion them into something more suitable to the new regional reality. The overriding problem is that there is no effective regional governance structure, or dedicated region-wide revenue, for comprehensive governance in the National Capital Region.

And, there is significant risk of not implementing an effective regional approach

“governance” ≠ government; it is a “process” of governing



National Capital Region Senior Advisory Group (SAG)

Jack Gansler – University of Maryland (Chair)

Bob Buchanan – 2030

Tom Davis – (ex) Fairfax County

Jim Dinegar – BOT

Doug Duncan – (ex) Montgomery County

Jim Dyke – BOT

Julia Koster – NCPC

Alan Merten – George Mason University

Dan Mote – University of Maryland

Dave Robertson – MWCOG

UMD Research Team

- Bill Lucyshyn
- Bill Dodge
- Scott Fosler



Some Thoughts from 1st SAG Meeting*

- “Confederation” of existing groups - - not a replacement
- Need Feds. to play proactive role (as “Principal Employer,” “Host of Community”) - - create incentives for regionalism
- Business community wants something sustainable (vs. dependence on elected officials and speeches on “cooperation”)
- Perhaps note some obvious potential benefits (e.g., common procurements; transportation gains; common “green” standards)
- Start with a HUD “sustainable community grant”

* May 10, 2010



Some Thoughts from 2nd SAG Meeting*

- Focus on future Regional problems/opportunities; and be specific e.g. transportation, education, infrastructure, health care, Chesapeake Bay, etc.
- Identify total dollars (Federal, State, Local) coming into region and try to negotiate a Strategic/Regional allocation (a la Gary, Indiana)
- Recognize how many potential dollars are being “left on the table” that could be used for planning and implementing regional development
- A “compact” is critical, and must have local and “state” endorsement to gain “cover” for politicians
- Must build on current organizations (government, private, civic, non-profit) - - perhaps combining some, for greater synergy

* June 30, 2010

Increasing Federal Funds for Regional Activities

- HUD – “Sustainable Communities Grants” (\$100M nationally - - MWCOG proposing)
 - Support metropolitan and multijurisdictional (regional) planning efforts - - focused on:
 - Economic competitiveness
 - Social equity
 - Energy use
 - Public health and environment
 - Long term development
- EDA – “Regional Innovation Clusters Initiative” (merging of economic, education, S&T, industry development, etc.)
- DOE – “Energy Regional Innovation Cluster” Grants (\$129.7M over 5 years - - energy efficient buildings)
- NCPC – Regional Voice in White House for NCR



Goals for Strengthening Regional Governance in the National Capital Region

- 1. Create an Abundance of Practicing Regional Citizens**, by educating and engaging the participation of individuals and groups in making regional governance effective.
- 2. Use the Greater Washington 2050 Compact to Shape Sustainable, Affordable Regional Growth** in order to reach regional agreement on future growth; to keep the National Capital Region competitive globally; and to be able to offer a high quality of life locally.
- 3. Make the National Capital Region a National/Global Model for Federal/State/Local Cooperation**, by addressing the need for all levels of government to work together seamlessly on regional challenges, and for the synergistic benefits.
- 4. Build a Regional Charter for Governing the National Capital Region**, thereby creating the capacity to keep strengthening regional governance, while maximizing existing organizations and structures.



Initial Thoughts on Requirements for Regional Success

- **Widespread recognition** of the **benefits** of change (to a “regional model”)
- A **regional governance** (vs. government) **“structure”**, with **authority**, **resources**, and **accountability**
 - **Combined** involvement and **commitment** of **Public** (Federal, State, District, County), **Private** (major sectors), and **non-profit/civic**
- **Sustained Leadership**; with a vision, a strategy, a set of actions, metrics, etc.
- **Continuous visibility** into actions and results (to maintain focus and support)
- **Take full advantage of the many, existing, regionally-focused organizations** (perhaps in a “network model” - - with the existing groups as foci for various functions)
- **Must engage corporate and academic leaders, as well as grass roots and community organizations** (people must think regionally)

Preliminary Conclusions

- There are large, potential, synergistic benefits (economic and quality-of-life) to be gained (and a clear need - - based on Fuller's study, the Frederick polls, and our interviews) from a proactive and successful regional governance "structure"
- However, there is **no effective regional governance "structure" or dedicated resources for general, comprehensive governance for the National Capital Region** (with boundaries flexibly defined)
- Even with planning and support, regional projects have long time horizons. For example, with transportation projects:
 - Dulles Airport – 1950 to 1962
 - Purple Line – Under study since 1992, alternatives analysis in 2008
 - Silver Line – Planning and discussion since 1976; construction began in 2009
 - Outer beltway – first appeared in April 1950, on a map prepared by the NCPC

Regional Challenges need a regional response



Discussion Items – Your Thoughts

- Goals for Regional Governance
- Organizational Structures
 - Charter
 - Authority
 - Responsibility
 - Resources
 - Removal of Barriers
- Implementation