

# Regional and Intergovernmental Planning

## Division Officers

Lee Schoenecker, AICP  
**Division Chair**  
5543 30th Pl NW  
Washington, DC 20015  
202-686-8864  
[leeschoenecker@aol.com](mailto:leeschoenecker@aol.com)

Rocky Piro, AICP  
**Chairperson Elect**  
1011 Western Avenue,  
Suite 500  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
206-464-6360  
[rpiro@psrc.org](mailto:rpiro@psrc.org)

Robert Leiter, AICP  
**Vice-Chair  
Metro & Regional Planning**  
401 B Street,  
Suite 800  
San Diego, California CA 92101  
(619) 699-6980  
[ble@sandag.org](mailto:ble@sandag.org)

Debbie Lawlor, NJPP/AICP  
**Vice-Chair State Planning**  
1 DeKorte Park Plaza  
Lyndhurst, NJ 07071  
201-460-4671  
[debbie.lawlor@njmeadowlands.gov](mailto:debbie.lawlor@njmeadowlands.gov)

Patricia Atkins, Ph.D.  
**Vice-Chair National Planning**  
614 West 40<sup>th</sup> Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21211  
(202) 994-8438  
[patkins@gwu.edu](mailto:patkins@gwu.edu)

Robert Kull, NJPP/AICP  
**Secretary-Treasurer**  
PO Box 77316  
West Trenton, New Jersey 08628-6316  
(908) 295-7739  
[rkull@planegy.com](mailto:rkull@planegy.com)

R. Scott Taylor  
**Newsletter Editor**  
PO Box 270  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
573-751-6774  
[Robert.Taylor@modot.mo.gov](mailto:Robert.Taylor@modot.mo.gov)

Ryan Harris, AICP  
**Webmaster**  
5 Penn Plaza, 18th Floor  
New York City, NY 10001  
(212) 944-2000, ext. 6168  
[ryanharris73@yahoo.com](mailto:ryanharris73@yahoo.com)

## THE SOUTH CAROLINA COG NETWORK: REGIONAL COLLABORATION ON STATEWIDE PLANS

By Norman Whitaker, AICP, Executive Director, Central Midlands Council of Governments, Columbia, South Carolina

Since 1969, a network of 10 regional councils of governments (COGs) has served South Carolina counties and municipalities. Each of the state's 46 counties is included in one of the COGs. This article focuses on efforts by the 10 COGs to provide "seamless" statewide planning products through coordinating their efforts and pooling their resources. It does so by initially providing a South Carolina context for regional planning and then by describing both the ten regional councils and the accompanying directors' network in South Carolina. It then provides statewide examples in transportation, community and economic development, and hazardous mitigation planning. It concludes by providing some comments on future opportunities for COGs in South Carolina and elsewhere. At the end, it contains the listing and addresses of the State's ten COGs

## THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONTEXT

**State of South Carolina:** A recent article in the Regional and Intergovernmental Planning newsletter discusses planning for sub-regions within the 38,000 square mile planning area of the Los Angeles region. The LA region's population is approximately 18 million. In contrast, the population of state South Carolina is 4.3 million, within a land mass of 35,000 square miles, framed by the Atlantic Ocean and the Blue Ridge Mountains. South Carolina is growing at a rate of 1.2 % per year, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, although the larger metropolitan areas and coastal regions are growing at a faster rate.

**Urban Growth Pattern:** South Carolina is a state of small cities, towns, and rural counties. Even in the metropolitan areas, South Carolina's largest city, Columbia, has a population of around 120,000, although the Columbia-Newberry Combined Metropolitan Statistical Area had a 2005 population of 727,000. Similarly, the Charleston MSA totals over 600,000 in population, while the well-known central city has a population of only 106,000. The Rock Hill, SC area is part of the Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord NC-SC MSA. The Aiken, SC area is part of the bi-state Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC MSA. The Appalachian Council of Governments (ACOG), which includes the Greenville and Spartanburg metropolitan areas, is the only SC COG serving over 1 million residents. The two central cities in the ACOG planning area, Greenville and Spartanburg, have respective populations of only 67,000 and 39,000.

A recent national study by the Brookings Institute of the "exurban" growth phenomenon further illustrates the state's dispersed population patterns. Exurban areas are beyond the suburban fringe, but are too developed to be considered rural. The study concluded that South Carolina had the highest proportion—9.5%—of exurban population of any state.

## REGIONAL COUNCILS IN SOUTH CAROLINA: A SNAPSHOT HISTORY

The South Carolina COGs started out as regional planning commissions and eco-

(Continued on page 2)

*“Most of the COG Boards include a few members of the South Carolina legislature. With the help of some of these legislators, the COG Directors have been successful in securing significant funding increases from the legislature.”*

*(Continued from page 1)*

conomic development districts in the 1960's. Like regional councils in other states, South Carolina's COGs were "clearinghouses" for a wide array of federal programs. Over time, the core federal programs have been distilled down to transportation planning, aging services, workforce development, economic development, environmental planning, and the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). All 10 regional councils house development corporations. Most of these COGs also house an Area Agency On Aging and a Workforce Development Board. There are a number of services unique to one or a few of these bodies: the Lower Savannah COG has a tourism division, Central Midlands is creating a wetlands mitigation bank, Pee Dee COG provides engineering services to member governments, Waccamaw COG has staff members trained in wetland delineations, and the Berkley-Charleston Dorchester COG has developed an online, interactive mapping service, featuring access to Multiple Listing Service (MLS) data.

#### **THE SOUTH CAROLINA ASSOCIATION OF REGIONAL COUNCILS (SCARC) AND THE COG DIRECTORS NETWORK**

**The Regional Councils:** The 10 COGs all belong to the South Carolina Association of Regional Councils (SCARC). All 400 plus members of the COG's boards of directors belong to SCARC. Each fall SCARC conducts training and networking conference. The new U. S. House Majority Whip, Rep. Jim Clyburn (SC) was the keynote speaker at the most recent conference. SCARC also publishes a quarterly newsletter. In 2003, SCARC published the *Impact Report*, a publication designed to showcase significant COG accomplishments. The impact report may be downloaded at <http://www.sccogs.org/downloads/impact.pdf>. Association publications have promoted the wide range of services available from the COGs. It has also retained a public relations firm to produce these publications

and to manage the logistics of the annual conference.

**The COG Directors Network:** Every month, the executive directors of the COGs meet in Columbia, the state capitol, to discuss matters of statewide significance. At most meetings, the agenda includes briefings from some of the state agencies that work with the COGs. In recent years, following a perception by the directors that they were falling "out of the loop" with regards to many of state agencies that had historically partnered with the COGs, the executive directors have undertaken a marketing program to raise the awareness of the COGs and their programs. This has involved meeting with state agency officials to establish, or reestablish, communications, and has generally gotten the COGs "back into the loop" and has resulted in contracts for planning and other services.

Most of the COG Boards include a few members of the South Carolina legislature. With the help of some of these legislators, the COG Directors have been successful in securing significant funding increases from the legislature. The directors also jointly visit members of the U.S. Congress each year.

Every two or three years, the South Carolina executive directors meet with their counterparts in North Carolina to compare notes and share strategies. South Carolina member COGs also participate with COGs from other Southeastern and border states in the South East Regional Directors Institute (SERDI). SERDI provides professional development programs for directors of regional councils, and through its Regional Councils of the Future program, is currently helping the South Carolina COG network develop a strategic plan.

#### **GOAL: A SEAMLESS, STATWIDE NETWORK**

#### **COGs Provide A Network Of Value at**

*(Continued on page 3)*

(Continued from page 2)

**State, Regional, and Local Levels:** In marketing their services to state agencies and other potential partners, the COG Directors' Network often asserts that they can consistently deliver a high quality, "seamless", statewide planning product. There is no statewide planning agency for South Carolina, and the COG Network is the most obvious provider of unified planning and services. This has been an appealing proposition to many of the state agencies. Rather than dealing with 46 counties and countless municipalities, they can discuss and negotiate projects and services with a single entity--the COG Directors Network. After a contract is in place, the 10 regional councils proceed independently, but usually with the benefit of a common, previously agreed upon format and methodology.

**Rural Transportation Planning Network:** The regional councils located in Charleston (Berkley-Charleston-Dorchester), Columbia (Central Midlands), and Georgetown (Waccamaw) serve as Metropolitan Planning Organizations, or urban transportation planning bodies, for their respective regions. A number of smaller MPOs are hosted counties or small cities. The Central Midlands and Berkley Charleston Dorchester COGs have recently completed commuter rail transportation studies.

Although there is no formal "RPO"--- Rural Planning Organization---- structure in South Carolina, the regional councils fill this role by developing 20-year Long Range Transportation Plans and 5-year Transportation Improvement Plans. The South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) contracts with each of the ten COGs for transportation planning services in rural areas. This function is generally fulfilled by the Planning Department in each of the COGs. Each year, the state DOT convenes a Partnering Conference, bringing together 10 COGs, 10 MPOs, federal transportation officials, and SCDOT staff. The COG Network and SCDOT have recently taken their partnership a step

further by starting a new planning enterprise: development of a statewide, COG-based system of transit coordinating agencies to meet a variety of federal mandates for better coordination of transportation services for medical and social service clients. As a first step, a statewide transit coordination plan is being jointly prepared by SCDOT and the 10 COGs.

Five years ago, the regional councils assisted the state DOT in creating a State Multi-modal Transportation Plan. Multi-modal plans at the COG level were rolled up into a unified, state transportation plan. A new iteration of this plan is now being developed, with heavy COG involvement.

In the last few years, there has been an upsurge in interest in planning for bicycle and pedestrian facilities in South Carolina. Other than a similar national up-trend in bike-ped planning, there are two possible reasons for South Carolina's renewed focus on non-motorized travel. First, accident rates for bicycle and pedestrian related traffic accidents have, historically, been high. Second, leaders throughout the state have realized that the state's nearly year-round outdoor recreation season is a quality of life asset that can contribute to economic development marketing strategies. SCDOT also sponsors an annual Pedestrian and Bicycle conference, in addition to the more general transportation planning partnering conference mentioned earlier.

**Community and Economic Development Network:** The roots of the South Carolina COGs are in providing planning, community and economic development, and grant administration services to municipal and county government clients, and these services are still highly valued by local governments. The landscape has changed since the early days of the COGs, in that, today, the larger local governments have more capacity to

(Continued on page 4)

*"Although there is no formal "RPO" structure in South Carolina, the regional councils fill this role by developing 20-year Long Range Transportation Plans and 5-year Transportation Improvement Plans. "*

*“Another core function for all SC COGs involves the Community Development Block Grant program for non-entitlement grantees.”*

*(Continued from page 3)*

provide their own planning and economic development services, and multi-county economic development alliances have emerged as leaders in the marketing function of regional economic development.

All of the COGs maintain planning departments and provide comprehensive planning and zoning services. Some of the smaller cities and counties rely on these councils for the full range of local planning services, including preparation of comprehensive plans, drafting ordinances, and staffing planning commissions. Central Midlands COG, for example, recently completed new comprehensive plans for the towns of Springdale and West Columbia and has contracted with Lexington and Batesburg- Leesville to prepare plans in the upcoming fiscal year. A new state law requires six hours of orientation planning, followed by continuing education courses, for local planning officials, including staff, planning commissioners, and zoning appeals boards. The COGs have emerged as a major source of this specialized, intensive training.

Another core function for all SC COGs involves the Community Development Block Grant program for non-entitlement grantees (those too small to receive an automatic, annual “entitlement” grant from the federal department of Housing and Urban Development.). The State Department of Commerce receives a CDBG block grant to sub-allocate to small cities and counties. This is done through a competitive application process. The COGs work closely with the SC Department of Commerce in ensuring the localities’ needs are being addressed by the program. Each COG receives an annual regional planning grant to cover the costs of preparing applications and helping local governments identify potential projects. While the local governments are not required to use the COGs’ services in preparing applications and administering grants, most non-entitlement CDBG communities chose to work with the COGs. Recent grant awards have included hous-

ing rehabilitation, water and sewer infrastructure, downtown revitalization, and development of a free municipal wireless internet (WIFI) network for a small city.

Currently, the SC COGs are jointly producing a statewide GIS inventory of major water and sewer lines under a contract with the SC Department of Commerce, funded by CDBG and the federal Economic Development Administration. The State’s Commerce Department needs this infrastructure information to work with economic development prospects. Again, the COGs collaborated on technical standards and formats for the project to assure a consistent, statewide product.

In another partnership with the SC Department of Commerce, nine of the 10 COGs operate Workforce Development programs. Each of the COGs is also an Economic Development District, working with the federal Economic Development Administration to plan, prepare, and implement Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies. COGs also assist their member governments with grants and loans funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. One COG, the upstate Appalachian Council of Governments, is a conduit for assistance from the federal multi-state Appalachian Regional Commission. Additionally, each of the COGs house a 501c3 development corporation for economic development purposes, and most also operate economic development revolving loan funds.

**Network in Natural Hazard Mitigation:** In 2003 and 2004, the COGs were hired by the South Carolina Emergency Management Division to produce Natural Hazard Mitigation Plans for each region of the state. The planners and GIS professionals from each COG met periodically to coordinate production of the plans. Great care was taken to ensure that the plans and GIS mapping followed consistent standards and formats. In addition to the obvious concern with hurricanes --- in 1989, hurricane Hugo devastated coastal

*(Continued on page 5)*

*(Continued from page 4)*

South Carolina, and also caused significant damage well inland--- earthquakes are a significant natural hazard in our state. An earthquake, measured at 7.6 on the Richter scale, severely damaged Charleston in 1886, killing 60 and shaking the ground as far west as the Mississippi River and north to New York. This was the largest earthquake on record to strike the eastern seaboard. Another large quake rocked Union County in the piedmont region of the state in 1913, and there are indications that huge earthquakes occurred in the pre-historic era. Localities that have adopted the COG-prepared hazard mitigation plans are now eligible for federal hazard mitigation grants.

### **CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE ENDEAVORS**

The COGs have discussed collaborating on several potential statewide projects, including helping local governments prepare for the 2010 Census and assisting New Carolina (South Carolina's council on global economic competitiveness) in developing a statewide network of economic clusters; and working with the Southeast Regional Directors Institute to create a strategic plan for their network, focusing on collaboration with a wide array of partners.

An overarching topic of discussion that often comes up at the monthly COG Directors network meeting involves the future of these regional councils in an evolving political and economic landscape, that has changed tremendously since the regional councils were founded in the 1960's. The COG directors have always had concerns about the continued relevance and survival of their organizations as federal funding continues to decline, new models of economic development emerge, and the many long-term executive directors and other key staff leaders reach retirement age. Discussion with colleagues in other states indicates that these concerns are not unique to South Carolina. Based on the South Carolina

experience, the future success of the COGs depends their ability to sustain and expand three of their traditional strengths:

**Regional Planning.** This has always been a core activity for regional councils, but regional planning is undergoing a rebirth in many parts of the country, as the most forward-thinking policy leaders realize that, with the continuing shift in jobs and economic activity to suburban and exurban areas, planning for growth, development and services must be regional in scope in order to encompass the full range problems and opportunities relating to economic development, land use, transportation, social services, open space and environmental quality. Interestingly enough, all four new executive directors hired by SC COGs since 2003 have had professional backgrounds in planning. Comparing 2007 to 1967, one thing is different: regional planning is not necessarily the sole turf of COGs, as new regional coalitions continue to form around development and quality of life issues. Regional Councils of the future will dominate this arena only if they assert themselves as planning leaders.

**Networking and Partnerships.** When regional councils were originally formed, they were designated as the provider of many services by default. That is not the situation today. Most of the services provided by South Carolina COGs today do not have to be provided by COGs; there are alternative providers that the funding agencies could work with instead. Constant networking and promotion of the statewide COG network has helped the SC regional councils demonstrate that they are the best regional implementors of statewide programs.

**Multi-tasking:** Regional councils have accumulated an odd array of specialties, encompassing topics as seemingly un-related as providing services for the

*(Continued on page 6)*

*“The COGs have discussed collaborating on several potential statewide projects...”*

*“Another emerging issue is regional water supply planning.”*

*(Continued from page 5)*

elderly and planning for future growth and development. Some of the emerging mega-issues in planning illustrate the key position of COGs in preparing our communities for the future. One such mega-issue is impact of an aging society on the physical form of our communities and their transportation systems, housing stock, and social service infrastructure. Who is better prepared to deal with these concerns than regional councils with decades of experience dealing with both physical planning and aging services. Another emerging issue---one that actually emerged years ago in other parts of the country--- is regional water supply planning. The long experience of regional councils in analyzing population growth, land development trends, and environmental planning makes them obvious candidates for leadership in addressing this long term, regional issue. These are just two areas in which one of the most prominent characteristics of a COG---- the provision of multiple, diverse, even seemingly unrelated services--- provides a key to future opportunity and sustainability.

#### **MORE INFORMATION ON REGIONAL PLANNING IN SOUTH CAROLINA**

The South Carolina Association of Regional Councils has created a simple web-site ( <http://www.sccogs.org/> ) serving as a portal to the web sites of the COGs. The 10 COGs and their executive directors are listed below.

##### **Appalachian Council of Governments**

Steve Pelissier, Executive Director  
Greenville, SC  
[Anderson, Cherokee, Greenville, Oconee, Pickens & Spartanburg Counties]

##### **Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester Council of Governments**

Ron Mitchum, Executive Director  
North Charleston, SC  
[Berkeley, Charleston & Dorchester Counties]

##### **Catawba Regional Council of Governments**

Harold Shapiro, Executive Director  
Rock Hill, SC  
[Chester, Lancaster, Union & York Counties]

##### **Central Midlands Council of Governments**

Norman Whitaker, Executive Director  
Columbia, SC  
[Fairfield, Lexington, Newberry & Richland Counties]

##### **Lowcountry Council of Governments**

Chris Bickley, Executive Director  
Yemassee, SC  
[Beaufort, Colleton, Hampton & Jasper Counties]

##### **Lower Savannah Council of Governments**

Wayne Rogers, Executive Director  
Aiken, SC [Aiken, Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, Calhoun & Orangeburg Counties]

##### **Pee Dee Regional Council of Governments**

Johnny Brown, Executive Director  
Florence  
[Chesterfield, Darlington, Dillon, Florence, Marion & Marlboro Counties]

##### **Santee Lynches Regional Council of Governments**

James T. Darby, Executive Director  
Sumter, SC  
[Clarendon, Kershaw, Lee & Sumter Counties]

##### **Upper Savannah Council of Governments**

Patricia Hartung, Executive Director  
Greenwood, SC  
[Abbeville, Edgefield, Greenwood, Laurens, McCormick & Saluda Counties]

##### **Waccamaw Regional Council of Governments**

David Essex, Executive Director  
Georgetown, SC  
[Georgetown, Horry & Williamsburg Counties]

## REGIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION PANELS AT THE APRIL 2007 PHILADELPHIA APA NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The Regional and Intergovernmental Planning Division will be sponsoring two panels at the Philadelphia Conference. Description of each panel follows:

### REGIONAL PLANNING---THE NEW JERSEY WAY

.....*get the full story at the National APA Conference in Philadelphia*

**TIME AND PLACE: MONDAY, April 16, 1:30- 2:45 PM, CONVENTION CENTER**

**Moderator of the Panel Session: Diane Brake, Regional Planning Partnership**

**Background:** While it is generally accepted that the term “regional planning” refers to planning beyond municipal boundary lines, there are no specific size or component requirements to deem an area a region for planning purposes. Over the years and across the nation, numerous regional planning entities were formed to guide future development within designated regional jurisdictions. Some authorities cross municipal lines, some county lines, and others deal with lands located in multiple states. The degree of governmental authority and powers vary greatly amongst the different agencies - including the ability to supersede local zoning, share tax revenues, collect user fees, and perform enforcement activities to name a few. Most were created in order to control or hinder the route and/or pace of development in locations with an environmental concern or sensitivity. Environmental issues ranging from safe drinking water supplies, clean air, wildlife habitat, coastal area protection, and preservation of forest lands have led to the establishment of regional planning initiatives. Nationally, some notable regional entities include the Regional Planning Association, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, the

Cape Cod Commission, Long Island’s Central Pine Barrens Commission and the Twin Cities Metropolitan Council.

Within the regional planning realm, New Jersey has been viewed for decades as a national leader. Three regional planning agencies of the State of New Jersey will be highlighted as a panel at the 2007 American Planning Association conference in Philadelphia. The following provides a brief description of each agencies organization, jurisdiction, and mission.

**The Meadowlands Panelist: Susan Bass Levin, Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs and Chair of the New Jersey Meadow Lands Commission**

The New Jersey Meadowlands, in North Jersey, covers almost 20,000 acres and is composed of ten municipalities in Bergen County and four in Hudson County. More than 8,400 acres of the Meadowlands District have been set aside for open space, waterways, and wetlands in this urban oasis.

The New Jersey Legislature created a regional body, the New Jersey Meadowlands Commission (formerly known as the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission), in 1968. The agency is presided over by a 7 member board of commissioners. The Commission has three main mandates: environmental protection, economic development, and solid waste management. It acts as the zoning board for the region, superseding local zoning, and is in charge of development and conservation decisions within the Meadowlands, as well as enforcement.

A key tool that the Legislature provided the Commission with was the ability to establish a regional tax sharing program, whereby tax revenues accrued after the

*(Continued on page 8)*

*“The Regional and Intergovernmental Planning Division will be sponsoring two panels at the Philadelphia Conference.”*

*“The Pinelands Commission is charged with the development and implementation of the Comprehensive Management Plan.”*

*(Continued from page 7)*

base year of 1970 are apportioned among the fourteen municipalities according to a formula. This tax-sharing program is aimed at ensuring that the Meadowlands areas zoned for preservation reap some of the benefit gained by the areas zoned for development. Each town's tax base prior to 1970 is unaffected by the arrangement and all the revenues from that tax base continue to go to the individual towns. Forty percent of the increase in the tax base over the 1970 valuation is subject to the tax-sharing program. Redistribution is based on the number of school children and the proportion of property the town has in the Meadowlands District. All new tax revenues are distributed among the fourteen towns, with no diversion of tax revenue to the regional commission.

The Commission operates an educational component known as the Meadowlands Environment Center and a research arm known as the Meadowlands Environmental Research Institute.

**The Pinelands Panelist: John Stokes, Executive Director of the New Jersey Highlands Commission**

The Pinelands National Reserve includes portions of seven southern New Jersey counties, and encompasses over one million acres of farms, forests, and wetlands. It contains 56 communities, from hamlets to suburbs, with over 700,000 permanent residents. In 1978, Congress established it as the country's first National Reserve, which is an area of nationally significant resources that are protected through a program of local land use management supported by federal financial and technical assistance.

The Pinelands Comprehensive Management Plan, adopted in 1981 to direct growth to designated areas in the Pinelands, is considered one of the most advanced regional plans in the country. The plan protects thousands of acres of the ecologically-significant Pinelands through

a combination of regional land use regulations and innovative tools like a regional transferable development rights program that rewards landowners for protecting their land from sprawl.

The Pinelands Commission is charged with the development and implementation of the Comprehensive Management Plan. It plays significant roles in monitoring the level and types of development that occur within the Pinelands, acquisition of land, planning, research, and education. The Commission, which consists of 15 members works with all levels of government to implement the Pinelands Comprehensive Management Plan.

**The Highlands Panelist: Dante DiPirro, Executive Director of the New Jersey Highlands Council**

The New Jersey Highlands Region is part of a four-state Mid-Atlantic Highlands system that traverses portions of Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The Mid-Atlantic system consists of over 3.5 million acres of land, of which the New Jersey Highlands Region is approximately 860,000 acres. The overall Highlands system, including the New Jersey portion, has long been recognized for its significant natural resource value, particularly the vast supply of clean drinking water. The Region is also noted for its scenic beauty displayed through a myriad of geographic and geologic features including rolling hills, pastoral valleys, steep ridges, diverse forests, critical wildlife habitats, and historic sites.

Protection of these assets, particularly the potable water supply which serves nearly half of the population of New Jersey, was a driving force behind the adoption of the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Act on August 10, 2004. The Act established the Highlands Region consisting of 88 municipalities located in 7 counties in the State, (Bergen, Hunterdon, Morris,

*(Continued on page 9)*

*(Continued from page 8)*

Passaic, Somerset, Sussex, and Warren). The region is comprised of two areas, the Preservation Area and the Planning Area, as delineated by the Act. The Preservation Area consists of nearly 415,000 acres located in fifty-two municipalities. The Act provides that all lands located outside of the Preservation Area, but within the 88 Highlands constituent municipalities' borders, are deemed to be within the Highlands Planning Area. The Planning Area consists of nearly 445,000 acres located in eighty-three municipalities.

### **“FROM ARMY POST TO NEW TOWN GOVERNMENT”**

**TIME AND PLACE: MONDAY, APRIL 16: 4: 30---5:45 PM**

#### **Background: Base Development and Then Closure:**

In 1917 the US Army purchased the land for Camp Devens. It consisted of property in four contiguous north central Massachusetts towns of Ayer (rail nexus of New England), Harvard, Shirley, and Lancaster. In the 1920s Camp Devens was upgraded to Fort Devens. The fort played a vital role as a training center and point of embarkation for thousands of soldiers during WWII, the Korean War, and Vietnam.

As part of the 1991 Base Realignment and Closure Act, Devens was realigned. A Devens Reserve Force Training Area remains, consisting of 5500 acres in Lancaster and 800 acres on the main and north posts of Devens. The balance of the land, 4400 acres, was sold to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and, through Chapter 498 of the Acts of 1993, placed within the newly created Devens Regional Enterprise Zone.

#### **The Context for Reuse and Redevelopment**

When the base went through the 1991 BRAC process, the four communities recognized that they did not have the resources to redevelop the base on their own. (They were communities of 3,000 – 6,000 people.) They invited the

Commonwealth of Massachusetts through its Land Bank (later Mass Development) to become the Local Redevelopment Agency. The Commonwealth authorized \$200,000,000 in bonding be set aside for the redevelopment process to deal with the superfund, infrastructure, and other issues associated with the redevelopment process. The Commonwealth identified 60 plus communities that would be impacted by the closure, realignment of Fort Devens. A steering committee was formed to assist the communities in grappling with the issues pertaining to base closure and to create a Re-use Plan and By-laws for the base.

The process of creating a reuse plan was informed by a charette held by the communities and the Boston Society of Architects. Planners, architects, and citizens from throughout New England participated in this charette and sustainable development emerged as the organizing theme of the redevelopment process. Numerous citizen participation opportunities and meetings were provided to work through the various issues which evolved into the 1994 Reuse Plan and Devens By-Laws. These documents were then voted on in a simultaneous town meeting event held in the three towns of Ayer, Harvard, and Shirley (Lancaster dropped out as the south post was to remain in use by Devens Reserve Forces Training Area) on December 7, 1994. The host communities surrendered their jurisdiction over the lands within the newly created Devens Regional Enterprise Zone to Mass Development and the Devens Enterprise Commission (DEC).

#### **The Potential for a New Town Government:**

It has been a challenging exercise to investigate how to start a new town. The last town created in Massachusetts was West Brookfield, eighty-six years ago in 1911. Numerous meetings were held to shed light on the machinations of municipal governance in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Besides the traditional needs of any community there

*(Continued on page 10)*

*“The process of creating a reuse plan was informed by a charette held by the communities and the Boston Society of Architects.”*

*(Continued from page 9)*

was a need to deal with vestigial concerns, such as appointing the town fence viewer (the person appointed by the town to settle boundary disputes). Schooling is currently covered through the creation of a Devens School District which contracts with surrounding towns for provision of school services. Devens residents' goals include having their own school for K-6 and working with Parker Charter School located on Devens, for provision of education to their 7-12 graders. The creation of additional housing beyond what was locked in by the 1994 Reuse Plan (282 units) became one of the foci of the debate about disposition. The need for additional housing was identified by the JBOS evaluation and by all parties. How much,

what type, percentage affordable, and where it might be located became front of center of the disposition process.

All of these and many more factors led to a political and electoral decision not to create a new town government out of the substantial redevelopment of the former Devens Military Base. Panelists will discuss in some depth why, at least to date, a new town government has not come into being and what the prospects are for a new town government in the future:

**Moderator: Peter Lowitt, AICP**

**Panelists: Chris Eaton, AICP  
Ed Starzec  
Ralph Wilmer, AICP**

---

## MEGAREGIONS TAKE CENTER STAGE AT APA NATIONAL CONFERENCE

*By Petra Todorovich Regional Plan Association*

**Background:** Recently the rapid population growth of the United States has gained increasing attention in popular media and planning forums. As highlighted in Arthur Nelson and Robert Lang's articles in the January issue of *Planning Magazine*, America will add 100 million people by the year 2043. Most of the growth will take place in ten emerging megaregions across the United States, or their subsets, which Lang identifies as "megapolitan areas." Megaregions are the result of rapid urbanization on the fringe of metropolitan areas, increasingly long commutes, and business travel among adjacent metropolitan areas. A special track at the APA National Planning Conference, April 14-18, will be devoted to Megaregions, Sustainability and Transportation, featuring 19 different sessions.

Megaregions are networks of adjacent metropolitan areas, linked by overlapping commuting patterns, large environmental landscapes, economic networks, and shared history and culture. Their emergence presents new challenges for cities and regions as they face development

pressures and transportation challenges that span local, state and regional boundaries. However they also present the opportunity for new competitive advantages by aggregating economic capabilities at the megaregion scale – essentially, creating larger business clusters that link metropolitan areas.

Take the example of the pharmaceutical industry in the northeast United States – the largest agglomeration of the biomedical research and industry in the world. There are distinct clusters of bio-med in and around the Boston region, the New York-New Jersey-Philadelphia corridor, and the Baltimore-Washington regions. These business and research clusters are positioned along the Interstate-95 and the Northeast rail corridor: adjacent, but not necessarily integrated. What would be the result of investing in high-speed rail in the Northeast that reduced travel time between these places?

**Megaregion Panels at 2007 National Convention in Philadelphia:** At a recent

*(Continued on page 11)*

*“Megaregions are networks of adjacent metropolitan areas, linked by overlapping commuting patterns, large environmental landscapes, economic networks, and shared history and culture.”*

*(Continued from page 10)*

economic development forum at the Providence Chamber of Commerce, Kip Bergstrom, Executive Director of the Rhode Island Economic Policy Council, argued that such investments could enable the integration of adjacent labor markets, creating greater and larger networks of highly skilled workers and innovators. He has some experience in this area, having seen the positive effect that more direct commuter service to Boston has had on the city of Providence, Rhode Island. This topic will be explored in greater detail at a session on "Building Economic Synergies in Megaregions (S449)" at the APA conference, which will feature Mr. Bergstrom as well as Ethan Seltzer, a planner from Portland, Oregon. Mr. Seltzer will talk about the Cascadia Megaregion, which links Portland, Oregon, Seattle, Washington, and Vancouver, British Columbia.

I work for Regional Plan Association (RPA), the independent, not-for-profit planning organization for New York-New Jersey-Connecticut. Over a year ago we launched America 2050, a national initiative that aims to develop a national framework for America's rapid projected population growth and the emergence of megaregions. RPA is acting as a clearinghouse for megaregion research and planning efforts across the country, and a resource to local and regional planners, public officials, and business leaders engaged in megaregion collaborations. We will be involved in several of the megaregion ses-

sions at the APA conference, including sessions on "Cross-Border Challenges in International Megaregions (S532)", "Megaregions and a National Transportation Agenda (S434)," and the session mentioned above.

Some of the other interesting sessions on megaregions at the APA conference will include those with a specific regional focus. The session, "Remaining the Midwest Megaregion (S684)," will include scholars and planners from the University of Michigan, Youngstown State University, and the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, who will talk about the Midwest Megaregion, which is the megaregion with the slowest growth in the nation. In contrast, a session on "Booming Sunbelt Megaregions (S678)" will focus on the rapid growing megaregions in the South and West, such as the Texas Triangle, Arizona Sun Corridor, South California and Florida Megaregions.

These sessions on specific megaregions will address the important question of whether effective partnerships can be formed at the megaregional scale to address challenges that span local, state and regional boundaries. To achieve success, these partnerships should be motivated by mutual self interest and shared policy concerns. For more information on burgeoning efforts in megaregions across the nation, visit [www.America2050.org](http://www.America2050.org) and join us at the APA Conference in Philadelphia this April.

*"For more information on burgeoning efforts in megaregions across the nation, visit [www.America2050.org](http://www.America2050.org)."*

## **American Planning Association 2007 National Planning Conference**

*April 14-18, 2007*

**Philadelphia, PA**

For more information, visit the APA website at [www.planning.org](http://www.planning.org).

Regional and Intergovernmental  
Planning Division of APA  
Website: [www.homestead.com/intergovernmental](http://www.homestead.com/intergovernmental)

PO Box 270 Jefferson City,  
MO 65102 573-751-6774

*“The Baltimore Metropolitan Council was the site of the third Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Roundtable.”*

## MID-ATLANTIC REGIONAL ROUNDTABLE III SUPER REGION COLLABORATION AT BALTIMORE

By Thomas Christoffel, AICP

The Baltimore Metropolitan Council was the site of the third Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Roundtable. The network has participation from about 20 county, regional, State and Federal agencies as well as the non-profit I-95 Coalition. Councils include: Baltimore Metropolitan Council, Delaware Valley RPC, George Washington RC, Metropolitan Washington COG, Northern Virginia RC, Tri-County Council for the Lower Eastern Shore, Rappahannock-Rapidan RC, Region VIII P&DC, Region 9 Eastern Panhandle PD&C and Thomas Jefferson PDC.

Meetings are coordinated by Tom Christoffel, AICP, Senior Planner for Virginia's Northern Shenandoah Valley Regional Commission. His Commission authorized staff to begin a dialogue with other Mid-Atlantic regions in 2005 after being presented the 2030 growth projections by Paul DesJardin, Chief of Housing and Planning, Metropolitan Washington COG. With that region requiring 600,000 workers and 400,000 units to house them from outside their footprint, the Northern Shenandoah Valley did not look forward to 25 more years of the post 9/11 accelerated growth pressures which have doubled housing values in four years.

The event was co-sponsored by the National Association of Regional Councils, with the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and the National Association of Development Organizations. These organizations recognize that inter-regional cooperation is very important—particularly when multiple states are involved. In the Mid-Atlantic, commuters as well as trade move across local, regional, and state boundaries on a daily, if not continuous basis.

Termed a “super-region” in press coverage of its first meeting, the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Roundtable has provided regions the opportunity to get to

know their neighboring COGs and MPOs and understand the unique issues facing the region. Those things that showed up on the flip chart review at the October 21, 2005 roundtable as issues for discussion and perhaps coordination across the many regions in the Mid-Atlantic included:

1. Multi-State Transportation Corridors - 9/340/I-81/270/ (to number a few),
2. Hazard mitigation
3. Metro Evacuation
4. Homeland Security
5. Air Quality (SHENAIR - VA-WV-MD - I-81)
6. Water - ground and surface (ICPRB)
7. Vision/Scenario/Alternatives - from a local region process related to those in other regions
8. Infrastructure,
9. Broadband
10. Regional Policy
11. No new bypasses in metro region puts more pressure on existing roads,
12. Freight
13. Labor chain
14. Everyone imports labor from outside their region - no surplus of labor even at the fringes
15. Multi-modal/multi-state freight/rail and ports – containers
16. Local Land Use

The next Mid-Atlantic Planning Roundtable is tentatively scheduled for May 31.

*(Continued on page 13)*

(Continued from page 12)

More communication and meeting involving APA State Chapters has been encouraged by participants in this process. Presentations from the Roundtable can be found at the Baltimore Metropolitan Council at <http://www.baltometro.org/content/view/773/0/> and on

the “ShenandoahValleyVAWVMidAtlantic” wiki at [http://colab.cim3.net/cgi-in/wiki.pl?ShenandoahValleyVAWVMidAtlantic\\_2006\\_12\\_08](http://colab.cim3.net/cgi-in/wiki.pl?ShenandoahValleyVAWVMidAtlantic_2006_12_08)

Persons wishing to be notified of future events and wishing to participate should contact Tom Christoffel at Tom.Christoffel@gmail.com

## NEWS FROM THE DIVISION

### Division Events at 2007 Philadelphia Conference in April

The APA National Conference runs from April 14-18. Yet, all of our Division events occur on Monday, April 16. Previous articles in this newsletter featured our two panels at the conference---“Regional Planning--- The New Jersey Way,” and “From Army Post to New Town Government.” Following is a brief description of other Division events that day.

#### **Program and Business Meeting Breakfast: 7:00-8:00 AM, Monday, April 16 in the Marriott Hotel:**

A modest breakfast buffet will be served and you are encouraged to come to this meeting. The tentative agenda for the meeting includes: (1) report of the past year; (2) work program and finance report/budget for the coming year; (3) discussion of on going Division activities dealing with evolving APA regional and intergovernmental planning through a proposed APA Planning Advisory Service Report or other similar APA document as well as the development of a possible APA policy guide on regional planning; (4) Division outreach efforts with regional planning public interest groups; and (5), Division activities relative to disaster mitigation and planning.

#### **Division Reception: 5:30 PM, Monday, April 16 in the Pennsylvania Convention Center:**

Immediately following the Division’s panel session, “From Army Post to New Town Government,” in the Pennsylvania Conference Center in the same room, the Division will hold a reception. And depending upon how many people show up for this reception, we may then invite those at the reception to convene at a nearby restaurant.

### 2007-2008 Work Program and Budget Costs

Following is the Division’s work program for

the period, March 14, 2007 to April 30, 2008. It has been initially approved by the Division’s Executive Board in a March 2, 2007 teleconference. Final approval will be voted upon at the Division’s program and budget meeting on April 16. You can comment there or if you have questions before that time, contact the Division’s Chair---Lee Schoenecker. His e-mail is: leeschoenecker@aol.com. He can be reached by telephone at; (202) 686-8865, any day, before 10:00 PM, Eastern Time.

**A. Evolve APA Policy on Regional and Intergovernmental Planning:** This is our highest priority and will take much hard work by members of the Division as well as many other APA members. Substantial efforts have been underway for the last year (reported elsewhere) and over the next 13 months, our efforts will focus on two overlapping and mutually supporting efforts.

**Costs:** \$100 for reproduction costs under A1 and A2 below.

#### **A1. Seek Approval on An APA Policy Guide on Regional and Intergovernmental Planning Per the New APA Policy Guide**

**Approach:** Issue papers have already been developed and distributed to the Legislative and Policy Committee. Given the new APA approach on the development of policy guides which is centered on advocacy and influencing pending legislation, these papers will be re-drafted and we will move forward accordingly.

#### **A2. Seek Funding for a Proposal to Develop an APA Planning Advisory Service Report or Other Similar APA Report on the Subject of Regional and Intergovernmental Planning:**

A proposal has been developed and submitted to a possible funding source. We will further “shop” this proposal during the coming year.

*“All of our Division events occur on Monday, April 16.”*

(Continued on page 14)

(Continued from page 13)

**B. Fully Establish and Enhance Working Relationships With National Organizations Supporting Regional and Intergovernmental Planning.**

Working relationships have already been established with the Alliance for Regional Stewardship (ARS), the National Association of Development Organizations (NADO), and the National Association of Regional Councils (NARC). These relationships will be expanded and strengthened in the coming year. More specific work program objectives follow:

**Costs:** \$300 for involvement under B4 below.

**B1. Closely Monitor and Serve as A Catalyst in APA Preliminary Efforts to Provide Comprehensive and Transportation Planning Training for NADO Members Becoming Rural Planning Organizations :**

In early January of 2007 the Executive Directors of APA and NADO met per this objective. Later in the same month, the APA Education Director traveled to Charlotte, North Carolina to meet with a NADO working group on rural transportation, and it now appears that some type of APA training may be forthcoming in the future. The Division was active in supporting these two events. Over the next year we will undertake efforts to serve as a further catalyst to help to ensure that such training takes place if and as appropriate.

**B2. Participate in NARC Efforts to Evolve Regional and Intergovernmental Planning Graduate Training in Regional and Intergovernmental Planning.**

Our Division was represented at NARCs early February National Legislative Conference at NARC's invitation. At that conference and at their request we participated in the deliberations of their temporary education committee set up to establish adequate graduate training in regional planning. They requested our continuing participation and we will do so within our priorities, time, and mission.

**B3. Explore the Possibility of Either Co-Hosting or Giving Strong Support to the Alliance for Regional Stewardship (ARS) Forum in Long Beach, California: November 6-9, 2007:**

Starting in 2001 and through 2006, the ARS sponsored regional forums every six months across the country, each forum usually drawing 100-125 people, which are attended by very knowledgeable and influential people in the regionalism field. Start-

ing in 2007, they will go to an annual national forum, hoping to draw larger numbers than in the past regional forums, starting in Long Beach in November. On the other side of the coin, there is a lot going on in California, including that State's 2004-initiated Regional Blueprint Program. Bob Leiter, our Division's Vice-Chair for Metropolitan and Regional Planning, who in his regular job is the Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning for the San Diego Association of Governments, is actively involved in the development of California's Regional Blueprint Program. Thus, efforts will be made over the next few months to see if our Division can either co-sponsor this ARC November Forum, or perhaps more likely, lend strong support to the same including providing some of the subject matter for this ARS Forum.

**B4: Lend Support to Mid-Atlantic Regional Forums Which Bring Various Regional Planning Activities to the Table to Discuss Common Understanding and Possible Future Approaches:**

In March of 2006, Division Member Thomas Christoffel coordinated a one-day forum in Washington, DC, bringing together representatives from regional planning agencies, both metropolitan and non-metropolitan---stretching from Richmond to Wilmington, Delaware. In December of the 2006, a similar forum was held in Baltimore and this time regional planning representatives were present from Richmond to Philadelphia. Representatives for NADO and NARC were also present at both meetings, and in fact, they provided for the luncheon meal. Looking to the future, Mr. Christoffel plans another such forum in Fredericksburg, Virginia in May of 2007. In addition to Mr. Christoffel, the Chair of our Division, Lee Schoenecker, will attend.

**C. Participate in Evolving APA Disaster Planning, Mitigation, and Recovery Policy Development Efforts:**

Growing out of Hurricane Katrina, and at the request of former Division Council Chair Forest, our Division has been involved in these efforts, mainly through our Secretary-Treasurer, Robert Kull, who has considerable experience in this area. To this end, we participated in an ad hoc working group at the 2006 San Antonio National Conference. Mr. Kull also attended, mainly at his expense, the July meeting of the Natural Hazards Workshop, held each year in Boulder, Colorado at the National Center for

(Continued on page 15)

(Continued from page 14)

Natural Hazards. The annual workshop convenes the most knowledgeable mitigation planning experts in the country. In the next year we will concentrate our efforts in reviewing the updating of the 1998 APA PAS Report, *Planning for the Post Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction* which should get underway in the near-future. We will also explore the development of short information papers on mitigation planning and assistance.

**Costs:** None

**D. Continue Teleconference Communications Between the Division Executive Committee, and as Pertinent, Others as Well:**

As a means to improve communication between the Division Board, using APA Chicago teleconference services, on the average, the Division will conduct a one-hour teleconferences once every other month.

**Costs:** \$500

**E. Increase our Membership to 200 by**

**April of 2008 :** Over the course of the last 24 months as noted in our cover letter, our membership has grown by 30-35 percent. We hope to maintain this growth at about the same rate. Thus, from our present membership of 175-180, we hope to obtain a membership of 200 by late April of 2008.

**Costs:** None

**F. Participate in Two Division Council Meetings Per Year As Required by APA:**

Division participation is required by the APA at both the Division Council meeting as part of the annual APA National Conference and at the APA Fall Leadership Conference.

**Costs:** \$1,300 in total for travel for either the Division Chair or the Chair-Elect.

**G. At National Conference Conduct Annual Business Meeting, and Receptions As Required by APA Chicago:**

The Division conducts its annual program and business meeting at each annual National APA Conference. And in 2007, APA Chicago is requiring a reception:

**Costs in 2007:** \$1,000

**Costs in 2008:** \$1,000

**H. Conduct the Allotted Two By-Right Panels at the 2007 National APA Conference:**

We have been able to do this at a quality level for many years going back to the 1990's and we intend to do the same again in the future. In the coming year, as the 2008 conference

will be held in Las Vegas, our two West Coast Board members, Robert Leiter in San Diego and Rocky Piro in Seattle, will jointly be responsible for developing these two panels.

**Costs:** None

**I. Develop Two Newsletters:** We have been able to do this over the last four years and intend to do so in the future. Further, in the coming year, we intend to develop a process that would provide the future Chair of the division with a newsletter development process that would best meet his or her needs.

**Costs:** Up to \$1,000 as an overall effort for newsletter, web site, the list serve development, and other features of our communication outreach effort. (Also, see J. below.)

**J. Upgrade our Division's Web Site:** As we fully engage such organizations as NARC, NADO, AMPO and the ARS, and to better serve our members, we need to include new modules. One of the most significant possible module additions would be to add the sub-state regional information collected as a supplement to the "Regional Community Action Newsletter" over the course of the last half of 2006, early 2007. This particular supplementary information consists of the various state sub-regions within each of the 50 states (between six and fifteen sub-regions for each state). To the best of our knowledge, this information and data base does not exist anywhere else in the country. With Mr. Christoffel's already-secured permission and his involvement, if technically feasible, we will archive this information on our web site to be made available to future possible use.

**Costs:** Up to \$1,000 as an overall effort for newsletter, web site, list serve development, and other feature or our communications outreach effort. (Also, see I above.)

**K. Carry Forward Solid Financial and Budgeting Controls As Done in the Past:**

In a two to three year period we have gone from a financial situation where we are not that far from being out of money to one in which we now have \$5,600, cash on hand, as of March, 2007. In the coming year we will probably have to draw on that money for APA required travel to APA National Conferences as well as APA Fall Leadership retreats, the payment for a newsletter editor, teleconferences.

**Costs:** None

(Continued on page 16)

(Continued from page 15)

**Budget Costs Summary:**

Extracting from the more detailed budget summary above, following is a summary of the proposed budget for 2007-2008 above. This is immediately followed by an anticipated table showing anticipated revenues and expenditures from March 31, 2007 to April 30 2008.

**Evolve APA Policy on Regional And Intergovernmental Planning:** **\$100**

For reproduction costs

**Fully Establish and Enhance Working Relationships with National Organizations Supporting Regional and Intergovernmental Planning :** **\$300**

To support that activity in the work program above listed as **B 4: Lend Support to Mid-Atlantic Regional Forums**---This money will be used to help support this forum and other organizations will contribute similar amounts.

**Undertake Teleconference Communications Between the Division Executive Committee and Others as Required:** **\$500**

APA Chicago has provided a teleconference capability to the Divisions. Assuming about eight teleconferences per year, each involving six Division Board members and each teleconference lasting about one hour, the typical teleconference will cost between \$60 and \$80.

**Participate in Two Division Council Meeting Per Years as Required By the APA** **\$1,300**

APA Chicago requires that all Divisions be represented at both the Division Council meeting the annual National Conference and also at the Fall Leadership Meeting. For the Philadelphia Conference \$300 is allocated; for the 2007 Fall Leadership Meeting in Washington, DC, nothing is allocated as the Chair lives in Washington, DC; and for the 2008 National APA Conference in Las Vegas, \$1,000 is allocated for the new Chair's travels and expenses.

**National Conference Receptions and Program Business Meetings:** **\$1,000 (2007)      \$1,000 (2008)**

In the past Chicago APA has strongly suggested receptions and at the 2007 Philadelphia Conference APA is requiring such a reception. We further anticipate that Chicago APA will require or strongly suggest that Divisions host receptions at the 2008 Las Vegas National Conference. Also, we have found that mixing receptions and program and business meetings does not work. Therefore, we are experimenting with breakfast meetings in 2007. (Such meetings have worked for other Divisions.)

**Increase Our Communications Strategies for the Newsletter, Web-Site and And List Serve** **Up to \$1,000**

Over the last few years we have been putting our communications vehicles and modes into shape. We feel reasonably comfortable with the product. Now we have to evolve more efficient means for making these communications vehicles to work, particularly with regard to the newsletter. This may require some type of minimum investment. Concerning our web site, we anticipate continuing to spend about \$100 a year for the same.

**Total Maximum 2007-2008 Budget, March 14, 2007 to April 30, 2008** **\$5,200**

**Budget for 2007-2008 Budget if Some Expenditures Can Be Reduced** **\$4,200**

(Continued on page 17)

(Continued from page 16)

**Project Revenues and Expenditures Anticipated for March 14, 2007 to April 30, 2008**

**Full Expenditure Budget for 2007-2008** **\$5,200**

**Budget for 2007-2008, If Some Categories Can Be Reduced** **\$4,200**

Hopefully money can be reduced if APA does not require a reception at the 2008 Las Vegas Conference and if our communications improvements costs less than anticipated.

**Money on Hand as of March 4, 2007** **\$5,600**

**Anticipated Revenues by April 30, 2008** **\$2,700**

**Total Monies** **\$8,300**

**Total Monies Minus Full 2007-2008 Budget Expenditure of \$5,200** **\$3,100**

**Total Monies with \$1,000 Lesser 2007-2008 Budget Expenditures** **\$4,100**