

Metropolitan Governance in Mexico: The Institutions

Juan Angel Demerutis-Arenas¹

¹*University of Guadalajara. Planning Department.*

juan.demerutis@cuaad.udg.mx

Abstract: Metropolitan Areas in Mexico are the result of the process that has led world population in general and of Mexico in particular to settle in urban areas. However, citizen participation in metro planning processes has been uneven through time, particularly for vulnerable groups. Therefore, this article analyses the relationships between local governments and the actors of civil organized society using as categories for the analysis, modes of governance considering: key decision makers, public-private relationships, and the key instruments that govern the processes of planning the metropolis. A three-step analysis is conducted: 1) Descriptions of context and background; 2) Revisions of adopted laws; and 3) Participation of organized groups of society in the decision-making process for metropolitan planning. This "chain of evidence" is used to explain two case studies in a narrative sequence: Guadalajara and Monterrey metropolitan areas. The research structure also allows characterizing some common stages of planning processes in both cities ranging from State Governments led planning, to the appearance of the federal Government in urban planning arena, to the fragmented planning by municipal governments of the metropolitan areas, to the emergence of coordination and municipal association, to the reappearance of the federal government in the metropolitan planning arena.

Keywords: Metropolitan governance; metropolitan planning; Mexico

The Process of Urbanization and Metropolization in Mexico

While the 20th century witnessed the development of urban Mexico, with the concentration of the country's population in settlements larger than 15,000 inhabitants (Table 1), the 21st century is characterized by a process in which these concentrations are articulated, and consolidated into large metropolitan areas (Table 2).

Population growth and rural-urban migration have led to urban sprawl and irregular development, which often exceeds the capacity of municipal institutions to adequately manage metropolitan territories; consequently, the metropolises risk becoming chaotic and out of control centers. In addition, urban growth has damaged the environment, as the invasion of cities into lands with high agricultural value, as well as the pollution they generate, both in the air and in the water, are evidence of the negative environmental impact on the process that has led the world population to concentrate in cities. This lack of capacity to manage metropolitan areas requires better governance modes and better institutions for citizen consultation and participation.

The urbanization process in Mexico has gone through several phases (Unikel, et al., 1976). The process was relatively slow in the period between 1900 and 1940, particularly in the first two decades due to the Mexican Revolution. This period of slow but steady growth, both in the countryside and in the cities,



generated a regional polarization of the country, with Mexico City, Guadalajara and Monterrey as the main poles. In the period between 1940 and 1970, the growth rate increased significantly due to a decrease in the mortality rate combined with an increasing migration, particularly of young people from the countryside to the city. The population growth in the country decreased at rates below 2% in the 1980s, with a consequent stabilization in the percentage of young people with the general population, which has placed great pressure on the government, since it must provide more jobs, facilities and services in urban areas. In the seventies, more than half of the population was already concentrated in urban agglomerations of more than fifteen thousand inhabitants, with the rest of the population settled in small settlements scattered throughout the national territory (Table 1).

Year	Population	Annual Growth Rate (%)	Urban population > 15,000	%	Non-urban Population < 15,000	%
1900	13,607,259		1,434,423	10.54	12,172,836	89.46
1910	15,160,269	1.09	1,782,911	11.76	13,377,358	88.24
1921	14,334,096	-0.56	2,085,117	14.55	12,248,979	85.45
1930	16,552,644	1.45	2,891,410	17.47	13,661,234	82.53
1940	19,649,162	1.73	3,927,694	19.99	15,721,468	80.01
1950	25,779,254	2.75	7,198,360	27.92	18,580,894	72.08
1960	34,923,129	3.08	12,746,685	36.50	22,176,444	63.50
1970	48,381,547	3.31	21,556,568	44.56	26,824,979	55.44
1980	66,846,833	3.29	36,135,767	54.06	30,711,066	45.94
1990	80,840,622	1.92	46,343,352	57.33	34,497,270	42.67
2000	95,753,396	1.71	58,311,557	60.90	37,441,839	39.10
2010	110,991,953	1.49	69,049,369	62.21	41,942,584	37.79

Table 1. Population in Mexico (Urban and Rural) Source INEGI.

Despite the decline in the rate of growth, during the 1980s the population growth would be enough to generate a city of 1.4 million each year; and in the next 2 decades a city of 1.5 million per year. The demographic data also show a pattern in the distribution, since there is a trend towards concentration in urban settlements, that is, those greater than 15,000 inhabitants (Unikel et al., 1976 and CONAPO, 2012). But there is another trend: the physical articulation of localities that originally worked independently, but which are now integrated into a single unit, in such a way that they add up to a population of 50,000 inhabitants, whether it is formed by a locality of a municipality or by localities that are located in two or more municipalities that show a high degree of physical and functional integration (SEDATU-CONAPO-INEGI, 2018). Considering the previous criterion, by the year 2000, more than half of the Mexican population resided in a metropolitan area, and by the year 2010 it was already 56.80% in 59 metropolitan areas (Table 2).

Of these metropolitan areas, there are three which in 2010 concentrated a quarter of the country's population; one of them, Mexico City, reached one million inhabitants in the 1920s, and the other two, Guadalajara and Monterrey also did in the 1960s. These three monopolized - even before reaching a million inhabitants, not only the attention of the municipal authorities that composed them, but also that of their states and of the federal government; the first for being the capital of the country, and the other two for being the capitals of their respective states. For this reason, subnational governments focused

on their development since the beginning of the 20th century, and hardly considered areas outside of them at the time of making decisions for the introduction of facilities and infrastructure, because at the same time that this trend was taking place, there was a great dispersion that included more than 5,000 settlements under 15,000 inhabitants in the national territory even before the 1960s (INEGI). However, local or municipal governments are embedded in a federal system, and metropolitan areas must be addressed in that context.

Category	1980	1990	2000	2010	2015
Metropolitan Areas	26	37	55	59	74
Metropolitan municipalities & delegations	131	155	309	367	417
States	20	25	29	29	32
Total population (millions)	26.1	31.5	51.5	63.8	75.1
Metropolitan population (% of Total)	39.1	38.8	52.8	56.8	62.8

Table 2. Metropolitan indicators. Source: SEDATU (2018).

The federal system that structures intergovernmental relations in Mexico comprises 32 federal entities, including the recently created Ciudad de México (CDMX). These sovereign units are the foundations of the federal pact; the Mexican Constitution establishes three orders of government: federal, state and municipal, without the possibility of an intermediate level between them, that is, a regional or metropolitan government. The Constitution establishes two orders of sovereignty: the federation and the states. The municipalities are free and autonomous but not sovereign, leaving the municipality as the basic cell of a political, administrative and territorial structure. Municipal governments can collect taxes, charge for subdivision rights of land and infrastructure, receive share of taxes charged by the states and the federation, and charge as consideration for water services, drainage, garbage collection, cemeteries, parks and maintenance of green areas. In the analysis developed in this study, the sovereignty of states and their capacity to formulate and implement policies are fundamental for understanding the structural framework in which metropolitan planning is carried out.

Study Analysis Criteria

Urban and territorial planning has been implemented through time in different ways in public policies throughout the Mexican territory. However, not all states have experienced and implemented it with the same resolve; some states have a relevant history in planning issues, while others simply had not dealt with it until the enactment of the General Law of Human Settlements in 1976. The most experienced states have achieved success stories but also failures, which should serve as a reference to inform those who are just following federal guidelines in this issues, about the pros and cons of planning policies and instruments. That is why it is important to describe and frame the contexts that have led to the development of planning at subnational level.

This study focuses on a recent trend in urban and territorial planning in Mexico, which is the coordination of state and municipal areas in the decision-making processes in metropolitan areas of the country, from a governance framework.

Governance is a term widely used today, which originated in the discipline of political science. It considers the participation of various social groups in conjunction with government action as a fundamental component, and emphasis is placed on the greater capacity for decision-making and on the

growing influence of non-governmental actors in matters previously reserved for the government (Becerra Mercado & Reyes Rodríguez, 2014). The term can be found in association with diverse planning issues, such as: environmental governance, water governance, good governance, or urban governance, to name a few. Urban governance is the most meaningful in the development of cities, and the concept has been an initiative of the UN-Habitat program as a campaign to empower citizens, to facilitate "good governance" and social inclusion (UN-Habitat, 2002). In large cities, urban governance has recently spread in coverage, to even consider "metropolitan governance", a very relevant concept, given the need for inter-municipal coordination, but above all, because of the urgency for participation of the groups of the organized civil society.

In the available literature, a wide range of debates about governance can be found; the vast majority grants three essential variants to the concept: 1) governance as opposed to the term government; 2) governance as a set of norms; and 3) governance as an integrated category of analysis in the regulation of issues of public interest, that is to say, as an interface between government, market and civil society (Henning & Heinrichs, 2011). The latter is the definition considered for the preparation of this study.

Governance includes two fundamental elements: normative and analytical. Governance as a normative concept can provide guidelines and norms for good planning, and as an analytical concept, it can facilitate the reflection and categorization of the reality of planning, particularly the mode of governance.

Henning and Heinrichs (2011) propose, based on Motte (1996), four categories for the analysis of governance: actors, relationships, institutional framework; and the decision-making process itself. With regard to the actors, it is essential to define who participates in the planning process, whether they are individual or collective actors, but above all, their roles, interests, resources and means of financing must be recognized. The relations are associated with the formation of coalitions or opposition fronts that can either become convergent interests or trigger a conflict between the different actors. The institutional framework provides rules of conduct, and enables the identification of institutions that prevail in both social and political contexts. Finally, the decision-making process is fundamental in the analysis, including: the effectiveness of the different actors to balance their interests (the state, the private sector and civil society); the identification of the mechanisms of social interaction that regulate the activities of the actors (both horizontally and vertically); and even the connection with those actors who are not directly involved in the process.

Urban and territorial planning has been influenced by the processes of law and policy making, particularly in the way in which diverse actors participate. Therefore, considering the approach of the modes of governance determined by Henning and Heinrichs (2011) as described before, a three-step analysis is proposed to be applied to two case studies: 1) descriptions of the context and background; 2) the revision of the approved laws; and 3) the membership of the consultation bodies involved in planning processes in the states in general, and in the metropolitan areas in particular, so as to describe the real possibilities of participation from the constitution of these participation/ citizen consultation bodies, and the guidelines of the approved laws. In order to organize this analysis, it was considered as a script for the development of the narrative the proposal of phases of Urban and Territorial Planning established by Demerutis (2005), which is based on the intergovernmental relations of the federation, the states and the state municipalities. The phases are listed below:

Phase 1. State experiences in urban planning: The planning of capital cities and the abandonment of small municipalities (1970-1975).

Phase 2. Federal revolution in urban and territorial planning (1976-1982).

Phase 3. Resistance by state governments to municipal planning by federal decree (1983-1992).

Phase 4. Municipal governments responsible for planning and fragmentation in decision-making in metropolitan areas (1993-2007).

Phase 5. Metropolitan coordination: municipal governments in conjunction with state government and governance (2008-2015).

Phase 6: The reappearance of the federal government in the arena of urban and territorial planning (2016- present).

Two case studies are comparatively approached using the proposed method of analysis, given that by their nature they can be paradigmatic to understand the situation of coordination between municipalities in a metropolitan area in Mexico; these cases are the Metropolitan Areas of Guadalajara and Monterrey.

Urban and Territorial Planning in the Metropolitan Areas of Guadalajara, Jalisco and Monterrey, Nuevo Leon

The States of Jalisco and Nuevo Leon have a long tradition of urban legislation dating back decades before the enactment of the General Law of Human Settlements (*Ley General de Asentamientos Humanos, LGAH* or GHLS in English) in 1976, which marked the beginning of the Federal Government into the scope of urban development. Both States are free and sovereign, like the rest of the states of the Mexican Republic. Their government is composed of three powers: Executive, Legislative and Judicial. Their Constitutions grant powers to enact laws to the Legislative Power, which is required to follow clearly defined procedures, in accordance with the Organic Law of the Legislative Power.

There are three metropolitan areas in the state of Jalisco: Guadalajara, Ocotlan and Puerto Vallarta. Of the 7.35 million inhabitants who lived in the state of Jalisco in 2010, more than four million lived in the Guadalajara Metropolitan Area, whose official name in Spanish is *Área Metropolitana de Guadalajara*, which currently consists of nine municipalities: Guadalajara, Zapopan, Tlaquepaque, Tonalá, Tlajomulco de Zúñiga, El Salto, Juanacatlán, Ixtlahuacán de los Membrillos and Zapotlanejo. In the Metropolitan Area of Ocotlán, which includes 3 municipalities (Ocotlan, Jamay and Poncitlan), the population in 2010 stood at 164,256 inhabitants. In the Metropolitan Area of Puerto Vallarta, an inter-state metropolis, 379,886 inhabitants lived in 2010 in two municipalities: Puerto Vallarta in Jalisco, and Bahía de Banderas in Nayarit.

In Jalisco, the issue of urban development was included in the public agenda since 1933. Among the principal initiatives, it stands out the requirement that any municipality of the state that included a city with more than three thousand inhabitants, should have a Commission of Planning and Public Works, in order to assist the Municipal Governments with the improvement of urban areas, as well as in the formulation of policies for their development. These commissions would be composed of the municipal president, the councilor in charge of public works, one representative of the merchants (Chamber of Commerce), a representative appointed by the municipal owners of the municipal seat, and an engineer

or expert from the same capital. The members of the Commission occupied honorary positions, for which they received no remuneration. The governor reserved the right to preside over any of these commissions at his own request. The main function of the Commissions was to elaborate and adopt a "master plan" for the physical development of the city.

These collegiate bodies adopted different forms over time but consistently their main function was to provide urban infrastructure for the municipalities, which was effectively performed; however, the issues related to planning and setting development controls were neglected. These oversights would later hinder the implementation of projects for the resolution of large-scale urban problems. It would also represent difficulties in developing master plans for the communities. For example, some of the issues related to transportation planning of Guadalajara are a proof of this lack of care in the planning of the city (Wario Hernández, 1998).

Up until that point, the mode of governance could be considered of the corporatist / administrative type, since the key decision-makers were predominantly businessmen and professionals - both with origins linked to the state government, together with public officials, and whose main objectives were economic growth and the regional redistribution of development with a very pragmatic style of policy-making.

In the State of Nuevo León there is a single metropolitan area, Monterrey; however, this federal entity also has extensive experience in politics for urban and territorial planning.

Valadez Fernandez (1995) categorized the history of planning in Monterrey in five periods, based on actors, planning techniques and legislation: 1) The private sector and planning: 1931-1950; 2) Advisory master planning: 1951-1960; 3) The institutionalization of the master plans: 1961-1970; 4) Consolidation of the legal framework: 1971-1980; and 5) Institutionalization of metropolitan planning: 1981-1990. In short, in the first years of planning in Nuevo León, from the 1930s to the 1970s, the private sector played a leading role, and later became an advisor to the state government, promoting the development of master plans for the city of Monterrey.

In the case of the state of Nuevo León, urban and territorial planning appeared on the agenda of the state government in 1927. By that time the goal was to to implement basic physical changes to the city, such as the widening of pre-existing roads and the construction of new roads, of which the state government was responsible in conjunction with the private sector.

Phase 1: State experiences in urban planning: Planning of capital cities and the abandonment of small municipalities (1970-1975)

This phase corresponds to policies adopted during the period prior to the publication of the General Law of Human Settlements (GLHS). Although the two states studied displayed a strong interest in urban and territorial planning for human settlements development controls in the period from the 1930s to 1970, this section emphasizes what happened in the immediate years before 1976, just when the capitals of both Jalisco and Nuevo León exceeded one million inhabitants and showed the features of a metropolitan area.

In both cases the planning of the capital city had been the main objective of the policies of the state governments. That is why this phase could be understood as the policy of "Plan the capital, forget the small municipalities".



In both states there was a strong participation of the private sector in conjunction with the state government, so that a type of corporatist governance existed, in which public-private partnership projects predominated for the growth of cities, mainly in the state capital. However, the governors' very strong link with the private sector, rested in the fact that their funding was necessary to implement planning actions. This strong bond, along with the centralist style of governing in the country, resulted in that the laws of planning and urbanization and their reforms were solely initiatives of the governors; in fact, there is no evidence that any local congressman or woman or specific interest groups proposed any amends during this period.

The private sector played an important role in promoting the city development. In Jalisco, merchants and industrialists were part of the commissions for public works and planning, and as members of them, they prompted the municipal government for the development of a master plan. Meanwhile in Monterrey, the industrialists supported the decision to develop a master plan for the state capital that defined the necessary infrastructure works for the metropolis.

In conclusion, planning was practically dictated by the State Executives and their associated businessmen, who with their resources established the guidelines of planning in the capitals. Governance was lead in a corporatist manner, because it aimed at growth, with a public-private agreement in which their partnership projects were carried out through cooperative works.

Phase 2: Federal revolution in urban and territorial planning (1976-1982)

This phase refers to the period between the appearance of the GLHS, published in the official periodical on May 26, 1976, and the following six years. The federal government amended three articles of the Constitution (27, 73 and 115) to provide a legal framework for the new law. During the first year after the GLHS, most states passed new laws on urban development controls. This general law established the basis for planning in the states and for the standardization of a national structure of urban and territorial planning. Following the establishment of this legal framework, each state modified its laws in accordance with its guidelines. Paradoxically with the GLHS, the federal government granted powers -which it didn't have before, on urban and territorial planning of the states, and simultaneously empowered the municipalities as key actors for the development of the cities and the territory. The participation of the three levels of government in urban and territorial planning through the GLHS attends to a principle of concurrence stipulated in the Mexican legislation. Although the federal government interceded for the municipalities, this was greeted with certain reservations by the state governments, resulting in contradictory state legislation sometimes.

The GLHS also included the concept of "conurbation" for the first time, which referred to an urban agglomeration where two or more cities became a homogenous geographical, economic and social unit. As a unit composed of several municipalities, the State executive was responsible for coordinating efforts among the municipalities involved, since in Mexico there are no regional governments. The state plan, as well as the plans for Conurbation Zones, became the first instruments of metropolitan planning in the Mexican states.

Guadalajara was declared a conurbation in September 1978 and Monterrey in 1984, although as explained earlier their size and functions were metropolitan since the 1970s when its population grew exponentially, which made it exceed one million inhabitants.

The GLHS included a requirement of citizen participation in the legislation. The plans of any level had to be presented to public consultation before being published; however, there was no mechanism to guarantee that the observations resulting from the consultation process were included in the Plan, that is to say that public participation was actually symbolic.

In Jalisco, the promulgation of the GLHS prompted the publication of a new Law which had the purpose of adapting to the provisions of the recently promulgated GLHS. However, the bases of the new law were mainly set in past experiences and scarcely in the guidelines of the general law. In reality, municipalities were not entitled to plan, since most of the responsibilities to authorize and plan the cities were left to the State executive.

During this phase the legislative changes generated discrepancies about its contents among the private sector leaders. In fact, they considered these changes a "socialist content of the law", in particular they mentioned that zoning threatened private property. These interest groups also expressed rejection for the granting of powers to local governments and favored a status quo and particularly supported the role of the state government.

This unprecedented situation in the state, represented a kind of startle between the corporatist relations that had prevailed in the state, which rarely questioned the decisions made by the authorities, to a more critical -although cautious- relationship of the various state interest groups.

Unlike other states that adjusted their legislation almost immediately to the promulgation of the GLHS, Nuevo León waited four years to do so. The purpose of the law was to determine the procedures and rules for zoning. It was also responsible for laying the foundations of a framework of attributions for the state executive and the municipal governments in the administration of the plans, but above all, for harmonizing the policy of urban and territorial planning in the state with the GLHS.

The Governor maintained the responsibility of authorizing the state and municipal plans of urban development, including zoning. He also was responsible for planning the metropolitan area, playing the role of coordinator of local governments, the same role he already had as coordinator of the actions proposed by the national plan for urban development. He ultimately acted as a mediator in conflicts between the government authorities and the public over the issues covered by the law and its application.

In this period, although the federal government had set guidelines to follow in the states, in Nuevo Leon, the state government *de facto* retained the attributions of the municipalities, Monterrey included.

In sum, both in Jalisco and in Nuevo León, the coordination of the municipalities of the metropolitan areas was still guaranteed by the state governments, whose interest in what happened in the territory, meant that in practice they were involved in all the planning processes in the municipalities. As for the mode of governance, this had the characteristics of the Corporatist and Administrative modes, because they aimed at growth and redistribution as well as efficiency; they had a pragmatic style and the nature of the public-private relationship was concerted, but at the same time in a competitive environment, mainly due to the emergence of the federal government.

Phase 3: Resistance by state governments to municipal planning by federal decree (1983-1992)

In 1983, the Mexican federal Constitution was amended to establish that municipal governments had the right to formulate, approve and administer urban development as zoning (Article 15). Despite this reform to the Constitution, the elaboration and implementation of the plan were still carried out by the states' governments. In Nuevo Leon, the authorizations of residential subdivisions were made directly in state agencies; something similar happened in Jalisco because although municipal approval was necessary for any development, there had to be a review or "technical advice" from the state executive.

In the municipal reform of 1983, reactions were generated from municipalities claiming their rights to autonomously manage municipal life in general, and the administration of the growth of cities in particular. However, only a few municipal governments were in shape to claim their independence; most of these municipalities were large and rich and were commonly part of the metropolitan areas. This was the case of the municipalities in the metropolitan areas of Guadalajara and Monterrey.

During this period, urban development plans for metropolitan areas were promulgated in both States - although the name referred to conurbations from Guadalajara (1982) and Monterrey (1988). This stage marked the entry of the state government into territorial/ regional planning implementation, but also the lack of resources and capacity of the municipal agencies became evident. At the time of the municipal reforms in the states of Jalisco and Nuevo Leon, only the metropolitan areas were decentralized, and only the municipalities that formed them were granted the responsibilities of urban and territorial planning.

In the state of Nuevo Leon, a new law, granted additional planning responsibilities to the municipalities, but still it reserved most of the planning powers for the state government. Due to this legislation, Municipal planning was strongly debated in Congress; a recurrent concern of the congressmen was the lack of capacity of the municipal governments that were not part of the Metropolitan Area of Monterrey. The congressmen highlighted the existence of a huge gap in urban planning of the time: on the one hand, a relatively new state plan was published as an instrument of planning policy, but on the other, the municipal plans were not executed due to the lack of resources in the municipalities.

In this phase, the coordination was carried out by the state government, which was responsible for the preparation and publication of urban development plans of the metropolitan areas, with the approval of the municipal governments. Regarding the mode of governance, it still had the characteristics of Corporatist/Administrative, since the membership of the consultation bodies was practically the same, as it relied on public-private partnerships through councils in which decisions were shared among organized entrepreneurs and officials of the state government to a greater extent, and municipal to a minor. Although in both states the consultation and citizen participation bodies had the same responsibilities and almost the same membership, it is important to highlight the incorporation, in the case of the Urban Planning Commission of Nuevo Leon, of two Universities of the state, while in Jalisco this still did not happen.

Phase 4: Municipal governments responsible for planning and fragmentation in decision-making in metropolitan areas (1993-2007)

In 1993, the federal Congress approved a substantial reform to the General Law of Human Settlements (GLHS). This law attempted to clarify the need of the municipalities to have the autonomy to decide on

planning and zoning within their jurisdictions. Although municipal governments were assigned to make plans, the necessary resources were not channeled to implement them through the elaboration of specific instruments. This situation resulted in an imbalance between rich and poor municipalities. In most cases, large capital cities -already converted into metropolitan areas, claimed their right to elaborate their own plans and determine zoning; meanwhile, the rest of the urban areas could not plan with autonomy, as provided by state law.

In addition to granting powers to local governments, there is an interesting fact worth noting in this phase: the initiatives for the new legislation were, for the first time in the history of the states of Jalisco and Nuevo Leon, proposals by an actor that was not the governor. In this phase, a new generation of urban and territorial planning policy was proposed, which included a sophisticated set of tools in which the experiences of the states as well as federal guidelines were merged. It included a complete list of zones, the limits of urban growth and the incorporation of strategic planning for city plans. In both cases, the initiatives were presented by congressmen, which broke with the tradition of direct proposals from the governors. This action can be interpreted as a change in the making of policies in the states because it was not only an imposition, but there was a consensus among congressmen and interest groups represented in Congress. There was also a notable concern about regional disparities within the state, which was not so evident in the previous phases and which had also been the product of the rapid growth of cities.

Organized groups of the society took part in the formulation stage of the law, as forums were convened to allow citizens to participate. These forums were organized by the official development committees in both state congresses. It was also the first time that stakeholders expressed their opinion on legislation for urban and territorial planning in a formal document.

The legislation of 1993 allowed municipal governments to finally have the possibility of implementing an official planning process, with which they became responsible for planning within their jurisdiction. The state governments promoted the elaboration of urban development plans in the municipal capitals during 1993 and 1994, but they left the local governments with decision making responsibilities on zoning. While this was an example of power devolution previously granted by the GLHS to the municipal government, the fragmented decision-making in land use became a serious planning problem. The municipal governments had the right to plan and to administer zoning as long as the content of their plans had been consistent with the guidelines established in the state plans, but interestingly, the state governments abandoned their responsibility as regional planners, leaving the full burden of planning to the municipalities.

In this phase, the municipal governments were characterized for exercising their responsibilities independently of the state government; as the state executive forcedly released some responsibilities to locals, as a result, metropolitan coordination was practically minimized. As for the mode of governance, it still had the characteristics of Corporatist/Administrative, since it relied on public-private partnerships, but at the same time a tendency was generated towards the populist mode, since the municipal governments sought to legitimize themselves with their citizens and voters so as to demonstrate its ability to help organized groups with interests in the municipal territory, and municipal-level politicians became key decision-makers.

It is worth noting again the participation of the academy in the consultation bodies in the state of Nuevo León, while in the state of Jalisco this sector continued to be relegated.

During this period, the municipalities took the lead in urban and territorial planning, and although they had a requirement of congruence with higher plans (regional/ metropolitan) these were never published. In the absence of these reference documents, each municipality opted -based on GLHS itself, for generating its own planning policies, generating an atomization of the decisions in this matter.

Phase 5: Metropolitan coordination: municipal governments in conjunction with the state government and governance (2008-2016)

In this phase, the problem of fragmented decisions by the municipalities is recognized, and a metropolitan coordination agenda is proposed in both states. This agenda includes the publication, in the case of the state of Jalisco, of a Metropolitan Coordination Law (2011).

The concept of Metropolitan Coordination appears for the first time in the legislation for planning in the Urban Code for the State of Jalisco. To reinforce the above, in February 2011, the Metropolitan Coordination Law of the State of Jalisco was published, and simultaneously, several articles of the Urban Code were amended and repealed, with which the metropolitan coordination was supported by a specific legislation that at the same time laid the foundations for the future of coordination in the Metropolitan Area of Guadalajara. This law, unique in the country, aimed to regulate the procedure for the constitution of metropolitan areas and regions, as well as to establish the bases for the organization and functioning of the metropolitan coordination bodies from the declaration of metropolitan area or region, the conclusion of coordination agreements and the constitution of coordination instances.

It is important to highlight that the Metropolitan Coordination Law of the State of Jalisco considers three instances of coordination: the Metropolitan Coordination Board (MCB), the Metropolitan Planning Institute (IMEPLAN), and the Metropolitan Citizen Council (MCC).

In Nuevo Leon, the State Congress the lack of inter-sectoral and inter-governmental coordination was acknowledged, as well as the need to respond to the challenges posed by metropolitan areas. Therefore, a new law was passed including guidelines for conurbations, as well as metropolitan and regional areas. According to this law, the municipalities that are part of a conurbation, had to conclude an agreement for the integration of a commission, in addition to the powers and obligations of the municipalities and the state.

The development of the metropolitan coordination institutions analyzed in this phase indicated an unprecedented trend towards the public participation in some decisions, which lead to conclude with two important points: firstly, there is already a process of coordination between the municipal authorities and the state government involved in a metropolitan area that previously did not exist; and secondly, that there is an important tendency towards the opening of spaces to organized citizenship in metropolitan planning processes.

Another key player in the process is the Metropolitan Fund: a national purse for construction of strategic infrastructure and facilities in metropolitan areas, since the year of its creation coincides precisely with the development of legislation regarding this in both states (2008). The amounts provided by the Fund cannot be underestimated; since its creation, in other words, a lapse of 10 years, more than four billion

dollars have been allocated to the metropolitan areas of the country, of which, more than four hundred and fifty million corresponded to the Metropolitan Area of Guadalajara, and more than three hundred to the Metropolitan Area of Monterrey.

In consequence, during this phase the mode of governance moved towards a Pluralist mode, although it still retains its roots in the Administrative/Corporatist mode. If this path follows, it will eventually be possible to make use of instruments such as disputes, mediation and elections or referendums on decisions regarding urban and territorial planning, although the balance of interests and the interactive relationship between the public sector and the organized civil society is still not so clear.

Phase 6: The reappearance of the federal government in the arena of urban and territorial planning (2017-present).

Recently, in November 2016 it was published in the Official Gazette of the Federation the new General Law of Human Settlements, Territorial Planning and Urban Development (*Ley General de Asentamientos Humanos, Ordenamiento Territorial y Desarrollo Urbano*, LGAHOTDU or LHSTPUD) which came to confirm the interest of the federal government in urban and territorial planning issues, and after 40 years, it redefined urban policy, which promotes, among other things, the constitution of deliberative bodies whose objectives are metropolitan coordination and governance. The new policy foresees and reiterates the role of coordinator and supervisor that the state governments should have, unlike the emphasis that the previous legislation had on granting powers to the municipal governments.

In matters of intergovernmental coordination, the new law establishes the need to address issues such as: the right to the city, equity and inclusion, the right to urban property, coherence and rationality, democratic participation and transparency, productivity and efficiency, public space, resilience, urban security and risks, environmental sustainability, universal accessibility and mobility.

The LHSTPUD includes a new definition of the metropolitan area that takes into account the conurbation, but which considers as the fundamental criteria for its conformation its complexity, and its social and economic relevance manifested in a territorial unit. This law also devotes a chapter to the Metropolitan and Conurbated Areas Plans in which the need for intergovernmental coordination is confirmed, but above all, it is important to highlight the metropolitan governance chapter that obliges governments to create two main instances for its management: the metropolitan ordinance commission that must coordinate the formulation and approval of the metropolitan plans, which is a technical instance with the participation of government officials; and also the Metropolitan Development Advisory Council, a body responsible for following up the public consultation and where representatives of the three levels of government participate, along with representatives of legally constituted social groups, schools of professionals, academic institutions and experts in the field, who should represent a majority on the council.

As a result, coordination processes, together with a consolidated governance, allow a new order to be foreseen in metropolitan areas, where intergovernmental coordination (both horizontal and vertical) should prevail, in addition to the increasing participation of representatives of the organized civil society, including the academy, since never before in the phases previously analyzed there was such diversity in the composition of the organs of citizen participation and consultation in urban and

territorial planning processes; time will tell whether this new order depicts better metropolitan scenarios.

References

- Aguilar Villanueva, L., 1996. El federalismo mexicano: funcionamiento y tareas pendientes. En: *¿Hacia un nuevo federalismo? Historia de las Americas-Estudios*. México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Azuela de la Cueva, A., 1989. El significado jurídico de la Planeación. En: *Una década de Planeación Urbano-Regional en México 1978-1988*. México, D.F.: El Colegio de México.
- Azuela de la Cueva, A., 1998. Planeación Urbana y Reforma Municipal. En: *Normatividad URbanística en las principales Metrópolis de México*. México, D.F.: El Colegio de México.
- Becerra Mercado, O. C. & Reyes Rodríguez, R., 2014. *El lenguaje contemporáneo del urbanismo: Glosario de términos urbanos*. Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara.
- Cabrero Mendoza, E., 1998. *Las Políticas Descentralizadoras e México (1983-1993): Logros y Desencantos*. México, DF: CIDE-Miguel Ángel Porrúa.
- CONAPO, 2012. *Catálogo. Sistema Urbano Nacional 2012*. México, D.F.: Consejo Nacional de Población.
- Congreso del Estado de Nuevo León/ LXXI, 2009. *H. Congreso del Estado de Nuevo León*. [On line] Available at: http://www.hcnl.gob.mx/trabajo_legislativo/pdf/dictámenes/3428.pdf
- Demerutis-Arenas, J. A., 2005. *City and regional planning in the mexican states: case studies Jalisco and Nuevo Leon*. Tempe(AZ): ASU.
- Demerutis-Arenas, J. Á., 2012. Las propuestas de las teorías de "gestión del desarrollo urbano" y las políticas de planeamiento urbano en el estado de Jalisco. En: *Planeación participación y gestión en los procesos urbanos actuales: Una visión latinoamericana*. Toluca, Estado de México: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, pp. 188-224.
- El Colegio Mexiquense, 2010. *III. Informe final de evaluación externa 2010 y su resumen ejecutivo. Versión definitiva*, México, D.F.: Secretaria de Hacienda y Crédito Público.
- El Norte, 1975. Ley de Urbanismo local será conocida en el país. *El Norte*, 29 01.
- Gamas Torruco, J., 1975. *El Federalismo Mexicano*. México, D.F.: SEP.
- García Ortega, R. & Bárcenas Alcalá, E., 1998. Área Metropolitana de Monterrey: Reglamento único metropolitano y descentralización de atribuciones a los municipios. En: *Planeación y Gestión Urbana y Metropolitana en México: Una revisión a la luz de la globalización*. Zinacatepec, Edo.Mex.: El Colegio Mexiquense, A.C., pp. 209-220.
- Garza Villarreal, G., 1989. *Una década de Planeación Urbano-Regional en México 1978-1988*. México, D.F.: El Colegio de México.
- H. Congreso de la Unión, 1917. *Constitución Política de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos*. México, DF.: Diario Oficial de la Federación.
- H. Congreso de la Unión, 1993. *Ley General de Asentamientos Humanos*. México, DF.: Diario Oficial de la Federación.
- H. Congreso de la Unión, 2016. *Ley General de Asentamientos Humanos, Ordenamiento Territorial y Desarrollo Urbano*. México, DF.: H. Congreso de la Unión.
- H. Congreso del Estado de Jalisco, 2008. *Código Urbano para el Estado de Jalisco*. Guadalajara(Jalisco): s.n.
- Henning, N. & Heinrichs, D., 2011. Fresh Wind or Hot Air --Does the Governance Discourse have something to offer to Spatial Planning?. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 35(1), pp. 47-59.

- Hernández Chávez, A., 1996. Las tensiones internas del Federalismo mexicano. En: *Hacia un nuevo Federalismo? Historia de las Americas-Estudios*. México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Iracheta Cenecorta, A. & Iracheta Carroll, J. A., 2014. *Evaluación de los Fondos Metropolitano y Regional del Gobierno Federal Mexicano*. México DF.: CIDE.
- Motte, A., 1996. The institutional relations of plan-making. En: *Making strategic spatial plans: Innovation in Europe*. Londres: UCL Press, pp. 231-254.
- OECD, 2006. *Competitive Cities in the Global Economy*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Pradilla Cobos, E., 2016. Zona Metropolitana del Valle de México: neoliberalismo y contradicciones urbanas. *Sociologías*, 18(42), pp. 54-89.
- Ramírez Saiz, J. M., 1989. Los objetivos de la LGAH. En: *Una década de Planeación Urbano-Regional en México 1978-1988*. México, D.F.: El Colegio de México.
- Rodriguez, V. E., 1997. *Decentralization in Mexico: From reforma Municipal to Nuevo Federalismo*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- SEDATU-CONAPO-INEGI, 2018. *Delimitación de las zonas metropolitanas de México 2015*. Ciudad de México: SEDATU-CONAPO-INEGI.
- SEDESOL - CONAPO - INEGI, 2012. *Delimitación de las zonas metropolitanas de México 2010*. México, D.F.: Secretaría de Desarrollo Social - Consejo Nacional de Población - Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía.
- UN-Habitat, 2002. *Concept paper*. Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat, 2016. *Nueva Agenda Urbana*, Quito, Ecuador: UN-Habitat.
- Unikel, L., Ruiz Chiapetto, C. & Garza Villarreal, G., 1976. *El desarrollo urbano de México: Diagnóstico e implicaciones futuras*. México, DF: El Colegio de México.
- Valadez Fernández, J. A., 1995. Evolución de la Planeación Urbana en Monterrey. En: *Atlas de Monterrey*. México, DF: El Colegio de México.
- Villar Calvo, A. J., 1998. *La impotencia municipal en el ordenamiento urbano, herencia del centralismo y la subordinación: Caso de Estudio, Estado de México*. Toluca, Edo.Mex.: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México.
- Ward, P. & Rodriguez, V., 1999. New Federalism, Intra-governmental Relations and Co-governance in Mexico. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, pp. 673-710.
- Wario Hernández, E., 1998. Limitaciones de la normatividad urbanística en el Área Metropolitana de Guadalajara. En: *Normatividad urbanística en las principales Metrópolis de México*. México, DF: El Colegio de México.