

# 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)

## EDITOR'S NOTE ON NEWSLETTER ARTICLES:

By Scott Taylor, Editor

The lead article, "The Role of Subregions in Los Angeles Regional Planning," was co-authored by Frank W. Osgood and Lee Schoenecker. It examines the role of the inclusion of 14 subregional planning agencies into the SCAG, including recent involvement in SCAG's Compass Growth Vision and its 2% Strategy. The second article, "Mid-Atlantic New England Regional Planning Conference in Celebration of the Pineland Commission's 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary," goes into some detail concerning this conference in New Brunswick, New Jersey, September 28-

29 of this year. The opening keynote speaker for this conference will be Bruce Babbitt, former U.S. Secretary of the Interior and former Governor of Arizona. Secretary Babbitt's 2005 book, *Cities in the Wilderness: A New Vision of Land Use in America*, provides an excellent back drop for this conference. The last article deals with various facets of Division business. Perhaps the most important information in this article discusses the Division's efforts to date in developing an APA Policy Guide on Regional and Intergovernmental Planning.

## THE ROLE OF SUBREGIONS IN LOS ANGELES REGIONAL PLANNING

By Frank W. Osgood, AICP, Lee Schoenecker, AICP

### REGION-WIDE PLANNING IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA

**The Los Angeles Region:** This very large region had a 2004-2005 population of between 17 and 18 million per the U.S. Census for 2004-2005. Within another 20-30 years it is projected that the population of the Los Angeles Region will reach 22-24 million people. This population covers the six counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura, and Imperial. Today, Los Angeles County alone has just about ten million people and is the most populous county in the United States. In addition, this six-county region includes 185 local general purpose units of government, not to mention the many special purpose districts. East to west, the Los Angeles Region stretches for about 130 miles, and north to south, it covers a distance of 40 to 60 miles. In total it covers close to 38,000 square miles, about half of which is in San Bernardino County.

**The Southern California Association of Governments and The Subregions:** Region-wide planning of some type within the above counties goes back decades, particular

that of Los Angeles County. Regional planning for the entire six-county region grew out of an expansion of the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG). This change resulted in SCAG's expansion to its present 77-person Regional Council (the board of directors) in the 1990s. During this same period, drawing on already existing organizations as well as newly-developed organizations, SCAG was divided into 14 subregions, particularly for planning purposes. And today, the great majority of SCAG's 77-person Regional Council is made up of the members from the 14 subregional organizations.

Two of SCAG's specific regional planning programs are of note as they relate to the 14 subregions. First, a growth management planning program initially identified a draft region-wide land use vision. Each of the 14 subregions were then involved in a subregion by subregion hands-on review of this draft vision as each review pertained to the respective subregion and also to the Los Angeles area as a whole. Ultimately, this draft vision resulted in the Compass Growth Vision and was incorporated into the final 2004 Regional Transport

(Continued on page 2)

*“Growing out of the Compass Growth Vision, an implementation approach called the 2% Strategy was developed.”*

*(Continued from page 1)*

tation Plan for the Los Angeles Region.

Second, growing out of the Compass Growth Vision, an implementation approach called the 2% Strategy was developed. This strategy pertains to that 2 percent of the land area in the Los Angeles Region where each of the 14 subregions contain several or more of the sites and areas that have significant potential for smart-growth type land uses and other like development. A total of a little over 260 sites and areas across the Los Angeles Region were identified. Also, SCAG has initiated a Demonstration program for 16 of these 260 sites or areas, providing consulting services to local governments and other involved organizations and agencies to implement the principles of the Compass Growth Vision. Substate regional organizations are involved in several of the Demonstration projects.

#### **THE FOURTEEN SUBREGIONS OF THE GREATER LOS ANGELES REGION**

The 14 subregions, listed alphabetically, and an example of a program consideration(s) each has or might incur follow:

**(1) Arroyo Verdugo Subregion** (Cities of Burbank, Glendale, La Canada-Flintridge, Pasadena, and South Pasadena; Over 400,000 population, 150 square miles) Known for its entertainment industry (including Disney studios) and rugged physical features, this cluster of five cities works closely to protect its environment.

**(2) City of Los Angeles** ( Over 3,850, 000 population, about 500 square miles). As the Region’s central city and nation’s second largest city, Los Angeles is crucial due to its downtown size, location, and centrality.

**(3) Coachella Valley Association of Governments** (Much of eastern Riverside County including Palm Springs, Palm Desert, Rancho Mirage, nine other local governmental bodies, and Riverside County; Over 400,000 population, 4,800 square miles) Key considerations include managing growth in a fragile environment, congestion, air quality, and maintaining a good quality of life.

**(4) Gateway Cities Council of Governments** (Long Beach and 26 other cities; Over 2,100,000 population, about 500 square

miles) Still suffering from loss of manufacturing jobs during the 1990’s recession, this subregion must cope with significant workforce retraining problems and extensive through truck traffic related to a huge influx of international trade activity at the Port of Long Beach and at the Port of Los Angeles.

**(5) Imperial Valley Association of Governments** (Six municipalities, a special purpose district, and Imperial County; Over 155,000 population, 3,000 square miles) Water supplies must be available over the 2000-2020 period to adequately maintain its irrigated crops while urban growth pressures are beginning to raise significant infrastructure capacity issues.

**(6) Las Virgenes, Malibu, Conejos Council of Governments** (Over 100,000 population, 250 square miles) Controlling growth and protecting the environment, including the Santa Monica Mountains, will be a prime objective.

**(7) North Los Angeles County** (Cities of Lancaster, Palmdale, and Santa Clarita; Over 500,000 population, 2,000 square miles) Controlling rapid residential growth is a vital concern.

**(8) Orange County Council of Governments** (All of Orange County including 32 cities; Just under 3,000 000 population, 948 square miles) Part of this area needs to revitalize its land use and infrastructure. Light rail and other transit should help congestion.

**(9) San Bernardino Association of Governments** (City of San Bernardino, 23 other municipalities, and San Bernardino County; Over 1,950,000 population, 20,000 square miles, largest geographic county in the country) Developing as a transportation/distribution center and housing growth market. Growing truck traffic and regional freight movement can adversely impact road capacity.

**(10) San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments** (Pasadena, San Gabriel, and 28 other cities; Over 1,100,000 population, about 500 square miles) The San Gabriel Valley has significant ground water and other environmental problems.

**(11) South Bay Cities Council of Governments** (Torrance is the largest of 16 cities south of the City of Los Angeles, over 850,000 population, over 250 square miles) This subre-

*(Continued on page 3)*

*“The formation of subregional planning agencies in the SCAG region has also provided opportunities for focused interregional planning to occur.”*

*(Continued from page 2)*

gion is fragmented by congested streets. And while an economic benefit, it is impacted by the noise, congestion, and pollution of Los Angeles International Airport.

**(12) Westside Cities Council of Governments** (Beverly Hills, Culver City, Santa Monica, West Hollywood, parts of the City of Los Angeles; Over 700,000 population, 100 square miles) Mostly built-out, these cities have common planning interests which influence their cooperative efforts. Key problems are air quality, water quality, and traffic congestion.

**(13) Western Riverside Council of Governments** (Western Riverside County including the City Riverside and 13 other municipalities plus Riverside County; over 1,200,000 population, 2,500 square miles) This huge, flat subregion is rapidly developing as a major transportation/distribution center, and is also providing housing to major job markets in Orange County and San Diego County. It is in the path of Los Angeles and Orange counties driven air which can be a problem.

**(14) Ventura Council of Governments** (City of Ventura and nine other municipalities as well as Ventura County; Over 800,000 population, 2,500 square miles) Holding an eclectic mix of small cities, rich farmlands and orchards, naval bases, and light industry, the region protects its agricultural heritage. It has recently legislated growth limits and other slow growth approaches.

#### **ONE OF THE ACTIVE SUBREGIONS: THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**

Various subregions have become quite active in planning and development activities pertaining to their own subregions. The Gateway Cities COG is a good example. It covers the industrial heart of the Los Angeles Region, providing for one out of seven jobs in this Region. Two specific examples of its subregional planning and development program, one dealing with transportation and economic development, one dealing with transportation and environmental protection, follow:

This subregion and its COG is integrally involved with significant improvements for major freeways. The I-710 study is particularly noteworthy as it is the main freight route from the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles over a

18-mile stretch to State Highway 60. This two-year effort will develop a multi-modal plan to modernize this vital freight transportation link. This study is being led by an Oversight Policy Committee with a representative from each of the COG's 27 municipalities plus representative from the two ports, a Los Angeles County Supervisor, and representatives from the Southern California Association of Governments, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the California Department of Transportation.

Another innovative project of the Gateway COG is their Clean Air Program which has two parts. The first part allows truck owners to trade in freight trucks built in 1986 or earlier for freight trucks built in 1999 or later and provides an average grant for a truck trade-in of about \$20,000. The second part involves a 4.1 million dollar grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to the Gateway Cities COG to provide further subgrants for off-road cleanup efforts. Some one million dollars of this particular COG program, as a matching subgrant, goes to the Port of Long Beach to clean up stationary diesel equipment.

#### **INTERREGIONAL PLANNING**

The formation of subregional planning agencies in the SCAG region has also provided opportunities for focused interregional planning to occur. Specifically, the Western Riverside Council of Governments participated in two interregional planning efforts which were funded by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD): one with the Orange County Council of Governments and one with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). Each of these studies looked at issues related to jobs/housing imbalance on key transportation corridors: the SR-91 corridor connecting Orange and northeast Riverside Counties, and the I-15 corridor connecting San Diego and southwest Riverside County. The studies led to cooperative follow-up implementation actions among the participating agencies, as well as the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and HCD. The interregional planning approach is now being discussed by other regional planning agencies in California through the Regional Blueprint Planning Network which has been formed by the Governor's Office and Caltrans.

*(Continued on page 4)*

(Continued from page 3)

## **BASIC CHALLENGES FACING THE SUBREGIONS**

### **Increasing Subregional and Regional**

**Awareness:** This requires a lot of effort and education on how regional efforts are important when so many growth and development issues extend beyond city boundaries. And this is true whether we are talking about a subregion or the Los Angeles Region as a whole. In fact, one could suggest that creating subregional awareness will also lead to better understanding of the Los Angeles Region in its entirety. Awareness can best be achieved through constant education in subregional meetings concerning such issues as traffic, air pollution, housing, taxation, and land use.

### **Signing Up and Keeping Cities in Sub-**

**regions:** Many cities within a given subregion have been in competition with each other for years if not decades. Thus, it is a constant struggle to get all the cities within a subregion to join and cooperate. One of the strongest cases for developing subregions comes from the success of cities working together to resolve common problems and find that their differences can be overcome through listening and helping each other. And perhaps the key to all this is an awareness that subregional cooperation saves monies for the individual local governments which would not be forthcoming without joint cooperation and agreement.

**Subregion Staff Development:** The staffs of the 14 subregional planning agencies typically range from one person to ten people, and a few have staffs of 20-40 people. There is substantial variance in their staff capabilities and needs. Generally, most subregions will eventually need increased staff whether through direct hires or contract, with the recognition that it will take time to acquire additional funding and to develop these staffs. Funding could come from local, state, or federal agencies for general and more specific purposes. And for highly special or technical needs funding might also come from foundations, other non-profits, and the private sector. Of special note, increased staff capacity needs to be evolved to allow each of the subregions to fully participate in the SGAG periodic update of the Compass Growth Vision and in implementing the 2 % Strategy. Just as importantly, staff capacity is also needed to enable these bodies to develop planning and development programs that are unique to each of the

14 subregions.

## **PRESENT AND FUTURE PROGRAM ROLES FOR THE SUBREGIONS**

**Planning and Growth Management:** As mentioned above each of the subregions were involved in the 2003-2004 Los Angeles Region Compass Growth Vision process, particularly as related to their individual subregions. And this process will be repeated in a more extensive manner in late 2006 and 2007 for the update of the Compass Growth Vision as it feeds into the 2007 update of the Regional Transportation Plan.

So each of the subregions is already involved in planning for the entire Los Angeles Region through Compass and its periodic updates. And several of the subregions are far enough along to be able to develop overall subregional plans and growth management measures. For example, a given subregion could explore three future alternative growth patterns: continuation of present growth, or focus on compact neighborhoods and open space, or develop growth nodes near and around major transportation facilities. In fact, two or three of the subregions, mainly via the subregional transportation function, are already close to such a subregional overall planning function. More of the subregions should follow in the same vein, moving eventually to broader subregional planning.

**Urban Vitalization and Revitalization:** The 2 % Strategy and its Demonstration projects was mentioned above. Under this Strategy, two of the subregions---the San Bernardino Association of Governments (SANBAG) and the Western Riverside Council of Governments--- are integrally involved in three of the Demonstration projects. SANBAG is involved with the City of San Bernardino and SCAG consultants in developing better rapid transit/land use linkages in that City. SANBAG is also involved along with SCAG consultants in working with the City of Ontario in providing for a better jobs/ housing mix for a large area that is about to undergo extensive residential development. The Western Riverside Council of Governments is working with several cities and SCAG's consultants to plan for the extension of Los Angeles Region commuter rail ---that of Metrolink--- beyond the City of Riverside.

As mentioned before, under the Compass

(Continued on page 5)

*“The subregions were involved in the in the 2003-2004 Los Angeles Region Compass Growth Vision process.”*

(Continued from page 4)

Growth Vision 2 % Strategy, there were identified about 260 smart-growth type sites and areas throughout the Los Angeles Region, including sites and areas in each of the 14 subregions. This is a program area which, eventually, should be ripe for these subregional organizations to develop community development efforts. Within a context of adequate planning and growth management, the various subregional agencies in direct working relationships with the local governments and other public and private parties might well evolve strong implementation programs for these various sites and areas.

**Housing Development:** All subregions in the Greater Los Angeles region need to develop housing--particularly affordable and work force housing. At present, the State of California is pursuing a far-reaching affordable housing program requirement as placed on local governments and implemented in part through the larger regional planning agencies such as SCAG, the San Diego Association of Governments, and others in different parts of the State. Within the Los Angeles Region, though there is some consultation by SCAG with the subregions, by and large, SCAG works directly with local general purpose units of government as most of the subregions are still too politically fragile to get involved. Eventually, however, as more experience is gained with the state program, on a case by case basis, the subregions could begin to play a role in this program. And looking beyond the State's affordable housing program requirements, the Compass Growth Vision also suggests that the subregions could get involved in housing for those sites and areas which have possibilities for infill development and other like Compass Growth Vision and 2 % Strategy implementation.

**Development of a Regional Citizenry:** One of the keys to the long-term success of the subregions is the development of a significant citizen involvement. Without such active and meaningful civic participation, regional or subregional planning will continue to have somewhat limited effectiveness. This is true whether we are talking about the Los Angeles Region and its subregions, or various other metropolitan and regional planning endeavors across the country. The 14 subregions provide a unique opportunity to develop varying citizen involvement models. Eventually, some of these models, with or without adapta-

tion, could be applied to SCAG as a whole, or in other parts of the country. Governments, and private and non-profit organizations, including foundations, need to provide political and financial support for citizen and civic involvement in regional planning and development.

## CONCLUSION

The 14 subregions have been in existence as a part of the Southern California Association of Governments structure for close to 15 years. This is too short a period of time to make judgments about overall success. Initially, however, it can be said that, generally, the approach is working reasonably well in most of the subregions, especially in the last few years. Based on the immense and truly sprawling nature of the Los Angeles Region of 17- 18 million people, the subregions allow each of these 14 planning bodies to operate more effectively and to let the local areas have their say as to how each of these subregions operate. This permits local satisfaction and pride to flourish. At the same time, each of the subregions participate in now-evolving Los Angeles region-wide planning through such SCAG programs as Compass Growth Vision. Based on progress to date, it is fair to suggest that, within 15-25 years, the use of subregional planning in the Los Angeles area might well be looked upon as an effective overall innovation. It is also possible that some of the unfolding innovations of the 14 subregions may eventually be adapted elsewhere across the country, especially as several large and medium-size metropolitan areas coalesce through urban growth.

*“the subregions allow each of these 14 planning bodies to operate more effectively...”*

**EDITORS NOTE ON PRECEDING ARTICLE:** One of the co-editors of the immediate prior article is Frank W. Osgood who wrote *Region Aroused*. This book is a work of fiction and docudrama suggesting how a strong planning program for the Greater Los Angeles Region might be developed and carried out. This includes strong regional and subregional planning for the 14 subregions which are constituent parts of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). While *Region Aroused* is a work of fiction, it is based on actual planning events of the late 90's and 2000-2001 when Mr. Osgood was Chair of SCAG's then Regional Advisory Council. This book was issued by RoseDog Books in 2003, the telephone number being 1-800-834-1803. Mr. Osgood can be reached at: fsosgood@yahoo.com, or (562) 598-3289.

## MID-ATLANTIC, NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL PLANNING CONFERENCE IN CELEBRATION OF THE PINELANDS COMMISSION'S 25<sup>th</sup> ANNIVERSARY

On Thursday and Friday, this coming September 28 and 29, former U.S. Secretary of the Interior, Bruce Babbitt will open this conference. It will be held in the Regency Hyatt Hotel in New Brunswick, New Jersey. For details on the web, go to: [www: regionalplanningcomesofage.org](http://www.regionalplanningcomesofage.org).

Following is a summary of the conference program and a brief background review of the Pinelands Commission and its program.

### PREVIEW OF THE SEPTEMBER 28-29 REGIONAL PLANNING CONFERENCE

**Basic Program.** After Secretary Babbitt's opening address on Thursday, September 28, Robert Yaro, Executive Director of the Regional Plan Association of New York will give an overview on the status of regional planning throughout the Mid-Atlantic and New England states. Then, there will be concurrent panel sessions in the morning followed by lunch and further concurrent panels in the afternoon. The evening banquet celebrates the 25th anniversary of the Pinelands Commission. Confirmed speakers include former New Jersey Governor Brendan Byrne and former Congressman James Florio, both of whom played a strong role in founding of the Pinelands Commission 25 years ago.

The September 29, Friday morning session will start with a series of concurrent panels followed by a series of workshops for regional planning efforts just getting underway. The keynote speaker for the closing luncheon will be Doug Foy who until very recently was the Massachusetts Secretary of the Office for Commonwealth Development, leading that State's Smart Growth activities under Governor Mitt Romney.

**Concurrent Panel Subject Matter and Some of the Speakers:** The various concurrent panels cover a wide range of regional planning subjects throughout the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions. They include: the Adirondack Park, Cape Cod, the Chesapeake Region, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, the Long Island Pine Barrens, the Natural Heritage Areas along the Schuylkill River and in the Blackstone River Valley, the New Jersey Meadowlands, the New Jersey Highlands, the

Pinelands National Reserve, and other subjects

A good two score speakers are lined up for the concurrent panels. Some of them include: Robert Ceberio, Executive Director of the New Jersey Meadowlands Commission; Don Chen, Executive Director of Smart Growth America; Carol Collier, Executive Director of the Delaware River Basin Commission; Raymond Corwin, Executive Director of the Central Pine Barrens Joint Policy Commission on Long Island; Richard Hall, Director of Land Use Planning and Analysis for the Maryland State Department of Planning; Brian Houseal, Executive Director of the Adirondack Council; Gerrit-Jan Knapp, Executive Director of the University of Maryland Smart Growth Center; Christopher Miller, President of the Piedmont Environmental Council; Barry Seymour, Executive Director of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission; John Weingart, Chair of the New Jersey Highlands Council; and Betty Wilson, Chair of the New Jersey Pinelands Commission.

**Support of the Program:** There are seven sponsors helping to finance this conference and about sixty partners further helping to promote this unique regional planning undertaking. Seven of the conference partners include the APA Regional and Intergovernmental Planning Division as well as the APA chapters in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Metro New York, Rhode Island, and Upstate New York.

### BACKGROUND ON THE PINELANDS COMMISSION AND ITS PROGRAM

**Basic Facts:** The Pinelands is located in the eastern and southeastern parts of New Jersey, the most densely populated state in the US. It includes parts of seven counties (Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, and Ocean) and all or parts of 56 municipalities. Some 700,000 people live

there and it contains 1.1 million acres, or over one fifth of the State's land area. From Boston to Richmond, it is the largest piece of land that is, basically, open space along the Mid-Atlantic Coast.

*Former U.S. Secretary  
of the Interior, Bruce  
Babbitt will open Mid-  
Atlantic/New England  
regional planning  
conference.*

*(Continued on page 7)*

(Continued from page 6)

**Background Leading to the Development of the Pinelands Commission and Its Program:**

The increasing urbanization of New Jersey in the 1950's and 1960's provided a context for the cultivation of an awareness of the fragile environment of the Pinelands. In 1963, a wildlife fire burned nearly 190,000 acres of the Pinelands, and in 1964, a supersonic jetport with an accompanying population increase of 250,000 was recommended by a local governmental body. Then, in 1967, John McPhee wrote the best seller, *The Pine Barrens*, which brought national attention to the Pineland's precarious state as threatened by encroaching urbanization and other factors.

In the early 1970's, the Pinelands Environmental Council was created and it prepared a Master Plan for 320,000 acres. In 1977 casino gambling began in Atlantic City, New Jersey, thereby increasing development pressures on the nearby Pinelands. In 1978 the National Parks and Recreation Act was passed, calling for the development of the Pinelands Comprehensive Management Plan. On January 14, 1981 and January 16, 1981, New Jersey Governor Brendan Byrne and U.S. Secretary of the Interior Cecil Andrus respectively approved this Congressionally-mandated plan. Highlights of the Plan follow.

**Selective Highlights of the Pinelands Comprehensive Management Plan Focusing on Major Land Use Categories:**

The Pinelands is divided into two basic categories: "Preservation Areas" and "Protection Areas." The first category consists of 290,000 acres or 26-27 percent of the entire Pinelands area. "Preservations Areas" are at the heart of the Pineland's environmental conservation efforts. Much of the "Preservation Area" consists of

blueberry farming and cranberry bogs.

"Protection Areas" are divided into four sub-categories: Forest Areas, Agriculture Production Areas, Regional Growth Areas, and Rural Development Areas. Forest Areas number 400,000 acres and Agriculture Production Areas consist of 69,000 acres.

Regional Growth Areas constitute 77,000 acres of the Pinelands and will contain the majority of the projected 137,000 new housing units now developing. Regional Growth Areas are also receiving areas for transfer development rights, mainly from "Preservation Areas." For example, of the 74,000 housing units anticipated for Regional Growth Areas, about 18,000 have or will get there through transfer development rights actions. Finally, Rural Development Areas number 112,000 acres, and to a degree, act as backup for development in the Regional Growth Areas.

This limited thumbnail sketch of the Pinelands program does not get into the many other significant environment facets of the Pinelands program, nor does it even attempt to highlight its many achievements over the last 25 years. Perhaps, however, the merits of Pinelands to date are best summed up by quoting Bruce Babbitt from page 179 of his 2005 book, *Cities in the Wilderness*:

*"Development should enlarge the possibilities for human progress, creativity, and quality of life, which it cannot accomplish by continually eroding the beauty and productivity of the natural world. The Pinelands story is a reminder that we can promote progress even as we preserve our history, our culture, and the integrity of the natural world in which we live."*

*"Development should enlarge the possibilities for human progress, creativity, and quality of life..."*

## DIVISION PROGRAM AND BUSINESS NEWS

### **NEW OFFICERS**

In January/February the Division held elections and the current Board was elected. It serves through late April of 2008. There was one candidate for each of the positions (though a write-in was possible). About 15 percent of the then 160 Division members voted. Following is a listing of the current officers and summary biographies:

**Lee Schoenecker: Chairperson of the Divi-**

**sion, AICP:** Lee is retired from the Federal government and he also spent ten years working for state and local governments, either directly or as a consultant. Under APA term-limits on Division Chairs, this will be his last term as Division Chair.

**Rocky Piro: Chair-Elect, Ph.D, AICP:**

Rocky previously served as Vice-Chair for Metropolitan and Regional Planning / Secretary. Rocky is a senior supervisory planner

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 7)

with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), Seattle Washington. He presently is in charge of the updating of the PSRC's long-range vision plan for the Puget Sound region.

**Robert Leiter: Vice-Chair for Metropolitan and Regional Planning, AICP:** Bob is Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning for the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). In the last two years, Bob was in charge of pulling together SANDAG'S pioneering regional plan.

**Debbie Lawlor: Vice-Chair for State Planning, NJPP/AICP:** Debbie is the Chief Planner for the New Jersey Meadowlands Regional Commission. She is now on assignment to the end of the year to the New Jersey Highlands Regional Planning Commission where she is in charge of pulling together that commission's first comprehensive regional plan. Debbie is also First Vice-President for the New Jersey APA Chapter.

**Patricia Atkins: Vice-Chair for National Planning, Ph.D, APA:** Pat is a research professor at The George Washington University in Washington, DC where she works on a variety of urban and metropolitan policy matters across the country. From the mid-1990s until about 2,000 she was editor of *The Regionalist*, a quarterly periodical sponsored by the National Association of Regional Councils and the University of Maryland-Baltimore.

**Robert Kull: Secretary Treasurer, NJPP/AICP:** Bob is a consultant and he spends much of his time as the Regional Planning Coordinator for Burlington County, New Jersey. Prior to his present employment, Bob was Assistant Director for the New Jersey State Office of Planning for 15 years.

In addition to the above officers, our newsletter editor/list-serve manager and our web master continue with the Division as in they past. They are:

**Robert Scott Taylor: Newsletter and List-Serve Editor, APA:** Scott has served in various capacities with the Missouri State Department of Transportation. He currently serves at that agency's right of way administrator. He also teaches at Columbia College in Columbia, Missouri and has taught courses in public management as well as ethics.

**Ryan Harris: Web Master, AICP:** Ryan currently is employed as an urban planner with Edwards and Kelcey in their New York City Office. Past employment has included that with the San Francisco County Transportation Authority and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

#### **THOMAS DOW: FORMER VICE-CHAIR FOR STATE PLANNING/TREASURER:**

After six active years as an officer in our Division, Thomas Dow decided not to run again for Division office. Instead, he took over as President of the Kansas APA Chapter. As the Division's Treasurer, he was as good as they come. He contributed two excellent land use-transportation articles to the newsletter and intends to put together more in the future. The Division by-right panel he organized for the 2006 San Antonio National APA Conference, "Urban Corridor Land Use-Transportation Planning," which examined strategic land use/transportation planning efforts in the Dallas, Ft Worth, and Kansas City areas, was outstanding and had standing room only on Sunday afternoon, April 23. The Kansas Chapter is very fortunate to have him as President and the APA needs more members like Thomas Dow.

#### **2006-2007 DIVISION WORK PROGRAM**

**A. Conduct the Allotted Two By-Right Panels at the 2007 National APA Conference in Philadelphia:** Three Division Board members--Debbie Lawlor, Pat Atkins, and Bob Kull---are pulling together the two by-right panels.

**B. Develop at Least Two Newsletters:** This constitutes the first of the two newsletters, and by the time of the conference in Philadelphia, we should have one or possibly two more newsletters.

**C. Better Integrate the Division's Web Site and List Serve:** We are now at the point where we can periodically send out documents on the list serve. However, we would like to get to the point where we can better use our list-serve in conjunction with web site to better utilize the two of them in combination.

**D. Review By-Laws With An Eye to Updating the Same:** These by-laws are 20 years old and they should at least be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with existing missions.

**E. Carry Forward Solid Financial and Budg-**

(Continued on page 9)

*"After six active years as an officer in our Division, Thomas Dow decided not to run again for Division office."*

(Continued from page 8)

**eting Controls As Done in the Past:** We now usually have been \$5,000 and \$6,000 on hand. In the coming year we will prudently draw down on that money for expenses involved with the development of newsletters, expenses associated with the development of a policy guide and/or Planning Advisory Service report for regional planning, limited use of teleconferencing of Division Board members, and any other incidental expenses.

**F. Encourage Division Student Planners to Participate in 2007 Student Competition of the American Society for Public Administration, Section on Intergovernmental and Administrative Management:** Early in 2006, we were approached by the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), Section on Intergovernmental and Administrative Management, as to whether we would like to have the Division's student members compete for the best graduate paper award along with students from the various graduate schools of public policy and management across the country. We answered in the affirmative and notified all of our students. Our Division has again been offered the opportunity to have our Division's student submit papers for this ASPA student award in 2007 and we have again accepted this opportunity.

**G. Increase our Membership to 185-200 by March of 2007:** Over the course of a year ending in March 2006, our membership grew by 25-30 percent and our Division was one of the fastest growing of the 19 APA Divisions. Looking forward two years to April of 2008, we hope to have our membership at 215-225. Meeting the above objective of 185 to 200 by March of 2007 and 215- 225 by March of 2008 will be anything but easy.

**H. Monitor Closely and Participate in Activities Leading to Improved APA Policy for Disaster Planning, Mitigation, and Recovery:** APA policy in this area centers around the development of an updated hazardous planning Planning Advisory Service guide as Chicago APA received a grant for the same from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Our Division will follow the development of that effort, but in addition, we will also continue to participate in efforts led by Chicago APA staff and its informal disaster mitigation and planning advisory committee.

**I. Evolve APA Policy on Regional and Intergovernmental Planning:** Over the course of the last year this has been our highest program priority and will continue to be so. A lot has happened and it will be discussed further immediately below, including Division program direction.

#### **APA POLICY FOR REGIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL PLANNING**

**Activities Over the Last 16- 17 Months:** At the 2005 APA Board of Directors meeting in San Francisco, our newly-renamed Division was charged by the Board to evolve an APA Policy Guide on Regional and Intergovernmental Planning. The development of any policy guide proceeds over a two-year period. During the first year an issue paper is developed for presentation to the Delegate Assembly which meets as part of the National APA Conference. Delegate Assembly reaction to an issue paper usually has significant influence as to whether or not the policy paper goes forward for full development. Assuming the policy paper is then given the go-ahead, at the next year's APA Conference the Delegate Assembly votes on the developed policy paper. The administrative and ongoing policy evolution of a policy guide is directed by a 12-person APA Legislative and Policy Committee.

In early 2006, a draft issue paper was sent out to various members of the Regional and Intergovernmental Planning Division by its chair for review. The revised four-page issue paper along with a one-page attachment giving the names and a bullet biographical sketch of each of the reviewers was then transmitted to APA's Legislative and Policy Committee. In a teleconference in late March of 2006, that included our Division's Chair, the Legislative and Policy Committee decided this issue paper should not be sent out in advance to the Chapter Delegate Assembly representatives for discussion purposes at the APA Conference in San Antonio. Instead, a hard copy hand-out would be given to each of the Delegate members present explaining the policy guide that our Division proposed to develop.

At the Delegate Assembly, each of the Delegate Members was given a six-page, Power-Point like hand out which basically mirrored the previously developed issue paper as prepared by our Division. Then, two members of the Divi-

*“At the 2005 APA Board of Directors meeting in San Francisco, our newly-renamed Division was charged by the Board to evolve an APA Policy Guide on Regional and Intergovernmental Planning.”*

(Continued on page 10)

**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

*“our target of going  
before the Delegate  
Assembly for approval  
at the Las Vegas  
National Conference in  
2008.”*

*(Continued from page 9)*

sion made a 20-minute presentation to the Delegate Assembly. Subsequently, representatives of nine different APA chapters publicly spoke in favor of proceeding with an APA Policy Guide on Regional and Intergovernmental Planning. No Chapter spoke out against the development of such a policy guide.

Subsequent to the Delegate Assembly a somewhat revised issue paper was transmitted to the Legislative and Policy Committee. In early June of 2006, this Committee held another teleconference and the Chair of our Division participated. The Legislative and Policy Committee decided the Division should pursue a Planning Advisory Service report rather than an APA Policy Guide on Regional and Intergovernmental Planning. Reasons for developing a PAS report rather than a policy guide seemed to focus on the complexity of undertaking the development of a policy guide for this particular subject. Also, though we may be wrong, we discerned that one or two members of the Legislative and Policy Committee wanted to possibly focus on the development of an APA policy guide on global warming in the next two years.

**Tentative Direction in Developing APA Policy on Regional and Intergovernmental**



**American Planning Association**

*Making great communities happen*

**Planning:** At this time the Division has decided to develop a dual-approach to the developing APA policy on regional and intergovernmental planning. First, we agree with the Legislative and Policy Committee to initially pursue the development of a PAS report and will look at the alternative means for accomplishing the same

We will, however, also continue to move towards the development of an APA Policy Guide on Regional and Intergovernmental Planning, with our target of going before the Delegate Assembly for approval at the Las Vegas National Conference in 2008. It is obvious to us from the support given to our proposal at the Delegate Assembly in San Antonio that the APA Chapters are not adverse to the development of such a guide. Yet, we do agree with members of the APA Legislative and Policy Committee that it is a difficult task. On the other hand, however, we most certainly do not believe that it is an insurmountable task.

Finally, if the Legislative and Policy Committee does, in fact, want to develop a policy guide on global warming on expeditious bases, we agree. We also believe that part of an APA policy guide on global warming might well have, as one of its possible implementing mechanisms, regional planning and decision-making at various levels of government and